

Board of Forestry Meeting Minutes

November 4, 2020

INDEX

| <u>Item #</u>   | <u>Page #</u> |
|---|---------------|
| <b>A. SEPTEMBER 9, 2020 BOARD OF FORESTRY MEETING MINUTES .....</b>   | <b>2</b>      |
| <b>B. PERMANENT RULEMAKING FOR SALMON, STEELHEAD, AND BULL TROUT STREAMS IN SISKIYOU GEOGRAPHIC REGION.....</b> | <b>2</b>      |
| <b>C. DEQ AND ODF COLLABORATION QUARTERLY UPDATE.....</b>   | <b>3</b>      |
| <b>D. FINANCIAL DASHBOARD UPDATE.....</b>   | <b>3</b>      |
| <b>E. *PROPOSED FINAL ORDER REVIEW – SISKIYOU CASCADE RESOURCES.....</b>  | <b>3</b>      |
| <b>F. OCTOBER 6, 2020 BOARD OF FORESTRY MEETING MINUTES.....</b>  | <b>3</b>      |
| <b>1. STATE FORESTER AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS.....</b>   | <b>4</b>      |
| <b>2. *HEARINGS BEFORE THE BOARD OF FORESTRY .....</b>  | <b>5</b>      |
| <b>3. FIRE SEASON UPDATE .....</b>  | <b>6</b>      |
| <b>4. DOJ MEMORANDUM ON STATUTORY AUTHORITY RELATING TO CARBON AND CLIMATE.....</b>                             | <b>7</b>      |
| <b>5. FOREST TRUST LAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY.....</b>   | <b>9</b>      |
| <b>6. OREGON FOREST CARBON ACCOUNTING FRAMEWORK.....</b>  | <b>10</b>     |
| <b>6A. FOREST ECOSYSTEM CARBON REPORT AND PNW FOREST CARBON INITIATIVE.....</b>                                 | <b>11</b>     |
| <b>6B. HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCT REPORT AND SAWMILL ENERGY REPORT .....</b>  | <b>11</b>     |
| <b>6C. GLOBAL CARBON FLUX AND FOREST CONSIDERATIONS .....</b>   | <b>12</b>     |
| <b>6D. FOREST MANAGEMENT SCENARIOS FOR CARBON MITIGATION.....</b>   | <b>13</b>     |
| <b>7. ODF URBAN AND COMMUNITY FORESTRY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM .....</b>   | <b>15</b>     |
| <b>8. OREGON GLOBAL WARMING COMMISSION EO 20-04 GOAL SETTING .....</b>  | <b>17</b>     |
| <b>9. BOARD CLOSING COMMENTS AND MEETING WRAP UP .....</b>  | <b>18</b>     |

*Items listed in order heard.*

Complete audio recordings from the meeting and attachments listed below are available on the web at [www.oregonforestry.gov](http://www.oregonforestry.gov).

- (1) Presentation, [Fire Season Update](#), Agenda Item 3
- (2) Presentation, [DOJ Memorandum on Statutory Authority relating to Carbon and Climate](#), Agenda Item 4
- (3) Handout, [Written testimony by Wagner for DOJ Memorandum on Statutory Authority relating to Carbon and Climate](#), Agenda Item 4
- (4) Handout, [Written testimony by Anderson for DOJ Memorandum on Statutory Authority relating to Carbon and Climate](#), Agenda Item 4
- (5) Handout, [Oral and Written testimony by Sweet for Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee](#), Agenda Item 5
- (6) Presentation, [Oregon Forest Carbon Accounting Framework](#), Agenda Item 6

- (7) Presentation, [Forest Ecosystem Carbon Report and PNW Forest Carbon Initiative](#), Agenda Item 6a
- (8) Presentation, [Harvested Wood Product Report and Sawmill Energy Report](#), Agenda Item 6b
- (9) Presentation, [Global Carbon Flux and Forest Considerations](#), Agenda Item 6c
- (10) Presentation, [Forest Management Scenarios for Carbon Mitigation](#), Agenda Item 6d
- (11) Presentation, [ODF Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program - Ramstad](#), Agenda Item 7
- (12) Presentation, [ODF Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program - Donovan](#), Agenda Item 7
- (13) Presentation, [ODF Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program - Shandas](#), Agenda Item 7
- (14) Presentation, [Oregon Global Warming Commission EO 20-04 Goal Setting](#), Agenda Item 8
- (15) Handout, [Written testimony by Wagner for Oregon Global Warming Commission EO 20-04 Goal Setting](#), Agenda Item 8

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held virtually on November 4, 2020 and hosted at the Oregon Department of Forestry Headquarters on 2600 State Street, Salem, OR 97310.

All Board members joined online by 9:30 a.m. into Zoom webinar. Chair Imeson called the public meeting to order at 10:02 a.m.

Board Members Virtually Present:

Nils Christoffersen  
 Cindy Deacon Williams  
 Brenda McComb  
 Joe Justice  
 Jim Kelly  
 Mike Rose  
 Tom Imeson

Board Members Absent:

None

**CONSENT AGENDA:**

A. SEPTEMBER 9, 2020 BOARD OF FORESTRY MEETING MINUTES

Approval of Board’s September 9, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

**ACTION: The Board approved minutes from the September 9, 2020 Board of Forestry meeting.**

B. PERMANENT RULEMAKING FOR SALMON, STEELHEAD, AND BULL TROUT STREAMS IN SISKIYOU GEOGRAPHIC REGION

Oregon Legislature directed the Board of Forestry to adopt rules to make the 2017 board rules regarding salmon, steelhead, and bull trout applicable for the Siskiyou Georegion. These rules shall be effective January 1, 2021. The specific rule would enact stream protections on small and medium fish bearing streams in the Siskiyou Georegion consistent with stream protection rules on salmon, steelhead, and bull trout streams already in effect in the rest of western Oregon. The Board to approve and adopt the proposed final rule language.

**ACTION: The Board approved and adopted the Proposed Final Rule Language as submitted with an effective date of January 1, 2021. (Attachment 3).**

C. DEQ AND ODF COLLABORATION QUARTERLY UPDATE

Department of Forestry and the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) in a collaborative effort are working towards better understanding and alignment of their respective water quality programs. This is an update for the Board and an information item.

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

D. FINANCIAL DASHBOARD UPDATE

Department provided an executive financial report and summary that will be submitted monthly to the Board. The report to include up-to-date information about the Department's financial condition, the financial and budgetary status, as well as other ancillary topics as appropriate for Board oversight.

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

E. \*PROPOSED FINAL ORDER REVIEW- SISKIYOU CASCADE RESOURCES

The hearing record for contested orders of the state forester (repair orders) involving three forest practices violations by Siskiyou Cascade Resources LLC was considered, and the Board to make a decision on the final order regarding the matter.

**ACTION: The Board determined the following:**

**For ODF Case No. 19-SW002 & 19-SW003**

- 1) **FINDS that the exceptions filed by Siskiyou Cascade Resources were not timely, but were considered on their merits in the event that the Board's conclusion as to timeliness is overturned on appeal.**
- 2) **DIRECTS Department to issue a Final Order that incorporates and modifies the ALJ's proposed order with a new time period to comply with the next instream work period.**

**For ODF Case No. 19-SW007**

- 3) **FINDS that the exceptions filed by Siskiyou Cascade Resources were timely and that it is reasonable to accept an email copy of the exceptions filed by the deadline in light of the current constraints on handling physical documents under the pandemic.**
- 4) **DIRECTS Department to issue a Final Order that adopts the recommendation of the ALJ's proposed order.**

F. OCTOBER 6, 2020 BOARD OF FORESTRY MEETING MINUTES

Approval of Board's October 6, 2020 Meeting Minutes.

**ACTION: The Board approved minutes from the October 6, 2020 Board of Forestry meeting.**

Mike Rose motioned for approval of the consent agenda items. Nils Christoffersen seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Joe Justice, Jim Kelly, Brenda McComb, Mike Rose, and Tom Imeson. Against: none. With Board consensus Items A through F were approved, and the motion carried.

## **ACTION AND INFORMATION:**

### 1. STATE FORESTER AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS [Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (28 minutes and 3 seconds – 12.8 MB)

Chair Imeson commented on:

- Outlined Board proceedings for Board members, presenters, and the public.
- Noted the public meeting will be live streamed, recorded, and posted online.
- Noted written public testimony can be submitted through November 18, 2020, and included with the meeting record.

State Forester Daugherty commented on:

- Discussed diversity, equity, and inclusion as he recognized Native American Heritage month, and the Department's efforts in fostering partnerships with Oregon's tribes. He spoke about the Recreation, Education, and Interpretation program striving to deepen understanding, to engage the public, and create dialogues while exploring diverse topics through social media.
- Described the Labor Day fire event, explaining how the combination of drought conditions, low humidity, and high winds gave way to a historical number of fires and acres burned. He noted the coordinated efforts on all levels that took place statewide to minimize the loss of life, residences, and property. He shared how the Governor has responded to the fire event by standing up a Governor's Disaster Cabinet, a Wildfire Economic Recovery Council, and three taskforces. Listed the three phases of fire recovery, the initial priorities for the state, and coordinated short-term tasks to help inform the recovery process.
- Elaborated on the executive leadership fire recovery coordination and collaboration with natural resource agency directors and federal agency executive partners as they take an all-lands approach to recovery. He shared the leadership's objective, alignment, and recovery priorities to fulfill the economic recovery work.
- Addressed the significant increase to salvage harvest notifications, the gap filled by Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and Department of Environmental Quality in supporting the fish habitat and water quality workloads in fire recovery and restoration efforts in the field.
- Noted the intention for the Board meeting being heavily weighted to explore the topic of climate change. Explained status of Department's work in responding to the Governor's letter on Forestry's report in accordance to Executive Order (EO) 20-04. Described the collective feedback received, the prioritization of actions, and the goal to create a Department climate change plan that identifies opportunities and supports leadership actions. He stated a purpose, vision, and set of principles were created to guide the development of the climate change plan, and shared them with the Board. He outlined eight areas of forestry climate actions that the Department will focus on as we produce the next iteration of this report. Closed by providing a rough timeline of drafting and review work, as well as collaboration with the Board before finalization and implementation of the Climate Change Plan.

Board Member Comments:

- Board Member Christoffersen commented about reforestation and afforestation post-fire, inquiring whether stocking rates should be adjusted and tree species propagated, relative to climate change. State Forester Daugherty mentioned the Department is looking as species migration patterns, but has not followed closely the research on stocking rates.
- Board Chair Imeson thanked the State Forester for the work the Department and staff have been doing as part of the fire recovery efforts. He recognized the partnerships, the participation in the disaster cabinet, and extra work everyone has taken on.

Public Testimony: No provision made for public testimony.

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

2. \*HEARINGS BEFORE THE BOARD OF FORESTRY

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (10 minutes and 45 seconds – 4.92 MB)

Tim Holschbach, Fire Prevention and Policy Manager, provided an overview of how patrol assessments are determined at the county-level, described the recent assessment and process followed for Tillamook County, and explained how the landowner notifications operate after lands are assessed. He outlined the factors that determines whether a lot can be assessed, the parameters under Chapter 477 requiring forestland protection and described how he reviewed the lot assessed that resulted in the private landowner appealing the County's determination. Kate Skinner, District Forester for Tillamook District was also present, and had no additional comments.

Bruce Gray, Private Landowner who appealed for a hearing in front of the Board, inquired about the forestland assessment process and how it is applied. He explained his perspective, intentions, and limitations as a landowner. He described what he observed about the assessment process and is striving to find ways to minimize costs as a landowner.

Board members commented on the Hearing before the Board of Forestry Presentation.

- The Board asked Mr. Gray about whether he contacted the Tillamook County classification committee and inquired about why his land was classified as forestland. Mr. Gray described his discussion with a local district representative but explained how he was still unclear about the timing of the assessment and the difference between his land over his neighbor's. A board member offered an example of how their land was evaluated as part of the classification process and explained how the Board does not have the authority to overturn an assessment made at the county-level but recommended for the landowner to connect with the forestland classification team in Tillamook County.

Public Testimony: No provision made for public testimony.

**ACTION: Adopt the proposed final order as written for Mr. Bruce Gray.**

Joe Justice motioned for approval of the staff recommendation to adopt the proposed final order as presented for Mr. Bruce Gray. Mike Rose seconded the motion. Voting in favor of the motion: Nils Christoffersen, Cindy Deacon Williams, Joe Justice, Jim

Kelly, Brenda McComb, Mike Rose, and Tom Imeson. Against: none. With Board consensus the motion carried.

3. FIRE SEASON UPDATE

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (57 minutes – 26 MB)

Presentation ([attachment 1](#))

Doug Grafe, Fire Protection Division Chief, provided an overview of the presentation. He reviewed the COVID-19 organization, structure, and utility of modules in the fire camps this last fire season. He commented on the drought monitoring across the state and explained how these conditions, along with the weather phenomena on Labor Day, contributed to the fire expansion. He described the various fires that ignited as a result of the Labor Day fire event, summarizing the total acres burned, structures lost, and estimated gross cost to the Department. He listed the fire statistics to date, noting the number of fires, causes of these fires, and the acres burned. He explained that 94% of fires were kept at 10 acres or less to date in 2020 and reviewed the 10-year averages.

Grafe reviewed the gross cost year-to-date of the Department's large fire costs over a 14-year duration and provided an update on the fire protection financial summary as of October 28, 2020. He reviewed the safety statistics for the fiscal year (FY) 2020, including the number of injuries, hours worked related to injuries tracked, and the five-year average of injury claim frequency for the Department. He highlighted the severity's program total program flight hours, aircraft utilization and described scenarios of resource allocation (e.g., infrared detection systems). He commented on the resource availability in Oregon, explained how landowner and Protection Associations contribute to fire suppression and resource coordination efforts. He recognized the Rangeland Fire Protection Associations, operators, and landowners who assisted in the 2020 fire efforts. He noted the trending increase in fire severity for Oregon and how this relates to the Department's century of fire history, explaining how 2020 is the largest year for fire in the 100-year duration.

Grafe commented on the scope of work anticipated for the Fire Protection Division and Department regarding the Governor Wildfire Response Council, response and mitigation, and recovery efforts. He closed by acknowledging the complete and coordinated system Oregon has in place and how Oregon was able to achieve the many successes on the landscape in 2020.

Board members commented on the Fire Season Update presentation.

- Board Chair Imeson shared gratitude towards Division Chief Grafe and the many teams' tremendous work over the fire season. Board members concurred with the Board Chair statement and offered additional recognition.
- Board member asked questions on fire season severity relative to Energy Release Component (ERC) trends to gain a better understanding of the data presented, the elements driving the ERC trend upwards, and if any regional variations exist. Hoped with further understanding, the Board and Department can respond to the ERC trends in a strategic way, beyond suppression efforts. Grafe explained the 30-years of data presented is a culmination of all local district's data relative to the ERC trend. He noted southwest and eastern Oregon areas are driving the trend and described how climate, fuel conditions, as well as live and dead fuel moistures are indicators for how much energy a fire can generate.

- Board member congratulated Division Chief Grafe and his team for their work in responding to COVID-19 and accomplishments relative to the recent fire season. Inquired about whether any language is being developed to distinguish between the Labor Day fire event and other fires on the landscape. Grafe commented on how there have been half a million-acre fires in Oregon's history and the inevitability of fire on the landscape into the future. He referenced the work done through the Governor Wildfire Response Council in areas of fire suppression, mitigation, and community recovery. He noted the Council's balanced approach in coming to terms with fires being a part of the landscape and how Oregon will adapt to this understanding. Grafe remarked on aligning suppression with the reality of increased fire activity across the landscape and think about the policies laid out in the Council's mitigation work, which can help the Department in wildland-urban interface areas and across the entire landscape.
- Board member thanked Division Chief Grafe and his team for their commitment to protecting human life and property during the fire season. Asked if fire ecological benefits within the forest recovery efforts are being considered and whether greenhouse gas emissions are being accounted for in fire efforts. Grafe discussed the mitigation efforts taken by the Department and Board in prescribed burning and how ecological benefits will be assessed as the land is being treated but noted the infancy of this program. State Forester Daugherty noted the Forest Carbon report contains data on 300 plots in the fire footprint and includes many forest pools across Oregon. He commented on the future research opportunities, restoration of tree species diversity, and accounting for fire effects on a landscape scale. He noted that fossil fuel emissions associated with forest protection, suppression, and recovery efforts are being accounted for but are not distinct from the other consumption of fossil fuels.
- Board member commented on the asset of a coordinated system, organized fire communities, and the innate culture of working together that occurs during fire season in Oregon.
- Board member noted the increasing fire severity situation that Oregon is operating under and inquired if forest management techniques implemented prior to Labor Day will be evaluated as effective or ineffective in minimizing fire on the landscape. Grafe described the Division's work relative to fire behavior and how Oregon State University (OSU) is a key partner for this work. He also highlighted the cohesive national strategy and Oregon's leadership engagement across many levels of government to create these strategies. Felt good about Oregon's position and the strategic plan in place. State Forester Daugherty noted that a group is being formed to research and monitor the burned areas, noted how patterns that emerge may not be uniform in terms of fire severity, and cannot speculate how burned areas relate to forest management.

Public Testimony: None

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

4. DOJ MEMORANDUM ON STATUTORY AUTHORITY RELATING TO CARBON AND CLIMATE

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (32 minutes and 40 seconds – 14.9 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 2](#))



John Tokarczyk, Policy and Analysis Unit Lead for the Partnership and Planning Program, introduced the presenters and the scope of the presentation.

Danny Norlander, Forest Carbon, and Forest Health Policy Analyst, provided a brief overview of the topic on statutory authority for the Board, the objectives for the information presented relative to climate change, and future policy work. He explained this topic does not directly correspond to the Governor's Executive Order (EO) 20-04 but may overlap with the work being done by the Department in response to the EO. He referred to the Department of Justice to conduct the main presentation.

Matt DeVore, Assistant Attorney General from the Department of Justice (DOJ), Natural Resources Section, explained what DOJ prepared to share with the Board and public about Board's statutory authority as delegated by the Oregon Legislature. He noted that public release of the memorandum is not intended to waive the attorney-client privilege as to any communications on the subject to the memorandum. He described the approach taken to research, review, and respond to each of the Board questions, as well as explained the intention for pairing each question with a statute citation. He reviewed the best practices in interpreting these statutes, noting that closely related statutes were considered as they can provide context to explain Board authority and listed areas the memorandum does not cover.

DeVore reviewed the eight questions submitted by the Board at the June 3, 2020 meeting. He provided a brief response to each question in sequential order and outlined the Board's authority according to the Oregon Revised Statutes (ORS) listed. He explained the criterion for each response, as the scope of the Board's statutory authority may apply differently to the statutes listed in the [presentation](#), and outlined any scope constraints relative to the subject the Board may want to provide a policy for. He referenced Legislative history to provide context for the Board's ability to set policy or engage in rulemaking, noting that this information is available in the appendix of the DOJ [memorandum](#). He explained how the last question was the amalgamation of the Board's overall authority to address climate change pursuant to Chapters 526 and 527. He described the broad policy statements that can be made under these authorities. He also informed the Board of a typo located on page five of the memorandum in answer number eight that ORS 526.630 should be ORS 527.630.

DeVore closed by mentioning the criterion of ORS 527.714 (5) act as the sideboards that were set by the Legislature and would need to be met before any rules under this category could be enacted and requires scientific evidence and monitoring to be found.

Board commented on DOJ Memorandum on Statutory Authority relating to Carbon and Climate presentation.

- Board had a clarifying question on number seven, response item G, related to pursuing projects on federal lands under the Good Neighbor Authority. If climate change was predicted to harm wildlife habitat or other stewardship values, would policymaking be allowed under the Board's statutory authority related to Good Neighbor Agreements. DeVore believed the Board may have authority under subsection one of ORS 526.274 and can direct the State Forester to facilitate the development of stewardship contracts, which the Board can guide the goals and objectives of these contractual agreements. He added under subsection one (g), the State Forester can engage in stewardship contract agreements



pursuant to the Good Neighbor Authority to perform any activities with the catch-all to perform other activities that can implement the Board's goals and objectives related to climate change.

- Board asked if there is a parallel between the carbon costs of harvest and carbon storage in harvested wood products relative to the Board's statutory authority. DeVore referred to ORS 526.016, which provides broad statutory authority, and allows the Board to regulate all matters of forest policy and management. Board followed up by asking if carbon costs of harvest are under the Board's authority, and DeVore responded with as long as it relates to forest policy and management.
- Board inquired on new regulations and whether the Board would need research to demonstrate harm has occurred as long as the Board already has scientific evidence to indicate a projection of harm in the future. DeVore explained under 527.714(5)(a) that the Board would have to find monitoring and scientific evidence that future degradation is likely, not necessarily if it has occurred, and noted subsection (c) that any proposed rule reflects available scientific information, monitoring, and field evaluation as the basis to support the Board's decision.
- Board inquired about regulatory moves relative to climate change and carbon. Noted if argued, may reduce property values, and could place the Board's effort at risk to Measure 49 claims. DeVore commented the risk is there but he was not prepared to address the question further at this time. Board followed up with a clarifying question, whether that risk could be avoided. DeVore responded that a rule that was required by federal law could be one of the exceptions to an obligation for the state to pay compensation.

#### Public Testimony:

- Jeffrey Wagner on behalf of WPD Wind Projects Incorporated provided written testimony ([attachment 3](#)) on the Board's work relative to the Forestry Program for Oregon. Urged the Board to consider adding wind energy as a renewable resource to the list of objectives under Goal G, and offered various points to support their request. Wagner referred to answer one granting the Board broad authority on forest policy or management relative to climate change goals.
- Lauren Anderson on behalf of Oregon Wild provided written testimony ([attachment 4](#)) on the Board's broad authorities. Urged the Board to pursue policies that position Oregon as a national leader in climate-smart forest management. Reflected on the biggest steps Oregon can take to confront climate change. Urged the Board to expand the review of statutes and rules to identify barriers for implementing EO 20-04. Looked forward to an open and transparent revision of the climate change goal G. Asked for recommendation to be produced on how current policies can be updated to best address climate change, greenhouse gas mitigation, and climate adaptation. Encouraged the Department to establish a clear timeline for policy adoption that implements the Oregon Climate Action Plan, and offered points to support their requests to the Board.

#### **INFORMATION ONLY.**

##### 5. FOREST TRUST LAND ADVISORY COMMITTEE TESTIMONY

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (14 minutes and 6 seconds – 6.45 MB)

John Sweet, Vice-Chair of Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC), and Coos County Commissioner provided oral and written testimony ([attachment 5](#)) about the Board's recent action

to enter the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) into the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process. He shared his objection to the Board's decision to move forward with the HCP, commented on the recent litigation and judgment between the State and Counties, and how favorable it would be to mitigate future damages. Listed financial considerations and potential repercussions that could come from the implementation of harvest restrictions. He shared his perspective on rural counties, and the impact harvest reductions may have on his community. He reminded the Board of their duty to the trust lands for management of economic, social, and environmental benefits. Sweet closed by asking the Board to abandon the HCP or demand better terms.

Commissioner Testimony: None

Board commented on the Commissioner's testimony.

- Board Chair Imeson expressed respect for the work the County Commissioners undertake. The Board Chair outlined the factors he considered before making the decision to move forward with the HCP and the NEPA process. He commented on the degree of certainty relative to the Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance, economic efficiency, and long-term agreement for the Department and Board as land managers. Explained the decision was not taken lightly, and more work is expected, and encouraged the counties to be involved with that work. He expressed the value behind the difference of opinions, and appreciated the continuing relationship between the County Commissioners and the Board.
- Board Members concurred with Board Chair's comments. Member McComb described how the NEPA process is a mechanism for stakeholders to express their perspectives or alternatives, and encouraged Commissioner Sweet as well as other commissioners to engage in this process. Member Kelly appreciated Commissioner Sweet sharing an alternative, larger picture view on the state overall. Sweet commented on how timber harvests and revenue impact critical services.

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

State Forester Daugherty provided recognition for Dr. Andrew Yost's Departmental Technical Achievement Award, for Andrew's outstanding public service, collaboration on research, and ongoing work in the arena of forest carbon, climate change, and accounting for carbon flux in forests and other products. Yost appreciated the award and had no additional comments. Board Chair Imeson shared his gratitude for Dr. Yost's work and contribution to the Board.

6. OREGON FOREST CARBON ACCOUNTING FRAMEWORK  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (11 minutes and 2 seconds – 5.05 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 6](#))

Andrew Yost, Forest Ecologist for the Partnership and Planning Program, provided an overview of the framework of information organized to present on the topic of Oregon forest carbon accounting. He reviewed how specific mandates influence and drive this work, noted where these mandates derive, and described the work completed in response to the charges set. He introduced the presenters, offered a brief biography of the presenter's work, and outlined the presentation order. Yost explained how each set of information presented will illustrate a dimension of the carbon accounting framework relative to the monitoring of historical perspectives, current processes, and

future modeling of forest carbon dynamics. He noted the last presentation will cover forest budget modeling and describe a project collaboration with ODF on simulating the carbon consequences of carbon mitigation in forest management scenarios.

6a. FOREST ECOSYSTEM CARBON REPORT AND PNW FOREST CARBON INITIATIVE

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (45 minutes and 6 seconds – 20.6 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 7](#))

Glenn Christensen, an Inventory Analyst with the US Forest Service, Pacific Northwest (PNW) Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) program, provided an overview of the presentation objectives. He shared the scope, sampling design, and the recent increase in the number of intensified grids in Oregon. Explained that FIA is a national program, how vast the PNW region is, and noted his appreciation for the Department's collaboration on-field efforts for the region. He reviewed the FIA website reporting tools, inventory database, and resources available to the public. Christensen described the range and type of assessments that utilize the FIA national database information.

Christensen discussed how the PNW-FIA forest carbon and harvested wood products (HWP) reporting is taking place in neighboring states, but for a range of interests. He provided base field data and reviewed how each FIA plot was measured. He defined what is included and excluded from the FIA forest carbon pools, outlining how each carbon stock pool was calculated. Christensen covered multiple aspects from the forest ecosystem carbon report, from estimations of carbon stocks per forest carbon pool to carbon stocks per acre and by ownership. He defined forest carbon flux, described how flux is measured and explained how these estimations of change are summarized as a net flux by each forest carbon pool. Christensen reviewed graphs highlighting the annual carbon flux in different pools for forest ecoregions, ownerships, tree growth, and mortality. He offered another perspective on flux based on westside and eastside county groupings, listing the live tree stocks, ownerships, and associated net carbon flux associated. He summarized the number of metric tons of carbon stored in Oregon forests, the amount of carbon sequestered in Oregon per year, and the net CO<sub>2</sub> emissions from wildfire accounted for per year.

Christensen commented on the reporting possibilities with this information collected for the western states. He mentioned the Pacific Temperate Forest Carbon Stocks and Flux Report that pulls together neighboring states and provinces data for regional analysis. Christensen reviewed the project phases, funding, and organizations involved with the report collaboration. He described the report's content parameters, the desired outcomes, and the anticipated timeline for report completion. Christensen shared another collaborative effort around the PNW carbon initiative and the outcomes from the forest carbon dynamics workshop, resulting in three initial research objectives. He outlined the next steps for this project with modeling runs and calibrations with various modeling scenarios. Christensen mentioned another study opportunity that derived out of the recent Labor Day fire event, describing how the analysis would be looking at fire effects through modeling and utilizing the FIA plots impacted by fire across ownerships, forest types, and age classes in the westside of the state.

6b. HARVESTED WOOD PRODUCT REPORT AND SAWMILL ENERGY REPORT

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (45 minutes and 38 seconds – 20.8 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 8](#))

Todd Morgan, Director of the Bureau of Business and Economic Research at the University of Montana, opened up by acknowledging the many researchers and organizations contributing to the Oregon Harvested Wood Product (HWP) Carbon and Sawmill Energy Use and Emissions reports. He listed the various activities that captured the Oregon Timber Product Outputs (TPO) information and the multiple team efforts that produced these reports. Morgan explained how the HWP report complements the forest ecosystem carbon analysis and reviewed the HWP model framework. He discussed the HWP data sources, data origins, and the additional parameters included with the model. Morgan reviewed Oregon Timber Harvest from 1906 to 2017, along with the timber harvest volume (i.e., TPO) and annual million metric tons of carbon (MMT C) accumulated for that duration. He provided graphs on Oregon's HWP carbon storage, including solid waste disposal sites (SWDS), the products in use (PIU), and ownership.

Morgan reviewed Oregon's HWP carbon change from 1906 to 2017, related the dips to economic recessions, and explained how the harvested wood products pool is net positive across all years. He described the wood product pools accounted for in the report, listed the type of simulations modeled and the confidence interval for the analysis outcomes. Morgan commented on the annual HWP carbon storage and cumulative emissions for each HWP pool, clarifying the types of emissions tracked with and without energy capture. He explained the importance of understanding HWP utilization relative to carbon storage, emissions, and energy captured.

Morgan reported on the 2017 Oregon sawmill energy use and emission study. He described the scope, participants involved, and data sources. Morgan defined the parameters of the energy consumption and emissions studied. He noted the methodology and units of measurement utilized. Shared the survey's response rate and results of the study for on-site energy consumption relative to the unit of lumber output for Oregon. Morgan reviewed national figures and highlighted the Oregon lumber industry (e.g., sawmills) as one of the largest producers of timber with relatively low consumption of energy per million board feet milled. Morgan offered context relative to the forest ecosystem's total carbon stocks, HWP pools, and fluxes. He closed by reviewing key points and listing additional data on carbon emissions from Oregon logging operations.

- 6c. GLOBAL CARBON FLUX AND FOREST CONSIDERATIONS  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (34 minutes and 34 seconds – 15.8 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 9](#))

Werner Kurz, a senior research scientist from the Canadian Natural Resources Forest Service, described the presentation's scope and explained how the global warming goal relates to land sector contributions, particularly forestland sectors. Referenced the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report as it identified pathways to achieve the global warming goal through a dramatic and simultaneous reduction in fossil fuel emissions and increase in land sinks. He explained the scale, the variability, and correlation between these two pathways as it relates to the United States territory. He reviewed a 2019 IPCC report on climate change that identified risks, opportunities, and synergies for carbon reduction through land sector actions, highlighting key messages and conclusions from the report.

Kurz presented a global perspective on how forestland carbon sinks contribute to carbon reduction in the atmosphere and how sustainable land management and other non-land actions could enhance reduction. He reviewed the objectives of Canada's National forest carbon monitoring, accounting, and reporting system (NFCMARS). Kurz provided background on the Carbon Budget Model (CBM) of the Canadian Forest Sector (CFS3) and described how a model is a tool to help forest managers assess the impacts or implications of various forest management strategies. He shared the alternative IPCC model Gain-Loss method used by Canada to calculate stock changes and greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, explaining the difference between the Gain-Loss and Stock Difference methodologies. He discussed Canada's general approach in using the model, described the data and modeling taxonomies included with this approach, and outlined the verification review process. Kurz explained how the framework for all data is integrated, interpreted, and applied over time. He offered an example of British Columbia forestland, demonstrating how this data can track interannual variability associated with the model's drivers, identify trends, and how GHG emissions change over time.

Kurz offered a systems perspective for the Board to consider when developing mitigation strategies for forestland. He noted how understanding forest products and biofuels used by society links to a better understanding of feasible substitutions and the net impact of emissions in the atmosphere. Kurz reflected on the connection between minimizing net emissions to how land is managed as a whole and focusing on GHG balance, not carbon stacking in forest ecosystems. He explored how to increase forest sinks, design mitigation portfolios, and achieve different climate change mitigation options. Kurz explained that a forest is unable to have maximum carbon storage and maximum carbon uptake simultaneously. He reviewed how the model quantifies mitigation portfolio benefits, calculates forested landscape potential to take up additional carbon, assesses tradeoffs, and evaluates risks of regional climate change impacts. He stated that if one designs mitigation portfolios, one must account for the change in GHG balances in forested ecosystems and harvested wood products and the changes achieved through substitution benefits, and one needs to do that analysis relative to a base case. Kurz commented on the innovational use of wood products and the latest Canadian province research on climate change mitigation in the forest sector. He reviewed wildfire risk relative to climate change, how emissions affect the global forest sink, and the future research in climate solutions that can reduce wildfire emissions while enhancing a forest-based bio-economy. He closed by listing a set of conclusions and references for the information discussed.

Board member Cindy Deacon Williams thanked the Department staff for putting together a series of informative presentations for the Board and shared appreciation for working with everyone as she departed the meeting.

- 6d. FOREST MANAGEMENT SCENARIOS FOR CARBON MITIGATION  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (32 minutes and 26 seconds – 14.8 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 10](#))

Kendall DeLyser, Senior Manager of Forest and Climate with American Forests, outlined the presentation objectives, offered background on the American Forests organization, and listed the pillars of research the organization pursues. She explained how climate change is the fastest growing pillar of work and research in this area is driven by the relationship between forests, forest management, carbon, and climate. She provided an overview of a collaborative project with the



Department, along with many other partners as they explore the impacts of forest management on carbon sequestration and storage in Oregon. She described the core modeling and research teams organized to help with the projects under this research subject. Explained the US Climate Alliance grant program assistance for these projects and listed other states that signed up for this modeling and research work to inform their forest management and policy or state climate actions. Noted how this project is separate from the Pacific NW Forest Carbon Initiative but hopes that project will help inform the American Forests work.

DeLyser expanded on the Carbon Budget Model (CBM) of the Canadian Forest Sector, how CBM can be applied to the United States Forest Sector, and reviewed the methodology associated with the model. She noted the uses of the Harvested Wood Products framework in the modeling analysis as different forest management scenarios are evaluated. She described the parameters, scope, and limitations for the modeling outcomes as it relates to state-level analyses. Reviewed how the modeling can be used to compare ecosystem carbon results for various forest management and natural disturbance scenarios. She referenced the multiple assumptions used for these alternative management scenarios and described how CBM modeling can draw up scenarios based on the representative information available in Oregon.

DeLyser spoke on the use of CBM as a tool and part of a greater analysis of forest management and natural disturbance scenarios. Offered historical background on the CBM, listed the credentials tying to existing internationally-recognized criteria, and noted the range of applicable uses of the CBM. She commented on how any tool used to assess potential management scenarios should be grounded in science and realistic landscape conditions. She described the baseline of information CBM contains but noted how the project teams strive to fill any knowledge gaps with literature reviews and surveying on-the-ground conditions for a region to ensure a greater degree of scientific certainty in the modeling results.

DeLyser described how the modeling process is operationalized and implemented through a work plan, which will ensure the project's goals can be attained. She listed the four phases of the work plans and described the tiered progression for each phase. Remarked on how the overall process will be informed by stakeholder engagement, outlined the planned approach for this engagement, and highlighted the engagement objectives. She reviewed the approximate timeline for this collaborative project, noted that results will be shared alongside any forest management or policy implications with the Board and stakeholders. DeLyser closed by reflecting on why this work matters, highlighting five areas of understanding this work can help inform and reminding the Board of the intention for this work.

Board commented on the Oregon Forest Carbon Accounting Framework series of presentations.

- Board asked about the degree of detail that forestland management would be assessed in the PNW-FIA study on fire impacts. Christensen listed the range of information and attributes included with the FIA plots. Board explained how this study could inform forest management and help determine whether management actions are successful in building resilience to climate change and future fires.
- Board inquired whether fossil fuel usage associated with managing the forest preceding a harvest operation can be assessed and included with future iterations of the Harvested Wood Product or Sawmill Energy reports. Morgan stated this level of inquiry was not included

with the scope of the studies, but this information could be attained. Board Chair Imeson commented that Oregon adopted legislation that will result in reductions in fossil fuel content for electricity provided in Oregon, but additional actions may be taken as this issue evolves.

- Board Chair Imeson appreciated the information provided and thanked the presenters for their participation, as this work will be relevant and useful to the Board as they continue to work on climate issues. Board members concurred.
- Board commented on the simulation of forest management activities and inquired about the CBM's ability to simulate silviculture practices or whether another model is utilized. DeLyser expressed that CBM has base operations, but the project team plan to assess how Forest Vegetation Simulator (FVS) modeling, as well as other models, can be incorporated with CBM, if not compared to the modeling results.

Public Testimony: None

### **INFORMATION ONLY.**

#### 7. ODF URBAN AND COMMUNITY FORESTRY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (57 minutes and 17 seconds – 26.2 MB)

Ramstad Presentation ([attachment 11](#))

Donovan Presentation ([attachment 12](#))

Shandas Presentation ([attachment 13](#))

State Forester Peter Daugherty introduced the main presenter of this multi-faceted topic, provided some background on the Department's Urban and Community Forestry Program, and offered an overview of what will be covered relative to this program.

Kristin Ramstad, Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program Manager provided an overview of the major themes relative to urban and community forestry that will be presented. She defined the program's mission, how it is funded, and described the scope of the program's assistance. She provided a modern definition of urban forestry and explained the environmental, social, and economic benefits associated with forest canopy and vegetation in urban areas. Ramstad reviewed the Tree City USA program mission, community-building goals and described the ambassadorship it promotes. She noted how resources can be limited in lower-income communities, and how the program assists those communities whether they are a part of Tree City USA or not. Ramstad outlined the contribution made by trees in urban communities from climate change mitigation to green storm water management, and overall public health. She introduced the Tree Plotter Inventory project, listed the program's features and data uses, and noted the potential future updates. She emphasized how trees are demographic indicators and commented on how the following presenters will explore the impacts trees have in urban areas.

Dr. Geoffrey Donovan, Economist for the US Department of Agriculture Forest Service Pacific Northwest Research Station, spoke on the connection between the human quality of life and mortality in association with the prevalence of trees in urban areas. He outlined three studies that he worked on relative to urban tree presence and public health. Donovan listed the parameters of the studies, the plausible outcomes, and the correlations studied. Donovan noted how trees' presence in urban communities correlates with other social drivers beyond public health and described these



drivers. He explored how tree and vegetation pervasiveness, type, and size can be associated with populations' lifespan and immunities built up over time. He closed by encouraging the continued expanse of tree canopy growth in urban communities.

Dr. Vivek Shandas, Portland State University Department of Urban Studies and Planning, explored how inequitable ecologies are relative to past urban planning practices and how landscapes can mitigate people's experiences in an urban environment. He highlighted a study that assessed air temperatures in cities around the nation, described the method of data collection, reviewed how tree shade is related to ambient temperature and heat exposure, and discussed the high correlation between the presences of heat refuges in racially-diverse or elderly communities. Shandas reviewed the history of federal planning decisions and how these decisions tie to the distributional effects of tree inequities observed in urban landscapes. He explained how landscape legacies can be assessed to form tree-planting strategies that would benefit air quality, ambient temperature, and biological diversity in neighborhoods. Shandas reviewed the impacts of red-lining and ecological implications in communities. He spoke on the proportions between invested and disinvested neighborhoods, as well as tree equity ratio and observed trends in urban areas. Shandas closed by relaying the relationship between patterns of housing and privilege to ecosystems and emphasized how the biological effects of residential segregation are being discussed as social justice and climate change issues persist.

Kristin Ramstad shared appreciation for the presenters' work in urban forestry and noted the importance of checking in with residents about identifying essential services or needs for communities. She explained how urban forestry work informs city planners and neighborhood organizers as strategies are built to implement or enhance social, economic, and environmental benefits within their communities. Ramstad noted the challenges to urban forestry funding, but described the various opportunities this work can facilitate across the state relative to mitigating climate change, engaging with communities in the Wildland Urban Interface on wildfire efforts, and promoting tree canopies through tree inventory administration that can inform urban development. Ramstad closed by exploring how the Department's Urban Forestry program could expand into the future, listed the multiple benefits of an urban forest, and thanked the presenters for sharing the urban forestry story.

Board commented on the ODF Urban and Community Forestry Assistance Program presentation.

- Board Chair Imeson appreciated the coordination of these presentations. He reflected on a past Board tour on urban forestry, noting the value of this tour for the Board and public, and recommended revisiting this topic in a tour-setting with future board members as the issues-relative to urban forestry change overtime. He inquired about the pace of funding and the existing mechanisms in place to keep up with the rate of work and assurance of this work into the future. Ramstad described the Department program's current organization to illustrate the need for more funding in order for the program to be sustainable and grow. Board Chair thanked the presenters for sharing this compelling information with the Board, and other Board members agreed.

Public Testimony: None

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

8. OREGON GLOBAL WARMING COMMISSION EO 20-04 GOAL SETTING  
[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (26 minutes and 50 seconds – 12.2 MB)  
Presentation ([attachment 14](#))

Danny Norlander, Forest Carbon and Forest Health Policy Analyst, provided an introduction to the presenter, an overview of the topic to be discussed, and the connection between the Oregon Global Warming Commission (OGWC) and the Department in responding to the Governor’s Executive Order 20-04. Board Chair Imeson added greater context to the breadth of expertise and work history of the main presenter.

Catherine McDonald, Chair of the Oregon Global Warming Commission, appreciated the introduction, the efforts made by the Department in responding to the recent fire disaster in the State, and the Board’s attention to the issue of climate change. She recognized the Department’s current projects and ongoing work towards creating a climate action plan. She mentioned the growing public interest in the Department as a result of their climate change report, as well as in OGWC to work in tandem with the Department on goal proposal for carbon sequestration and storage, as stated in the Executive Order (EO).

McDonald provided background on land sector offsets in the United States, discussed the current mitigation efforts, and described the range of the potential natural climate solutions available, but explained how a change in management of lands would be needed to achieve these potential outcomes. Shared the six steps planned to develop a recommendation for the Governor and noted how robust stakeholder engagement would be sought for each step. Reflected on the US Climate Alliance that Oregon joined in 2017, described the Natural and Working Lands Initiative established in 2018 with this alliance and noted the World Resources Institute as a leader to assist States as they consider land sector greenhouse gas (GHG) mitigation plans.

McDonald explained how Oregon has the Forest Ecosystem Inventory, Harvested Wood Products, Carbon Reduction Potential Evaluation (CaRPE) tool, and Blue Carbon program to anchor into as OGWC and agency partners assess the potential inventory improvements. She referenced a publication that reported on various scenarios of changes in land management practices and how these scenarios could help the State exceed current carbon emission reduction goals. She elaborated on the climate mitigation goal-setting for Oregon’s natural and working lands, listed the outreach efforts for this work, and described the process to engage the wide range of stakeholders as the recommendation(s) are developed for the Governor. McDonald closed by reviewing the mechanisms assembled by the Nature Conservancy and could be pursued to increase sequestration on working lands in the state arena.

Board commented on the Oregon Global Warming Commission EO 20-04 Goal Setting presentation.

- Board asked how the partnered agencies will be reaching out to landowners to fulfill the survey conducted by American Forests. McDonald plans to work with agency partners to pull together lists, share outreach strategies for coordination of direct outreach, and utilize the data from a recent small woodland owner survey.
- Board Chair inquired what to anticipate in the coming months relative to the climate change work plan. State Forester Daugherty stated the Board’s climate change work plan will be

revised and concentrated work on revising Goal G will be pursued, as it ties directly to the Department's Climate Action Plan and the work for OGWC. He also mentioned the work with American Forests will be in play and the Department's goals will need to be aligned with the Board's updated work plan. McDonald added that partner agencies will also be working with OGWC by providing technical support and coordination of policy information over the next few months. McDonald and State Forester Daugherty expressed how capacity is limited across agencies and identified some limitations of the EO work. McDonald was hopeful in attaining a baseline and reliable data sets for forecasting.

- Board Chair Imeson thanked all of the presenters for coming together to present a great series of information to the Board, which will help lay the groundwork for future Board actions.

#### Public Testimony:

- Jeffrey Wagner on behalf of WPD Wind Projects Incorporated provided written testimony ([attachment 15](#)) on the revision of Goal G from the Forestry Program for Oregon. Urged to include wind energy generation to support compatible land-use noted in the Governor's Executive Order 20-04. Outlined the statutory citations that allow the Board and Department to make policy and rules relative to forest management. Recommended to consider the inclusion of wind energy and leasing on state forest lands.

#### **INFORMATION ONLY.**

#### 9. BOARD CLOSING COMMENTS AND MEETING WRAP UP [Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (18 minutes and 56 seconds – 8.66 MB)

Board Chair, Tom Imeson, reviewed the agenda items in sequential order with Board members and Department staff, and welcomed any closing comments or follow-up questions on topic items.

- Board Member Rose commented on the caliber of the presentations presented to the Board and hoped that new board members would be given access to this information. State Forester explained the hope was for new board members to join today's meeting but reminded the Board that all presentations are recorded for future review and how the information laid a foundation for current members moving forward.
- Board Member Kelly inquired about the next steps on the topics presented relative to Board involvement. State Forester Daugherty outlined the next steps for Board engagement anticipated in January 2021, such as seeking Board feedback on the climate change action plan and public engagement framework, as well as discuss the revisions to the Board's work plans like incorporating the Governor's requests and ensuring the Global Warming Commission direction is aligned with the Board of Forestry policymaking direction. He stated the goal is to continue this work as capacity allows. Board inquired if specific policy options are likely to be produced in response to the Governor's Executive Order 20-04. State Forester noted the climate change action plan listing the framework of eight areas of focus as policy goals to pursue and understand Board direction.
- Board Member McComb asked about whether private landowner incentives will be explored to adopt new or alternative practices that may come out of the American Forests project. State Forester stated if a cap and invest bill is adopted by the Oregon Legislature, a portion of the bill would allocate funds to improve mitigation on working lands. State Forester described the different types of incentives, where funding could come from, and the various

positions landowners have expressed. Board would appreciate more information on the nuances of financial incentive development, implications, and limitations for landowners. Board would like to understand how landowners feel about these incentives and openness to alternative land management. State Forester noted that details of the landowners' financial models are unknown, but a dialogue with landowners on these incentives may be possible. State Forester Daugherty offered gratitude for the extended service provided by the Board members and recognized their service to Oregonians. He shared a few words about the Board member's participation, decisions, and accomplishments made over eight years. The Board Chair appreciated the kind words shared, the opportunity to work with the Department, and to balance difficult issues with the values of stakeholders. Board Chair Imeson and Member Rose thanked the State Forester and Department for the awards. Board Member explained how tough this volunteer role can be, but the Department and the great work that everyone does has helped him fulfill his role with professionalism and integrity. Board member Kelly noted how he will continue to carry the torch regarding safety, and the State Forester commented on how safety has become part of the Department's set of values.

**INFORMATION ONLY.**

Board Chair Imeson adjourned the public meeting at 5:43 p.m.

---

Respectfully submitted,  
/s/ Peter Daugherty



---

Peter Daugherty, State Forester and  
Secretary to the Board

HR

*Meeting minutes approved at the January 6, 2021 Board Meeting*