****Pursuant to public notice made by news release with statewide distribution, a committee meeting of the Committee for Family Forestlands [an advisory body to the Oregon Board of Forestry with authority established in Oregon Revised Statute 527.650] was convened on April 18, 2019 in the Santiam Room of the ODF Operations Building, 2600 State Street, Salem, Oregon

**Draft Minutes**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| ***CFF Committee members participating:*** | ***ODF Staff:*** |
| Kyle Abraham, Deputy Chief ODF Private Forests Division, Committee Secretary  John Peel, EO Landowner Rep. (Voting)  Bonnie Shumaker, Landowner, NW Landowner Rep. (Voting)  Kaola Swanson, Environmental Rep. Ex-Officio (Pacific Forest Trust)  Glenn Ahrens, OSU College of Forestry Ext. Ex-Officio (By phone)  Brad Siemens, USFS State & Private Forestry Ex-Officio (filling in for Lind)  S. Mark Vroman, Industry Rep. (Voting) Hampton Family Forests | Susan Dominique, Committee Administrative Support  Danny Norlander, Forest Health Survey & Monitoring Specialist/Food Plot Rule Process Coordinator & PF Bills Manager!  Paul Clements, Training and Compliance Audit Coordinator  Wyatt Williams, Invasive Species Specialist |
| ***Members not attending:*** | ***Guests:*** |
| Linda Lind, USFS State & Private Forestry Ex-Officio  Evan Barnes, Committee Chair, SW Landowner Rep. (Voting)  Gilbert Shibley, Landowner-At-Large (Voting)  Rex Storm, AOL/OTFS Ex-Officio Forest Operators  Jim James, OSWA Executive Director Ex-Officio  Julie Woodward, OFRI Ex-Officio | Barrett Brown, OSWA member |

Before the meeting was called to order, Shumaker announced that she would not be interested in renewing her term on the Committee. Abraham noted that Shibley’s term was ending as well. Shumaker suggested the name of another OSWA member that may be interested in replacing her as NW Landowner Representative.

1. **Welcome and Review of Agenda – Kaola Swanson**

Swanson filled in as Chair of the meeting as Evan Barnes was unable to attend. She reviewed the order of the agenda and asked for any changes. Roll call, approval of the minutes and any potential public comment would be followed by an update on the Private Forests Division business; a Legislative update and then updates on Incentives, the Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review followed by a presentation on the State’s Emerald Ash Borer Response Plan. Clements was present to provide a discussion of the FPA Compliance Audit as well. The meeting would conclude after some next meeting planning and subjects to focus on for the Committee’s Annual Report to the Board.

1. **Introductions/Roll Call**

(See participant list above.)

1. **Approval of the February 2019 Minutes**

Swanson asked for any adjustments or corrections to the February Minutes. Dominique shared that she had received some minor corrections from John Peel but didn’t have an opportunity prior to the meeting to get them incorporated. Peel had a question regarding a discussion at the last meeting on what he saw as a contradictory juxtaposition of the Forest Legacy Program and industrial ownership/participation in the federal program. Brad Siemens, USFS State and Private Forestry briefly explained Legacy’s Program goals informing their award decisions. He agreed that it’s more difficult for family forestlands because their smaller acreages make it more difficult for them to compete nationally. And he thought further discussion would be beneficial for both sides. He further suggested that it would be worthwhile for Amy Singh (ODF Forest Legacy Coordinator) to present the program and answer any questions members might have. (Siemens offered to send the six page proposal on the Hood River Fish and Forest Project that was awarded to the committee.) He also suggested providing a summary of the judging criteria used by the federal panel.

Returning to the minutes, Swanson asked for a Motion to Approve. Vroman made a Motion to Approve as edited. Shumaker seconded the motion. All voted in favor of approving the March minutes as edited.

1. **Public Comment**

(No public comment was offered.)

1. **Private Forests Division Update – Kyle Abraham**

Abraham provided information regarding the current personnel changes and began by announcing they had hired a new Public Affairs Director, Joy Krawczyk coming to ODF from the Department of Revenue. With that appointment, Ryan Gordon (who had been filling in as an interim Public Affairs Director since last October) would be returning to the Private Forests Division in his position as Family Forestland Coordinator. Danny Norlander in turn who had been filling in for Gordon, will been focusing on some developmental work relating to Carbon policy, his continuing role as Division Bill Coordinator and his regular duties as Monitoring Specialist in the Forest Health and Monitoring Unit. He noted that one of the new Board members, Jim Kelley, had proposed that the Agency engage more heavily on carbon and the climate change functions. Topics that have been on the Agency’s radar for a while but haven’t been a priority because of a lack of capacity and funding.

Ahrens offered himself as a resource on that subject as Extension has been working a fair amount on understanding how to work with small landowners in that regard. He advised that subject involves integrating a lot of fairly new knowledge and science into established processes. OSU is working on a project with the Pinchot Institute on unlocking and exploring Carbon markets. He noted they featured the Carbon topic at the Oregon Woodland Cooperative Annual Meeting. Shumaker clarified the Cooperative’s function was to coordinate marketing and promotion of alternative timber products, like essential oils, biochar, firewood, boughs and other products as well as facilitate vendor relationships. Aggregating timber sales and alternative products together makes them more competitive in the markets, than they would be individually. Norlander asked whether there had been any conversations around aggregation of seedling purchases. Ahrens agreed that is a big challenge that needs additional efforts. Swanson noted that there were also market aggregation efforts around carbon for small forestland owners. Siemens suggested having the Pinchot Institute provide a presentation on carbon efforts and sequestration as relating to ecosystem services for small landowners. He said that the Institute has put a lot of work into it and should have some observations to share. Ahrens added that Jon Stewart, Raincloud Tree Farm and RFPC member had recently implemented a carbon project so would be a good person to share that experience.

Continuing the Division Update, Abraham announced that he was offered and accepted the position of Division Chief of Private Forests following Lena Tucker’s promotion to Deputy State Forester. Those Executive transitions are scheduled to be complete July 1st. Travis Medema, who is the Eastern Oregon Area Director will continue to work as an interim Deputy State Forester through the transition, and will continue to be the ODF staffer to the Suppression Committee for the Governor’s Wildfire Council. (Kaola Swanson is also part of that Council on the Suppression Sub-Committee.) Staff will be opening a recruitment for the Deputy Division Chief soon. And as things go once that position is filled it may dictate other personnel changes within the Division. He went on to remind everyone that the upcoming Board of Forestry agenda includes a presentation of the newest OFRI Values and Beliefs Survey. That annual public survey is used to gauge public understanding, interest and values regarding Oregon’s forests. OFRI tracks those values and beliefs over time to provide record of how people view Oregon’s forests. The gathered responses are valuable in setting general priorities and outreach. Abraham considered the survey to be a very interesting cross-section look at how people view Oregon’s forests and the services it provides. There are questions related to if we need more regulation, less regulation, should we reforest, should we not? They survey a cross-section of Oregon. 100 people are surveyed annually by DHM Research out of Portland. He noted that there were a couple of things changed this year with their methodology. One change was being put up as an online survey which seemed to increase the response rate overall. And they added some questions about the public’s understanding of the function of Keep Oregon Green. He reminded members that now all the Board meetings are streamed live on the YouTube Channel, and recorded so that you can watch the proceedings when you are available to. (Noting there may be a delay on the recorded version as they have to format the video for size.) Swanson added that there is also a Governor’s Wildfire Council meeting that is open to the public on April 23rd held at the ODF&W from 9:00 am to 3:00 pm.

Continuing Kyle shared that the Board’s agenda would include a Forest Ecosystems Carbon Report related to the work that the Agency has done thus far on climate change. This background for the Board is in response to their previously stated concern regarding current efforts and will provide a starting point for future discussions. Jennifer Weikel, Private Forests Wildlife Specialist will present the Technical Report for Marbled Murrelets for the Board to accept or Reject. Part of the requirements of the Division 680 rules is that the draft report be reviewed and checked for accuracy by an independent Expert Review Group. The Report is a scientific accounting of the species and doesn’t go into policy recommendations. We are recommending obviously that they accept it. And acceptance would begin the next phase of identifying what the Board views as objectives. Their values and beliefs about what forest practices regulation needs to do if anything to maintain the species over time. This is really about the process in the 680 rules that says that the Board will create rules for T&E species.

Swanson shared some of her view of the Wildfire Response Committee and sub-committees being staffed.

Abraham clarified that there will be three sub-committees working separately on Suppression, Mitigation and Recovery. To date only the Suppression Sub-Committee has been formed. ODF is providing staffing support of these separate sub-committees. Norlander noted that there is some obvious confusion regarding the Recovery Sub-Committee’s goal, as it is not just reforestation and forest restoration but community and infrastructure recovery after a large fire. Recovery from smoke, public health, economic recovery, tourism as well as bridges, culverts, etc.

1. **Legislative Updates – Danny Norlander**

Norlander began that there had been a variety of legislative deadlines had passed. So the April 9th was the First Chamber Session deadline. (That basically means that a bill must have a work session held in Committee or it was dead). So that has narrowed up the number of bills that are active with the caveat that if bills are in Ways & Means, Revenue or Rules Committees or any of the joint committees they will live on forever. Those that remain will begin a new series of work sessions and hearings and some were subsequently referred to Ways & Means which means they could live there indefinitely. Others completing their work session will go to the Floor and they wind up with a Floor Vote at some point. So that process starts over again. House Bills that made it through the House are now at the Senate and they have to go through that work session process again in May having to pass through the Senate Committees by May 24th or are dead again unless they are in Ways & Means, Revenue or Rules, etc. So May 10th and 24th those are our next deadlines for when things might start dropping off this list again. Any bills that are regarding money or rules go to Ways & Means, Revenue or Rules Committees but are not guaranteed a hearing. Sometimes many bills are wrapped together into a ‘christmas tree’ bill the financial impact of which is pretty huge as it has all agencies and departments together. Continuing on the timeline May 24th is the Second Chamber Committee deadline for completed work sessions and hearings. He added that the real ‘sausage making’ comes in June. The State wants to have everything done by June 21st, but the actual end date is June 30th if there is still business to do. And if it’s pushing up to the June 30th deadline and they go past that, the Governor can call a Special Session.

Then Norlander directed the Committee’s attention to the current revised list of bills Private Forests is watching to date. The most obvious is HB 2073, the Harvest Tax Bill which was sent to the Session with a split of 60% General Fund and 40% Harvest Tax. It had a recent public hearing in Revenue where Kyle testified. That rate is a placeholder for further along in the process when it is combined with other pieces of information in terms of our ending balance and forecast of timber harvest revenues for the next two years. So that one gets married up with our budget bill to actually set the rates and everything so we meet that percentage split. Kyle went and testified on that yesterday at its Public Hearing in Revenue. Harvest Tax is a really big umbrella of funds and part of which goes to the administration of the Forest Practices Act, and part of it goes into the Protection budget. That rate has been set at a certain number for a number of years. Roughly right now landowners pay approximately $4.28/1000 bd. ft. But there was a suggestion from Rep. Paul Holvey to raise that to $16.00/bd. ft. (more in alignment with Washington, but disregarded that Oregon’s tax structure is substantially different.) That suggestion instigated a debate with conflicting testimony about how those numbers should be derived. (Again, the written testimony and materials can be found on the Legislative pages.)

Brown participated by proposing that he thought Holvey is trying to paint a picture that the General Fund is subsidizing industry and private landowners. Whereby refreshing the conversation over again as to how much General Fund participation should be in fire suppression. Brown felt that was a conversation to be had at a larger level as to whether the State wants to continue to incentivize responsible forest management especially weighing that with the desire for healthy ecosystems. Norlander suggested that Holvey’s testimony was pretty broad. And part of that was a concern over losing our insurance policy down the road because if that goes away, it would be a large potential hit to the GF. That question will likely be brought up that the Wildfire Council and he thought that most of the legislators are more comfortable letting the Wildfire Council go through its process and seeing what comes of that. Being a Revenue Bill it could come up in the Short Session next year if it needs to after the Wildfire Council has gone through some of their work. Then he briefly addressed other bills many of which deal with State business in general. Looking at some of the more forestry specific ones, HB 2152 ends a lot of the special tax assessments. It is assigned to Revenue and will most likely be there till the end of the session. Historically this bill has been introduced repeatedly over the years and never got to a vote and whether or not it gets a hearing is unknown at this time.

HB 2222 is basically concerning reporting providing us with some funding to follow the past passage of SB 360 that required reports to the legislature. This is a statute to make sure we follow statute. That is sitting on the Senate desk now waiting for a floor vote. So, HB 2225 from 1000 Friends of Oregon makes changes to the Template Test in land use allowances which also has its floor vote scheduled. Others that might be interesting are HB 2280 which would require all State rules be reviewed every 5 years. HB 2365 provides funding for SOD eradication efforts will probably wind up in the Christmas tree bill. But it did make it through Committee unanimously and was sent to Ways & Means. Another is HB 2373 was sent to Ways & Means saying that the State Forester can send fire crews to fight any fire in the State. Siemens asked how that would relate to the USFS Master Agreement. Norlander replied that we already have that authority as facilitated that through various coop agreements, BLM agreements and others. Norlander surmised that it may have come out of the belief that the federal agencies aren’t doing enough. But we don’t see any need for that. Norlander admitted that there was concern about souring some of our relationships. The Agency still has no position on it. HB 2469 is the secondary forest dwelling bill that this committee has worked on. OSWA submitted and Bonnie went and testified on. Barrett Brown went and testified as well. It had its House vote yesterday and it passed 56 to 2. Now it’s on the Senate side and will get probably be assigned to a Senate Committee on Energy and Environment from there will proceed through the Senate hearings and work sessions. The bill as submitted to the Senate had some amendments added by Representative Clem that would require a management plan and guarantee no future subdivision of the property. Additionally the amendments restricted its use as a vacation rental and added fire safe building requirements. Norlander advised that if passed this gives counties the permission to grant the exemption. Bill 2835 is a bill to establish the public right to access to use recreational waterways, but it was amended specifically to State and County lands, government lands and no longer has language extending access rights to cross private lands. Bill 2952 creates a new GNA revolving account that can be used for timber sale monies done from federal lands to facilitate more GNA work into the future. That is in Ways and Means now. HB 2980 is one of the last pesticide reporting bills from the Session still alive and just extends the sunset on the Pesticide Use Reporting System and is intended to provide funding. And then 5019 is our budget bill.

On the Senate side, we’ve got a lot less. SB 88 is a rural ADU bill that sets out requirements for having ADUs in the WUI including limiting the size of the structure to 900 sq. ft. and specifying the distance from existing structure to the ADU along with some building code requirements. That is being watched by Fire. SB 339 is another fire one, incorporating under protected and unprotected rangelands into the fire protection system. SB 772 creates a taskforce to look at forest health and how things take place when conducting forest health treatments. It’s geared a lot towards providing a youth core concept and funding for that side of things. HB 2020 the Carbon Reduction Bill establishes a Carbon Policy Office within Oregon Department of Administrative Services and directs Director of Carbon Policy Office to adopt Oregon Climate Action Program by rule. Continuing amendments assure the work sessions will continue for some time. It’s been gut and stuffed once already with the -31 amendment. The companion to that is SB 928 which establishes the Oregon Climate Authority and makes the Office of Carbon Policy (currently in the Governor’s office) and the Department of Energy into one agency down the road that would administer whatever comes out of 2020. The funds that come out of the Cap & Trade program would run through that agency. HB 2020 is in a Joint Committee so it will just continue on. And SB 928 is in Ways & Means now because it is creating a new agency which will require a lot of funding so it will get sorted out in that realm. Norlander gave a quick description of other bills as well but encouraged any questions could be directed to him when they come up.

BREAK

1. **Incentives Update – Danny Norlander**

Norlander reported that he is transitioning back to a more normal workload with the return of Ryan Gordon from a temporary assignment and hiring of a new Incentives Coordinator, Nate Agalzoff. Norlander presented the Incentives update for Agalzoff who was unable to attend due to meeting conflicts. Notable for update is that ODF Santiam is working with the local NRCS office to expand the current Conservation Implementation Strategy (CIS) area to include people who were impacted by the Santiam Park Fire that happened in March near Lyons. Down in Medford there’s a new CIS which will be coming on line in the Williams area. He reminded members that CISs are project areas that are funded in 3 year intervals by NRCS. Landowners can sign up and get work on the ground cost-shared for that period of time. The Williams area relates to the Taylor and Klondike Fires. So we may also look into some EFRP Emergency Forest Restoration Projects which are run through the Farm Service Agency. There is one for Chetco Bar, one for Barry Point, 5 or 6 years ago. In Douglas Co. they are working to get one implemented for the snow event that took place and potentially one for drought interactions which happened in the past few years in that same area. So, drought and snow at the same time! Staff are trying to get together with the FSA representative to go through all the EFRP stuff that is going on. To be qualified for EFRP on the fire side it has to be a natural event. So lightning-caused fires are applicable. One started by lawnmowers, or other human activities are not. So that limits what fires that can utilize that program. He continued to say they also have an Agreement in place with the American Forest Foundation (AFF) to do management planning that lines up with NRCS projects similar to the NRCS agreement but focused in on different areas. NE Oregon and SW Oregon have the large bulk of that. But we are also working in the Klamath area and then John Day, Central Oregon area to get management plans for small woodland and forest owners. Those plans can be used to go after funds from NRCS or one of our Community Assistance Grants or Western State Fire Managers or Bark Beetle Programs. It kind of opens the door to a lot of our incentives programs. That should be an ongoing project for some time. We’ve hired some Limited Duration staff to do those plans in various areas. It also ties in well with another AFF project called Woods Camp which is accessed online and being advertised through Facebook. It’s an online tool to attract people into doing forest management planning and other programs. It’s kind of tiered to the NRCS CISs where they are focusing, but that isn’t to say that it’s not Statewide. A lot of it goes through Extension in some areas, working with SWCDs in others, and some NGOs like Wallowa Resources in the northeast Oregon. So it provides a platform for landowners to get information about their property and subsequently get in contact with a forester or peer landowner to get information about what is available out there eventually getting them on track to complete a management plan or simply get more information about our incentives programs. So that went live in November, and I think it’s getting pretty good traction, a lot of interest. Woods Camp is run through AFF. ODF, Extension and the SWCDs are associated with it. Siemens asked if Woods Camp was promoting use of the Uniform Plan Template. Norlander confirmed that they are using the Uniform Planning process and the resulting plans should align with the first 8 NRCS planning goals. There is 9 total goals in the NRCS plan but the ninth one is NRCS specific approving process. The first block is pre-planning and the second block is the actual plan writing. Siemens reported that AFF just hired another western representative, so it sounded like they are bringing more capacity to the west. Ahrens commented that the industry and government agencies have been begging for one good online system. So they are also trying to use the Uniform Planning System as the way to help landowners. He suggested that some catchup is needed for help with AFF and Woods Camp as it may not understand the forest types in NW Oregon.

To conclude Danny reported that Tree Farm System just had an Inspector Training with the current format. There are new certified inspectors including 3 ODF staff members.

1. **Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review – Marganne Allen**

Marganne Allen, manager of the Forest Health and Monitoring Unit gave members an update of where the Systematic Review process was on Siskiyou Streamside Protections. The members had received a copy of the drafted Review on the 15th of March. The latest version of the talking points was passed around with a physical copy of the Review, so members could follow along with the information she would be providing.

Recapping the function of the Monitoring Unit is to be the Adaptive Management arm of the Board of Forestry regarding forest practices by checking on rule implementation trends and effectiveness. Those checks provide a sense of the frequency, quality and quantity metrics indicating how effective we are at meeting our goals for resource protection through the Forest Practices Act and reporting back to the Board on what was found. The Systematic Literature Review was begun in 2018 after the Board prioritized monitoring work on the Siskiyou riparian areas. Monitoring staff have worked searching for peer-reviewed literature on vegetative desired future condition, stream temperature and shade specific to Small and Medium Fish-bearing streams in the Siskiyou to determine if the FPA rules are effective in maintaining water quality in the Siskiyou. Staff have also facilitated providing the Board contextual information on fish status and trends in that area (by ODF&W) and Water Quality status and trends on water temperature by DEQ with their TMDL (Total Maximum Daily Load) procedure. She set the stage saying that June will be important on the project timeline and her key question to the members was wanting to know whether the Committee desires to actively present recommendations at that June Board meeting. In June the BOF will be asked for a decision relative to whether or not rules are working; rules are not working; or there is not enough information currently to evaluate based upon the literature review and corresponding contextual information without new data collection. The Board’s decisions will be very specific to whether we are meeting the goals for stream temperature and meeting the goals for Desired Future Condition (The shade outcome.)

There is a core assumption with forest practices act, that if you build the desired future condition within a stand you get good outcomes for water quality and you get good outcomes for fish. Staff specifically noted that we are not going to revisit those assumptions. Swanson asked how certain can staff be that the desired future condition will actually achieve its goal within the extra context of climate change? Allen responded that the simple answer to that it is out of scope within this particular monitoring project. It was new for the Board to specifically direct our monitoring. Especially re-prioritizing the Monitoring Strategy that had already been laid out. In June the Board will be provided a range of options to select from. That will define what the next steps are in the process. To provide more context staff is also looking at the voluntary measures in the gradient of behaviors. Things like stream restoration; road restoration; inventory work; etc. As well as fish status and trends.

When doing any systematic review we are setting it up as transparently as possible. What the parameters we are using to make decisions about how the process ‘net’ is designed to capture information. The point being trying to eliminate any kind of bias that could be interjected as thoroughly as possible still understanding there will inherently will be bias, but they will be as transparent as possible about what that bias is. Again looking at rule effectiveness relative to stream temperature, DFC and shade. Stream temperature is a quantifiable standard and we are looking at numeric criteria, but there are multiple, different temperature thresholds according to the beneficial use by fish, the fish type, their lifecycle and things like that. That’s the numeric criterion and the Protecting Cold Water Standard, the 0.3 metric. So staff is looking at the quality and relevance to that metric in the literature and how much variation there is. The DFC and resulting shade are a narrative standard rather than numeric that we need to interpret subjectively which involves trying to determine what stand conditions on average across the landscape would be similar to mature stand conditions. The most specific information we have is relevant to conifer-dominated stands. But whether you are doing clear-cut or thinning the notion is that the FPA promotes and encourages active management, so there is a tension between wanting to have resource protection and also encouraging and promoting active management. Small and Medium Fish-bearing streams that fall under that category. So on average across the landscape as people harvest and grow and harvest and grow and so forth the desired future conditions are maintained and managed for. That’s not old growth, but is modeled on an 80 to 200 year old stand with a modeled average age of 120 years using forestry growth and yield tables and adjusting the stocking level for assumed disturbance and mortality rates in the RMA.

Brown asked if the average, is supposed to mimic the basal area of 120 years, or the shade performance of a 120 year old stand. In the rules it talks about a ‘mature stand condition’ providing ample shade and large wood but it doesn’t provide specific metrics. Allen shared the struggle sorting that out but she didn’t want to convey that is unanswerable. So when they went through the literature review they did seek to quantify the literature in their quality and relevance relative to the study. They had to try to utilize studies that may have acceptable standards but to our best judgment may have different riparian standards and different metrics to make a judgment call. Was it more or less protective or equal to FPA? So its trying to find information we can mine to inform the assessment. Another study looked at diameter distributions by species and a similar type of analysis that looked at cover. Looking at species composition only one case had studies that looked at species richness in a mature stand. So it provided the ‘yardstick’ but we didn’t have another study that showed the ‘treated’ condition so there was nothing to hold the data up against. So that’s our challenge. As staff are prepping for the June BOF meeting. Allen shared that this was the first sharing of the information in total and admitted it was difficult trying to story this. She invited any input on how to improve her presentation before the June Board meeting. The Division doesn’t know what the Board’s decision will be and the Division’s next steps depend purely on what the Board decides to do. Swanson recognized that Marganne went over the methodology for the Review rather than the outcomes and inquired if staff had developed a recommendation. Allen begged off answering for the time being directing members to feel free to review the Board materials when available online. Allen assured the member they will have a recommendation but the Board certainly has the discretion to decide that they feel differently. Again, Allen noted the challenging nature of this project because the decision is out of their hands on the adequacy of the rules. The Board makes that decision. Staff’s function is to present where they think there are key gaps in the science as well as opportunities. After some concern expressed by the eastern Oregon member, Allen assured that anything that the Board decides on this review would not be relevant to the Eastern Oregon georegion.

Swanson offered that the riparian vegetation could be totally intact and mature and you can still have stream temperatures that are higher than anticipated to be and how that possibility fits in the modeling of an intact riparian area’s ability to absorb the fluctuations in temperature. Allen responded that the Department has to meet the evidentiary criteria required by statute to be able to conduct relevant monitoring. Relevant to the question of whether there is a substantial evidence of forest practices contributing to the problem.

Returning to her original query, Marganne presumed that the Committee wants time to testify in front of the Board so it can be scheduled and materials be submitted. They have proposed the same offer to the Regional Forest Practices Committees in their review of the report. Abraham encouraged them to consider it and let them know. Swanson suggested that members come to the next meeting with their initial thoughts and have another conversation about testifying and/or providing materials and hopefully Marganne or Terry Frueh would be available again to answer any of their questions. Abraham offered to help with the delivery of those messages.

LUNCH

1. **Emerald Ash Borer Response Plan – Wyatt Williams**

Wyatt Williams, Invasive Species Specialist was invited to provide a Forest Health update on Emerald Ash Borer as well as including some other invasive forest insects and diseases in the news and in staff work recently.

Private Forests Health Unit publishes an annual report called Forest Health Highlights and also produce Fact Sheets on different topics, herbicide use, diseases, noxious weeds and insect pests. They push that information out on the ODF Public site and keep it regularly updated. <https://www.oregon.gov/ODF/ForestBenefits/Pages/ForestHealth.aspx>

Focusing on the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) he provided a history of its spread and eradication efforts. First detected in the U.S. in 2002 there has been a lot of effort to try to stop it but luckily EAB is a long ways from Oregon. From detection in 2002 to now it has spread to over 30 states and it has killed over 100 million Ash trees. The closest population we have is Boulder, Colorado. So this is but a couple of days drive from the epicenter to Oregon. EAB are transported very nicely with human activity. Now the main culprit for its spread is in infested firewood and nursery stock. One inch saplings of ash can harbor EAB. Despite a huge public education effort by APHIS, the Forest Service and States on not moving firewood and with even federal regulation not to move firewood, it is still escaping those containment lines. Then he shared the signs and symptoms of EAB in Ash: Starts dying from the top down; finding epicormic shoots; Finding characteristic exit holes from the adults and evidence of galleries.

Individual trees can be protected but it is very costly from $100 to $300 dollars/tree for Imidachloprid (a neonicotinoid). And Emamectin is a very good one but very costly. This single treatment has to be repeated every one to three years. There are some areas of effort like Shenandoah National Park and they have this skyline ridge they want to protect and have a $30,000 annual budget just to go around to a couple of hundred ash trees and inject them to preserve the historical and environmental integrity of Skyline Drive. Right off the drive however there is a mass die-off of Ash plus all the Hemlocks. So that expensive chemical control is about all we have. For biological control there have been 4 insects imported into the U.S. tested and approved for release. A couple of them are sticking and providing up to 35% predation rate but that’s still short of the goal. Populations of EAB are still exponentially rising. Wyatt pointed to the two cost categories associated with EAB infestation. The primary one the costs of tree removal and replacement in the urban areas. And the ecological costs, as evidenced in the Eastern U.S. are devastating. Wiping out a lot of true ash species growing along the riparian areas similar to here. And they are already seeing some ecological changes in the mid-west. In 2011 EAB had cost $1.7 billion dollars and $850 million of that from local government, State Government, including SWCD, city governments. Then $38 million in costs are from the federal government. In addition, landowner costs and property value losses. For the timber industry, Ash *is* a timber crop in the eastern U.S. So for preparedness planning they forecasted out some of the costs for Portland that indicate if established here in less than 10 years we could have all the Ash die in Portland. There are an estimated 72,000 public street trees. These are just the ones growing along the streets just in Portland. So $21 million dollars. An average cost is $290 per tree. Some of that can be way more expensive and some cheaper. Then $387 dollar replacement cost that includes labor. So basically you are looking at a $50 million dollar insect impacting Portland’s urban forestry. Costs mount up when you have mass die offs. Also there is research suggesting that there are health impacts as well in urban areas where cardio-vascular disease and depression actually increases due to the lack of tree canopy which would encourage outdoor activity. (The analysis done for Portland didn’t include any of the effects to property values just removal and replacement.)

Emerald Ash Borer only eats ‘true ash’ (in the genus Fraxinus) and Oregon does have a wild native Fraxinus that extends up into Washington and down into California. Once you get an eye for it, you can’t miss it. It’s all over the Willamette Valley. These islands of Oregon Ash are generally right within agricultural land. But it has its own unique environment. With all understory plants, some rare, there are some T&E species associated with Oregon Ash stands. Those stands are sort of a refuge, and island of habitat, so deer and elk use these stands for feed and cover. There is no other tree species that can form canopy for us where Ash grows in Oregon. So if we get EAB we’re going to lose a lot of riparian over story structure which can have an influence on stream temperatures and sediments. So there could be a lot of ecological effects too along with the economic costs. We know this is coming and are planning for it. The State now has a risk map based on the known occurrence of Ash in the State. Mostly in the Willamette Valley but also tributaries to the Rogue and there is some Ash in watersheds of the coast range. Breaking it up by elevation. One thousand foot elevation or below has 80% of all of our Ash. So we can take this to landowners too, industry, small woodland owners and say if you have property above 2000 feet you are likely not to have Oregon Ash. This helps us plan where to target our outreach and our surveys. A lot of states are pre-planning but we are the first one on the west coast to develop a State Plan. Work was done in conjunction with Oregon Dept. of Agriculture who is our regulatory agency and can enforce the quarantines. So, ODF and ODA led the charge. Forest Service, Karen Ripley from Region 6 was there. Iral participated. We had APHIS Health Director and PPQ staff comment on it as well as having staff from the cities of Portland, Corvallis come together for 7 planning meetings over the course of a year. We also formed a Steering committee and we farmed out the draft Plan for review and comment. The coordinator drafted and published it last year and it is also online. The website has the full 80 page plan for EAB. The Plan defines the role of each stakeholder. Readiness, the risk assessment, the risk map comes into play. They discussed current efforts for detection and monitoring. Oregon Dept. of Agriculture will lead as a regulatory agency. In the appendix of the plan a sample press release is prepared to go. We developed an IPM Fact Sheet for landowners. So the chemical control, biologic control all that is in that plan. When asked about establishing the biologic ahead of time, Williams explained that the controls only feed on EAB larvae, or eggs so it is considered to slow the population but rates are still rising. A firewood inspection station in California has detected EAB and the firewood did drive through Oregon. Believe it or not people do move firewood.

He reported that the EAB work being done is under a USFS Forestry Grant and is called the Oregon Forest Pest Detector Program and awarded through the Western Competitive Grant paid for 3 years. ODF partners with OSU as the main agencies with training and planning deliverables. The contract facilitator was the same one who coordinates the Oregon Invasive Species Council so is already familiar with the partners and issues. Detection is difficult as pheromone traps are not effective. The goal of this program is to train professionals to be the detectors. State Park workers, foresters, professional arborists, landscape contractors. People who work around trees every day who can help recognize EAB and ALB. He extended all credit to Amy Grotta, OSU Extension Agent. Training has been focused on forest professionals and can be provided on demand. Unfortunately the grant is running out December 31st this year but the online training will still exist.

ODF has an Urban & Community Forestry Program, Kristen Ramstad manages. She is also involved with the Oregon Pest Detector and the creation of the Statewide EAB Plan. So the Urban and Community Forests Program and the Forest Health Program with help from the Public Affairs Unit are pushing out this EAB message. Also the OR Invasive Species Council (OISC) sponsors a hotline for the Forest Pest Detector Program, where any pests or invasives can be reported by the public.

Williams thought the Readiness and Response Plan is a great tool for the local governments. And the impacts will be most noticeable in the urban and rural interface. First thing is to know where your Ash is. Know how much Ash you have. And start thinking about a plan. If you had to remove all that Ash, how would you do that, and what would you replace it with? And in our Plan we list the tools necessary so that’s where he sees it being the most useful is in preparing the local communities. There is a section explaining what will happen statewide if detected and will convene a stakeholder workgroup to assess the situation. So EAB if it is found in Ontario is a lot different situation than if EAB is found in Springfield so it was important to allow some flexibility and options in the plan. We are ready to convene a working group of experts to determine exactly how we are going to treat that incident, that population. Right now there is a federal quarantine on EAB and so if we do detect it we will have to form some quarantine around it. The plan has been published and was released last May 2018. The Forest Service has a Fraxinus Genetic Conservation Program right now to start collecting native seed sources for some of these Fraxinus species. ODF applied for it and received funding to start collecting seeds this fall and next fall. We are going to collect 1 million ash seeds and put them in cold storage to conserve the genetics of the species. It is definitely a big effort by lots of people who are very passionate about this.

Williams also reported a Gypsy Moth (GM), spray treatment in Corvallis next month. They are doing a ground-based rather than aerial application. Unlike EAB with True Ash. Gypsy Moth has over 500 known host species they will attack including Doug-fir. And so it’s both a forest and Ag pest. One big difference is that the pheromone traps we installed across the state each year has been a great tool for early detection. Every year Oregon detects a population of gypsy moth, or individuals with those pheromone traps. They usually come in through sticky egg masses that may be on patio grills, and furniture and trailers coming into the state. But with those detections we are having some success against invasive species in Oregon. Case in point, we have been 100% successful in detecting GM and eradicating it every single time. Williams finished off by noting other invasive diseases and insects which they are monitoring and offered his services to present to any groups with concerns or interest in Invasives.

1. **FPA Compliance Audit – Paul Clements**

Clements came to address the Committee on the logistics and background and high level results of the Private Forests Division FPA Compliance Audit. The Oregon Forest Practices Program has a mandate for monitoring. And the Monitoring unit tries to quantify the results by determining what we can accurately measure to provide some statistical transparency. The SSBT Rule Review was the result of seven years of study on a series of sites up in NW Oregon. That’s monitoring. We monitor effectiveness and implementation. And the SSBT Review was looking at effectiveness. We found that our standards as they were applied resulted in a condition that didn’t meet certain criteria so we made a change. We also monitor implementation and that’s how well or often do people do what they are supposed to do? No matter what rule set we are looking at the intent is the same. To check the system and see if it is working. We check methods of production. We develop study protocols that have minimal variance in backgrounds for a uniform process regardless of topic. In 2009 – 11 Biennium the cuts in the Division (40%) curtailed the Audit program. When the next biennium came and the revenue began to return as all sorts of stakeholders were insisting on funding the program. The Legislature added a Budget Note for 2009-11 that said, ‘You will conduct an audit of forest practices and you will employ private contractors to do it.’ Staff developed a RFP put it out for bid and we got a contractor, Barnes & Associates from Roseburg. They entered into an Agreement to do up to 5 years of work on an annual basis. There are 288 rules in the OR FPA and we picked 57 of them for the first audit. Mostly about roads and stream protection and riparian areas. We did quality checks on our work and the questions were: How often to the operators comply with the rules? How does it vary by landowner? Which rules have high or low compliance rates? And what is the scale of the impacts comparing with 2002? One of the speed bumps in this process to date is getting permission to go on private land. We had a lot of buy-in from industrial owners where they are most alert to their impacts and maintaining their social license to harvest. Many of the timber certification programs have a need and requirement for a 3rd party inventory of processes and this provides that for them. However, it is a different process to call up private non-industrial landowners and ask for permission to go out there and measure how well a harvest was done. He didn’t get a lot of straight up refusals but did get a fair amount of ‘no response’. They had to ask 384 to get 55 permissions. We don’t have blanket authority to go onto somebody’s land and start measuring even though a notification of operation was submitted and a timber harvest operation did take place. We are obviously comfortable going out there and checking on operations that are happening or seeing if trees are planted. But to come along 2 or 3 years later we need written permission from a landowner particularly if we are hiring a contractor to do this field work. Sites are chosen proportional to the acreage logged. So we sample the western side about twice the rate of the eastern side because there is just that much more activity. Paul continued that they began looking at all notifications that listed some kind of harvest activity, either clear- or partial-cut then stratify it by acreage and landowner class. In the last audit on the ground checks were walked down every stream and every road on the selected sites, collecting data on Waters of the States, Roads, Stream Crossings, Landings and Quarries. Data is loaded into an algorithm which basically says, yes, this meets the rules or no it wasn’t in compliance. We get a GPS point of every piece of data collected so we can go back for a QA/QC of the contractor. Paul emphasized that this is not an enforcement. The information is anonymous. When this started we wound up in a situation with the Freedom of Information Act where there was a request for specific landowner identification. The Audit was on hold for a year as the Department worked with the Dept. of Justice which culminated in a confidentiality clause as it is our assertion that it’s in the public interest to do this work and if we can’t do it confidentially we won’t get landowner permission to conduct the audit. Some questions we used to determine compliance were: Did the rule apply? Were there sediment contributions to the WOS? If so, how much? So they were also looking across a range of impact. So these results are used to focus FPA training and ODF works with the Association of Oregon Loggers (AOL) to address the standout low compliance issues. So for the State and the Department we can verify what the Rules do. We can say to you that for these 57 rules we’ve got about a 95% compliance rate on all ownerships statewide in the time we sampled. And then we went back over 3 more years we did see a positive trend in four years. We have this process in place and it is our belief that these audits will inform the future efforts. Monitoring has formed a stakeholder group, the Compliance Audit Review Team to represent the interests of the landowners. The Audit’s value is that it is objectively derived information with which we can have an informed discussion. And otherwise we are just talking about how we feel and everybody ‘feels’ differently. So, we take those results to the Board. Also other monitoring work continues. He noted that members heard about the current Siskiyou Systematic Review looking at effectiveness. They are preparing the next round of the audit narrowing the focus to reforestation compliance. How well do people reforest lands in Oregon from which trees are cut? So when we go to look at compliance and do monitoring and the rule says 200 trees/acre and we are going to measure how many trees/acre within any great precision we cannot make any judgment calls because for the sanctity of the audit we can’t afford that degree of latitude because we have to give a precise answer. That is reflective of the difference between monitoring and administration of the FPA. We have to be more precise in monitoring. In on-the-ground administration we can be subjective and incorporate field conditions, etc. in any actions that are called for. Clements reported that within days they are going to run the field protocol and then compose a Statement of Work to be a part of the Request for Proposal in bidding out the contract through the state contracting portal. They are hoping to have people on the ground by September. Paul reiterated there is a lot of value in being able to say an independent 3rd party gathered this data rather than the staff.

Vroman offered from his perspective as well as the industry perspective that it is extremely valuable having monitoring in place because it does help with the social license. They provide the State notification of our forest activities but not to a point where it’s a permit to do those activities. And then it’s monitored to check how well you did what you told us you were going to do. How well did you implement those rules? So that’s very powerful process of gaining public trust and protecting the environment. That 3rd party audit is verification that can be reported publically that says, we did what we said we were going to do.

Clements implored that one of the things that he would like to see more of is landowner participation. Not only to respond back to us regarding access but as a valuable opportunity specifically during the QA/QC process with ODF staff. He would like to ask landowners to allow the contractor to work with interruption during the actual survey. Once we demonstrate that it’s just kind of a nameless/faceless output it’s easier for landowners to find value in the process and the benefit of a check for certification systems. Abraham noted that the Budget Note that began the Audits didn’t come with any focused funding but the Division continues to do the compliance audit annually in whatever form our budget allows framing it within our current resource capability. And there are lots of concerns about prioritizing what we do and what we do next. Available staff time and expertise and funding ultimately determines how far reaching the audit will be. Paul added that in monitoring they are trying to build a culture of continuous improvement at every turn.

Ahrens agreed that he’s heard a lot of talk about how big the problem is in getting smaller landowners permissions to audit their lands. But lack of engagement is an impediment to focused outreach and assuring information is a true representative sample. These audits can tell us what areas need more focused technical support and education. Where are the challenges to reforestation success? The seedling supply, storage of seedlings, or seedling quality issues? Drought, I&D, soil class? The design of the audit should answer the following questions: Are people are achieving compliance? If not what is the cause?

1. **Annual Report Planning – All**

Dominique opened the discussion sharing some processes she has traditionally used in preparing the report. She pulls all the discussion for each work plan topic from the past year. Then summarizes the Committee’s work for the year. Members were invited to contribute and recommend any format changes. In the past the Chair has provided an introduction to the report and presents the report to the Board. Abraham suggested continuing the preparation consolidating the summaries to be as brief possible and kept within a narrative style. Susan offered that there should be a focus on all they had accomplished and the testimony provided to the Board during the year. All testimony will be entered in as appendices of the Report. The Report needs to be completed by mid-June at the latest. Peel liked the idea as presented of creating the draft but also reminded the group that they should bring their thoughts together regarding the June Board meeting and any recommendation they might have on the Siskiyou Streamside Protection Review.

Abraham added that the work plan for the 2019-20 will need to be determined and noted in the report as well along with a mention of the Eastern Oregon Operator of the Year Merit Award being nominated by John Peel. Swanson asked about the appropriateness of including the efforts on the secondary forest dwelling bill now moving in the Senate committees. Not business for the Board but they were kept informed of OSWA’s and the members efforts working towards succession planning in a big way. Kyle agreed that the Committee could call it out in the report but noting that it didn’t include any actual endorsement from the Board but rather informational. Abraham reminded members that getting facetime with the Board is always valuable to their standing and credibility as an Advisory Committee. Ahrens added that it would be good to report what CFF is about as there are newer Board members that might not know the Committee’s function. Dominique thought that regardless of actual testimony it could be interesting if each member composed a small personal message to the Board to include in the Report. Ahrens agreed and noted that it could/should be related to the highlights of the year’s past discussions and what was acted on.

Peel added that he has personally experienced the lack of engagement from landowners on the eastside and ineffective outreach and knowledge of management tools and programs that are available. Perhaps indicating that half day workshops may appeal to unengaged forest landowners on topics specific to them. It seemed to Brown that Extension would be the likely concierge or liaison to those resources. Connecting to NRCS, ODF and OFRI regarding available programs. Ahrens agreed on all counts. But he gets focused sorting out their roles in that partnership. Peel admitted he didn’t know how to systematically go about informing the forestland constituency but bringing them in to sit down with ODF or NRCS and finding tools that are available would be a good outcome for continuing engagement. Abraham called out the work plan item on Educational Needs for Family Forestland Owners as a Tier II topic that might be raised in priority for the next work plan.

1. **Good of the Order, Next Meeting Topics – All**

Abraham further explained that putting the work plan up for discussion is a good way to refresh members on their accomplishments and reconsider what their focus might be in the coming year. Some of the issues may be checked off, others raised up.

Swanson summarized action items for next meeting are to consider and compose recommendation on the Siskiyou project and consider potential written or live testimony. To what topics should be prioritized for the next year. They wanted to hear more on the Forest Legacy program from Amy Singh and possibly information on the Oregon Woodland Cooperative. Kyle added a reminder that they had originally scheduled to have Tim Murphy from DLCD come and present the Farm and Forest Report in May.

Swanson adjourned the meeting at 2:45 PM.