

DRAFT Board of Forestry Meeting Minutes

November 5, 2014

INDEX

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Page #</u>
A. MINUTES – SEPTEMBER 3, 2014	2
B. REGIONAL FOREST PRACTICES COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS	2
1. STATE FORESTER AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS.....	2
2. LIASIONS TO THE BOARD AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION	3
3. URBAN FORESTRY PROGRAM UPDATE AND STORMWATER INITIATIVES.....	4
4. DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY FISCAL REPORT.....	4
5. FINAL ORDER – KIRBY SILVEUS – WALDEN III, INC.	4
6. ANNUAL AND PERIODIC REPORTS OF FOREST CONDITIONS AND TRENDS	5
7. UPDATE AND TIMELINE FOR RIPARIAN RULE ANALYSIS.....	6
8. SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALTERNATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS	7

Items listed in order heard.

Complete audio recordings from the meeting and attachments listed below are available on the web at www.oregonforestry.gov

- (1) Handout, [Elliot State Forest Alternatives](#), Agenda Item 1
- (2) Presentation, [Green Infrastructure in Our Urban Environment](#), Agenda Item 3
- (3) Presentation, [EQC and BOF Joint Meeting, Stormwater](#), Agenda Item 3
- (4) Handout, [Proposed Final Order – Case No. 08-DG033, Walden III LLC](#), Agenda Item 5
- (5) Presentation, [Annual and Periodic Reports](#), Agenda Item 6
- (6) Presentation, [Riparian Rule Analysis Update](#), Agenda Item 7
- (7) Public Comment, [Meg Thompson, Ph.D.](#), Agenda Item 7
- (8) Public Comment, [Jim James, Oregon Small Woodlands Association](#), Agenda Item 7
- (9) Public Comment, [Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers](#), Agenda Item 7
- (10) Public Comment, [Scott Hanson, Oregon Small Woodlands Association](#), Agenda Item 7
- (11) Public Comment, [Jake Gibbs, Lone Rock Resources](#), Agenda Item 7
- (12) Public Comment, [Heath Curtiss, Oregon Forest Industries Council](#), Agenda Item 7
- (13) Public Comment, [Oregon Stream Protection Coalition](#), Agenda Item 7
- (14) Presentation, [Subcommittee on Alternative Forest Management Plans](#), Agenda Item 8
- (15) Handout, [Deliverables and Timeline](#), Agenda Item 8
- (16) Handout, [Public Survey & Community Roundtable Packet](#), Agenda Item 8
- (17) Public Comment, [Dave Ivanoff, Hampton Resources](#), Agenda Item 8
- (18) Public Comment, [Ray Jones, Stimson Lumber Company](#), Agenda Item 8
- (19) Public Comment, [Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers](#), Agenda Item 8
- (20) Public Comment, [Chris Smith, North Coast State Forest Coalition](#), Agenda Item 8
- (21) Public Comment, [Ian Fergusson, Association of Northwest Steelheaders](#), Agenda Item 8
- (22) Public Comment, [Bob Rees, Northwest Guides and Anglers Association](#), Agenda Item 8
- (23) Public Comment, [Rhett Lawrence, Sierra Club](#), Agenda Item 8
- (24) Public Comment, [Bob Van Dyk, North Coast State Forest Coalition](#), Agenda Item 8
- (25) Handout, [Committee for Family Forestlands](#), Agenda Item 1A

In accordance with the provisions of ORS 526.016, a meeting of the Oregon Board of Forestry was held on November 5, 2014 at the Tiffany Center, 1410 SW Morrison St., Portland, Oregon 97205.

Chair Imeson called the public meeting to order at 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:

Sybil Ackerman-Munson
Nils Christoffersen
Cindy Deacon Williams

Tom Imeson
Tom Insko
Gary Springer

Absent:

Mike Rose

CONSENT AGENDA:

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (30 minutes –21.2 MB)

State Forester Decker noted that Item A was unavailable, removing it from the list of items considered for Board consent.

Chair Imeson questioned the Board on their approval of Agenda Item B. With Board consensus, Item B was approved.

A. **SEPTEMBER 3 MEETING MINUTES**

Approval of Board Meeting Minutes

Minutes of the September 3, 2014 Board meeting were unavailable and deferred until the January 2015 meeting.

B. **REGIONAL FOREST PRACTICES COMMITTEE APPOINTMENTS AND REAPPOINTMENTS**

Administrative Work Plan –Committee Appointments

The Board received recommendation on appointment of a new candidate to a position on the Regional Forest Practice Committees.

The Board appointed Scott Gray to the Northwest Regional Committee with a term expiring September 2015.

ACTION AND INFORMATION:

1. **STATE FORESTER AND BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (30 minutes – 21.2 MB)

State Forester Decker offered comments noting:

- this was a joint meeting and tour with the Environmental Quality Commission,
- passing of Hal Salwasser, former dean at the College of Forestry, and John Christie, former Department of Forestry employee and passionate forest advocate,
- recent news coverage regarding the Department's handling of pesticide complaints and strong commitment to clear transparency in procedures for responding to complaints and working with cooperating partners,

- participation in a recent field tour hosted by Brett Brownscombe looking at the state's role in federal forests, and
- upcoming annual meeting of the Council of Western State Foresters where federal forest policy and federal funding will be a topic of focus in the coming year.

Jim Paul, Deputy Director of the Department of State Lands, referenced a presentation ([Attachment 1](#)) to provide an update on the Elliott State Forest Alternatives Project and initial draft findings from modeling the alternatives. Board discussion ensued on differing revenue streams, ownership, and management options across the alternatives with State Forester Decker committing to keep the Board informed of progress and direction provided from the State Land Board related to the future of the Elliott State Forest.

1A. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Meg Eastman Thompson, Ph.D provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 7](#)) expressing concern with public health risks related to contamination of citizen's drinking water with cancer-causing chemicals recommending mandates on watersheds, halt of clear-cutting activities, manual brush removal, sustainable harvesting and inclusion of all drinking water properties into protections of state forests.

The Committee for Family Forestlands submitted written testimony ([Attachment 25](#)) after the meeting requesting the Board consider responding to recent articles in the Oregonian that dramatically mislead readers about the laws that govern the use of herbicides in Oregon's forests.

2. LIAISONS TO THE BOARD AND ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COMMISSION

Administrative Work Plan – Governance

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (18 minutes – 12.5 MB)

Chair Imeson welcomed members of the Environmental Quality Commission for a discussion on the Board and Commission liaison positions created to strengthen communication and coordination activities between the Department of Environmental Quality and the Department of Forestry and the departments' policy-making commission and board.

Environmental Quality Commission Chair O'Keefe recognized the liaison role that places a designated Board and Commission member at each other's meetings when potential topics of overlapping interests and authorities are on the meeting agendas with liaisons providing periodic updates to both Commissioners and Board members.

Department of Environmental Quality Director, Dick Pedersen, and State Forester Decker highlighted several topics requiring collaboration between the two agencies, Board and Commission.

Board Member Gary Springer and Commission Armstrong discussed their ongoing work as liaisons, providing examples of improved communication, improved relationships and understanding of joint policy issues, and opportunities for future collaboration.

Information only.

3. URBAN FORESTRY PROGRAM UPDATE AND STORMWATER INITIATIVES

Private Forests Work Plan – Urban Forestry and Water Quality Topics

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 - (54 minutes – 37.1 MB)

State Forester Decker introduced the joint topic held with the Environmental Quality Commission focused on green infrastructure and water quality in the urban setting, providing context for the following day's joint field tour.

Paul Ries, Urban and Community Forestry Program Manager at the Department of Forestry, referenced a presentation ([Attachment 2](#)) to provide an overview of the Urban Forestry Program, highlighting two Western Competitive Grant projects, the Regional Urban Forestry Strategy and Green Infrastructure in Interface Communities, and summarizing how green infrastructure provides an excellent approach for examining the intersection of urban forestry and water quality in the forests where people live.

Lisa Cox, Municipal Stormwater Coordinator at the Department of Environmental Quality, referenced a presentation ([Attachment 3](#)) to provide an overview of stormwater rule and policy, stormwater permits in Oregon, how stormwater is the leading contributor to water quality pollution in urban waters, elements of low impact development, and responsible stormwater management practices.

Discussion ensued regarding stormwater mitigation efforts by local mills and industry, urban forestry involvement in communities across the state, urban forestry programs in other states, regulatory permitting, and incentive programs used to encourage responsible stormwater management.

Information only.

4. DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY FISCAL REPORT

Administrative Work Plan – Ongoing Financial Status Checks

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (9 minutes 6.8 MB)

Satish Upadhyay, Administrative Services Division Chief, provided an update on the Department of Forestry's financial status while referencing information on the [Financial Dashboard](#).

Information only.

5. FINAL ORDER – KIRBY SILVEUS FOR WALDEN III, INC.

Administrative Work Plan – Final Orders

[Listen to audio](#) MP3– (9 minutes – 6.8 MB)

Angie Lane, Civil Penalties Administrator, presented an overview of a civil penalty case ([Attachment 4](#)), encompassing a reforestation obligation that was not met by a landowner in Douglas County, namely Walden III Inc.

Chair Imeson reviewed final order procedures and alternatives before the Board.

Board discussion ensued with comments surrounding the importance of reforestation and challenges with multiple owners and land use changes occurring with the property.

Board Member Tom Insko motioned for the Board's adoption of the proposed final order.

Board Member Gary Springer seconded the motion.

Voting in favor of the motion: Tom Insko, Gary Springer, Sybil Ackerman-Munson, Cindy Deacon Williams, Nils Christoffersen, and Tom Imeson, against: none.

With an affirming vote of consensus, Chair Imeson ordered:

The Board adopted the proposed final order in the matter of Kirby Silveus.

6. ANNUAL AND PERIODIC REPORTS OF FOREST CONDITIONS AND TRENDS

Emerging and Overarching Issues Work Plan – Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (30 minutes – 20.8 MB)

Kevin Birch, Forest Resources Planning Director, introduced the topic focused on refreshing systems for reporting forest conditions and trends.

Brandon Kaetzel, Principal Forest Economist, referenced a presentation ([Attachment 5](#)) to summarize prior feedback from the Board related to the Indicators for Sustainable Forest Management and present elements of a potential dashboard framework used for tracking and reporting forest conditions and trends.

Board discussion ensued on limitations to providing extensive data on an annual basis, availability of staff to adjust timelines as needed to fit Board priorities, interest in seeing certainty in reporting on topics such as land use changes, value in providing clear context – connecting the data to how the trends impact the Department, interest in broader economic reporting, how to effectively report ecological durability components, and how to measure or report on proactive measures.

Board Member Gary Springer motioned for the Board's approval of the list of reports, with latitude to develop other reports as necessary, and their associated timeframes for delivery.

Board Member Cindy Deacon Williams seconded the motion.

Voting in favor of the motion: Gary Springer, Cindy Deacon Williams, Sybil Ackerman-Munson, Tom Insko, Nils Christoffersen, and Tom Imeson, against: none.

With an affirming vote of consensus, Chair Imeson ordered:

The Board approved of the list of reports, with latitude to develop other reports as necessary, and their associated timeframes for delivery.

7. UPDATE AND TIMELINE FOR RIPARIAN RULE ANALYSIS

Private Forests Work Plan – Water Quality Protection

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 – (51 minutes – 35 MB)

Peter Daugherty, Private Forests Division Chief, presented an overview of the work completed since the September 2014 Board meeting on the riparian rule analysis, referencing a presentation ([Attachment 6](#)) providing context, a summary of discussions, an adjusted timeline and next steps in the process.

Board discussion ensued regarding importance in field testing prescriptions with stakeholders and the Regional Forest Practices Committees, value in receiving a summary of feedback from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and the Department of Environmental Quality, importance of a timeline focused on quality work as opposed to doing what's fast, and value in meeting with the Environmental Quality Commission liaisons/chairs/directors group to view the prescriptions in the field together.

Chair Imeson called for public comment.

Jim James, Executive Director of Oregon Small Woodlands Association, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 8](#)) encouraging the Board reference prior testimony submitted by John Westall reviewing the guidance, process and scientific information used when the Environmental Quality Commission developed the Protecting Cold Water criteria and recommending the Board and Department research tradeoffs associated with temperature, shade and productivity throughout the policy making process.

Scott Hanson, President of Oregon Small Woodlands Association, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 10](#)) expressing disappointment with the Board's decision to develop prescriptions for a new riparian protection rule, concern the Protecting Cold Water criteria is not based in science, support for including research on fish health and canopy openings such as those referenced in his testimony, interest in the Board's evaluation of the impacts various actions have on the beneficial uses of forest streams and fish, and encouragement to use the Regional Forest Practices Committees for development of prescriptions and voluntary measures.

Brian Schlaefli, Chair of the Southwest Regional Forest Practices Committee, provided public testimony with an update on recent meetings of the Committee recognizing that current progress is focused on exploration and discussions - not decisions, recommendations, or actions at this time, while sharing gratitude from many excited and engaged members of the Committee, thankful for the opportunity to contribute.

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 9](#)) urging consideration of several factors throughout the riparian rule analysis including: sensitivity of cooperative stewardship successes by forest landowners, operators, and staff foresters, unintended consequences of implementing a rule change, variance from the state's Protecting Cold Water criterion being small and rule changes should accordingly be small, geographic-specific, and simple, while recognizing landowners and operators are most familiar with forest practices performance.

Discussion ensued regarding the geographic-specific regions with Mr. Storm describing preference to limit the rule's scope to areas where statistically valid samples from the RipStream data occur.

Jake Gibbs, Lone Rock Resources and Chair of the Oregon Forest Industries Council's Forest Management Policy Committee, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 11](#)) emphasizing the importance of riparian rule process, encouraging the Board find a solution that reflects the magnitude of the issue, applause for outreach to the Regional Committees, and interest in becoming more engaged with the Department as a private landowner and through a series of meetings with the Oregon Forest Industries Council.

Heath Curtiss, Oregon Forest Industries Council, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 12](#)) offering gratitude for outreach to the Regional Forest Practices Committee and stakeholders, requesting the Board revisit the statutory charge, encouraging a small fix to a small problem, cautioning against confining the range of solutions to those that fit neatly within the Department's predictive modeling, and encouraging a solution based on the input of stakeholders and recommendations of the Regional Forest Practices Committees.

Candace Bonner provided public testimony offering support for prior testimony heard and requesting that testimony be taken into account throughout the rule analysis process.

Mary Scurlock, Oregon Stream Protection Coalition, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 13](#)) encouraging the Board adhere to the new rule timeline and continue active public outreach and engagement with consideration to pending federal disapproval of Oregon's coastal program and increased public scrutiny, expressing concern with limiting the geographic areas affected by the rulemaking, request to include the Siskiyou Region in the rule's scope due to the high aquatic resource values at stake, request for exclusion of any region from this rulemaking be accompanied by a clear plan for how the rules in those regions will be evaluated and amended with respect to the Protecting Cold Water criteria, encouragement to include the Department of Fish & Wildlife's expertise in the regulatory use of maps, consideration for all fish species, inclusion of upstream reaches as default, and consideration of specific prescription elements including buffer delineation methods and which trees contribute to basal area targets.

Information only.

8. **SUBCOMMITTEE ON ALTERNATIVE FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS**

State Forests Work Plan – Alternative Forest Management Plans for NW State Forests

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 Part 1 of 4 – (47 minutes – 32.7 MB)

State Forester Decker introduced the next step in the process of seeking the Board's general direction in regards to forest management, noting ongoing work of the Subcommittee on Alternative Forest Management Plans in response to the former board's concerns on financial viability and the Governor's call for increased financial and conservation outputs. Recognition was given to the significant amount of public input received, the conceptual nature of the forest management options under consideration, challenge in showing effectiveness and durability in conservation with predictable and sufficient economic returns, and recognition of timeframe as well as the notion that you may never have enough information on which to make difficult decisions.

Brett Brownscombe, Governor's Natural Resource Office, shared remarks from the Governor expressing comfort with the proposal to consider development of a new forest management plan based on a land allocation approach, importance of addressing concerns moving forward and providing greater detail on conservation and production outputs as well as how an allocation approach would be

implemented, interest in exploring opportunities with neighboring landowners to advance conservation strategies across ownership boundaries, exploration of a conservation fund, further discussions with the counties, interest in conservations related to a habitat conservation plan, and continued support throughout the next steps in the process, encouraging diligence and commitment to engagement.

Chair Imeson provided a brief summary of the September 29 Subcommittee meeting where purpose was to decide upon a conceptual approach to forest management that carries the best chance of achieving both financial viability and increasing conservation outcomes, while acknowledging concerns expressed about the need for additional analysis before the board makes its decision, that neither option would provide enough volume or timber or include conservation measures, concern regarding an expedited timeline, and desire to have more discussion and detail on the relationship between state forest management and social wellbeing of communities that rely on these forests.

Liz Dent, State Forests Division Chief, noted that both management options presented to the Subcommittee were designed to meet the twin goals of financial viability and increased conservation outcomes in the context of Greatest Permanent Value and were developed with significant stakeholder involvement and outreach. Referencing a presentation ([Attachment 14](#)) and timeline ([Attachment 15](#)), Ms. Dent provided further context related to the land allocation approach the Subcommittee recommended for the full Board's consideration, including a summary of zone goals and intended development of conservation and production principles, land allocation maps, and modeling results.

Josh Barnard, State Forests Division Policy Analyst, summarized several supporting strategies identified within the draft management options under consideration including pursuit of a Habitat Conservation Plan, increasing no-cut stream buffers and green tree retention, revisiting the planning processes, continuing emphasis on slope stability, transportation networks, and recreation, and reinvesting in monitoring and adaptive management.

Brian Pew, Deputy Division Chief, described the Division's work focusing on additional efforts outside the planning process including continued improvement of business practice and function, evaluation of alternative revenue funding options, exploring ways to establish an experimental forest, and establishing a fund for conservation or recreation projects.

Board question and comment ensued with clarifying responses from Staff related to funding gap estimates, recalculations necessary to determine harvest target volumes needed, how the volume targets are specified in the implementation plans instead of the forest management plans per statute, importance of developing estimates on volume and value, intent to model those numbers on a map, revisions desired to the funding gap estimate if the legislature funds the Department's policy option packages, helpful to illustrate positive and negative influences the various funding streams have and how that will affect variances to land allocated to conservation or production, challenge in depending upon the general fund as a sustained funding source, whether estimates for rebuilding the State Forests Division consider CPI or softening of stumpage values, and value in understanding the order of magnitude.

Tony Andersen, Public Information Officer, referenced the presentation slides and a packet of public input (Attachment 16) to provide a summary of public involvement, highlighting specific results from a recent public survey designed to capture feedback on the draft approaches to state forest management and plan for continued public involvement and outreach.

Chair Imeson called for comment from the Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee.

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 Part 2 of 4 – (14 minutes – 9.7 MB)

Tim Josi, Chair of the Forest Trust Lands Advisory Committee (FTLAC), provided comments on behalf of the Committee, recognizing difficult conversations held with the trust counties regarding potential implications of changing forest management and commending the Subcommittee for recommending a land allocation approach, before reading two motions made at a recent FTLAC meeting: 1) FTLAC supports the land allocation direction that the Board Subcommittee has recommended and 2) FTLAC does not support a revenue pooling system as understood at this time.

Speaking for himself and the Tillamook County Commissioners, no longer on behalf of the FTLAC, Mr. Josi commented on challenges inherent with securing county by county approval on allocating 30% of lands to conservation, concerns with potential to increase buffer widths, further environmental regulations and whether some counties would be hit harder than others, request for the Board to use the Forest Practices Act as a modeling guideline for the 70% and use an independent modeling firm to verify volumes on the ground.

Board discussion ensued related to the counties' satisfaction if the Department's financial viability issue is resolved and encouragement for the county's continued engagement in the work at hand.

Chair Imeson called for public comment.

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 Part 3 of 4 – (1 hour 6 minutes – 45.4 MB)

Ray Jones, Stimson Lumber Company, provided public comment and written testimony ([Attachment 18](#)) in support of the land allocation alternative while expressing concern with the tone of the proposal, lop-sided towards conservation outcomes with little specificity around harvest levels or county beneficiaries, concern a HCP would have unintended consequences, as would increasing incremental streamside buffers, and a desire to keep to the original conservation fund concept. Mr. Jones requested the Board identify clear metrics around harvest volumes and financial outputs and compare those graphically to other Stakeholder Plans and the current plan.

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, provided public comment and written testimony ([Attachment 19](#)) supporting the Department's recommendation to use the land allocation approach as the primary strategy, consider a range of production strategies that would optimize financial viability, provide careful modeling of revenue and conservation outcomes, next steps and informal checklist.

Bob Van Dyk, Wild Salmon Center and North Coast State Forest Coalition, provided public comment and written testimony ([Attachment 24](#)) offering cautious support for exploring the land allocation alternative while expressing concern with the durability of conservation zones, a desire to have conservation zones managed for late successional forest and healthy aquatic ecosystems, encouraging the Department seek broader buffers on debris flow streams, and encouragement to cooperate with neighboring public landowners when considering effective conservation commitments.

Andrew Miller, Stimson Lumber, provided public testimony in support of the land allocation alternative while indicating concern of a strong bias from the Department's perspective around conservation and virtually no content about financial issues, both Department budget and sustainability, a lack of attention to human, social, and economic viability in rural northwest Oregon, and offering encouragement for the Board in thinking about funding that's sustainable, encouraging the counties come forward with perspectives on what that means for them, support for the Department working with an independent agency to verify modeling results and establishment of a conservation fund.

Dave Ivanoff, Hampton Resources, provided public comment and written testimony ([Attachment 17](#)) summarizing key differences and concerns between the land allocation approach and the 70/30

approach developed through the Stakeholder Group including: the open-ended nature of “at least 30%”, lack of specificity as to volume outputs and how financial viability will be achieved, a changed framework of the conservation fund, federalization of state forests if green tree retentions and riparian set-asides are increased, prior nonproductive attempts at securing a HCP, objectives of creating larger diameter trees across the landscape, pursuit of General Fund dollars for land management, and lack of reference to rural unemployment, poverty and the decline in the social fabric of small communities. Mr. Ivanoff requested the Board direct Department staff to develop a zoned land management strategy similar to that contained in the Stakeholder 70/30 approach.

Ian Fergusson, Association of Northwest Steelheaders, provided public comment and written testimony ([Attachment 21](#)) in support of the land allocation concept based on the greatest likelihood it would provide certainty around both conservation and timber harvest, while expressing high support for an increased non-cut riparian buffer width throughout the stream network to aid contributions to instream woody debris for the long term.

Carolyn Eady provided public testimony encouraging the Board recognize successes found in the current forest management plan and structure-based management, acknowledge financial pressures for the Department and counties, address concerns regarding reallocation and redistributions in the counties, accept take avoidance measures, and proceed with social acceptability, acknowledging science informs the decision but does not determine it.

Tom Wolf, Trout Unlimited, provided public testimony in support of points made previously regarding concerns, appreciation for increased buffers along streams, support for the land allocation approach, interest in seeing the 70/30 be a floating number as opposed to absolute, and a need to factor in recreational opportunities available in the Tillamook and Clatsop State Forests to residents of a growing Washington County.

Bob Rees, Northwest Guides and Anglers Association, provided public comments and written testimony ([Attachment 22](#)) offering support for Bob Van Dyk’s testimony, increased buffer zones and management across the landscape for wood delivery into the watersheds and ocean, concerns with increasing water temperatures, recognition of significant financial contributions arriving from the sportfishing industry, and benefits from increased buffer zones to include additional vegetation for high water events that are detrimental to spawning salmon and retention of cold water during the summer season.

Donald Fontenot provided public testimony describing all Oregonians across the state as key stakeholders, interest in seeing more land designated for conservation and an additional zone dedicated to recreation.

Chris Smith, North Coast State Forest Coalition, provided public testimony and written comments ([Attachment 20](#)) expressing concern with the lack of visibility and durability for conservation areas, requesting durability in the form of inclusion in administrative rule and visibility with long-term publically available maps that specify intended land allocations.

Rhett Lawrence, Sierra Club, provided public testimony concurring with statements made by North Coast State Forest Coalition and offering general support for the land allocation model with recognition that tightly controlled management is needed to see an increase in conservation outcomes with interest in conservation zones being strictly late seral and old growth forests with healthy riparian zones and that clearcutting or heavy thinning techniques do not have a place in conservation zones.

[Listen to audio](#) MP3 Part 4 of 4 – (47 minutes – 32.6 MB)

Chair Imeson reviewed the recommendation from the Subcommittee to:

- 1) Direct the Division to utilize a land allocation approach as the primary strategy for developing a comprehensive forest management plan,
- 2) Direct the Division to consider a range of production strategies and conservation measures that could include those described in the Draft Land Allocation Option, and
- 3) Direct the Division to model and evaluate strategies and measures that present the highest likelihood of achieving the twin goals of financial viability and improved conservation outcomes.

Board question and comment ensued with clarification from Staff on matters of:

- this being a starting point - success to be found as further detail is explored,
- a need to demonstrate this is more than a mapping exercise,
- how to ensure public understands conservation efforts continue across the entire landscape- not just the focused areas, and the Department's increased ability to invest in conservation,
- value in mapping to clearly convey strategies across the landscape,
- modeling and analysis should detail conservation benefits anticipated for both conservation and production areas to understand broader thought values on both goals,
- interest in providing definition to durability and security in the 30%,
- how to define buffers in the timber zone considering conservation and financial viability,
- conservation fund should remain focused on conservation not various management,
- sensitivity and respect for the Subcommittee process, support for the concept,
- mapping exercise will challenge the concept more,
- need to consider how the zoned approach may adversely affect the counties or add complexity to funding,
- whether the model results appear operationally achievable across the districts,
- a need to have rule models around what kind of conservation strategies would be in place across the landscape in both conservation and production zones,
- the spatial distribution model works over time with ability to add in constraints or considerations to help predict where harvest occurs now and into the future,
- production strategies will vary by district, designated staff and time scheduled to review model outputs in the field, commitment to work with staff in the field to ensure outputs are operationally feasible, and
- interest in providing the counties and public opportunity to review the modeling results.

Chair Imeson questioned the Board for a motion.

Board Member Gary Springer motioned for the Board's approval of the Subcommittee's recommendation to:

- 1) Direct the Division to utilize a land allocation approach as the primary strategy for developing a comprehensive forest management plan,
- 2) Direct the Division to consider a range of production strategies and conservation measures that could include those described in the Draft Land Allocation Option, and

- 3) Direct the Division to model and evaluate strategies and measures that present the highest likelihood of achieving the twin goals of financial viability and improved conservation outcomes.

Board Member Nils Christoffersen seconded the motion.

Discussion of the Board ensued on matters of:

- concern with recommendation 2 using the words “that could include” with preference to change to “including” to promote exploration of all option strategies and measures,
- additional concern that changing the wording to include everything would result in added unnecessary model runs that would push the timeline further out,
- stakeholder outreach may be beneficial with regards to kinds of modeling,
- more time is needed to consider exactly which strategies should be run through the model,
- intent to leave some flexibility in consideration of a full range of strategies,
- importance in clearly defining financial viability and increasing conservation values, and
- interest in a zone allocated to flexible, adaptive management to meet short-term goals.

Voting in favor of the motion: Gary Springer, Nils Christoffersen, Tom Insko, Sybil Ackerman-Munson, Cindy Deacon Williams, and Tom Imeson, against: none.

With Board consensus, Chair Imeson ordered:

The Board directed the Division to utilize a land allocation approach as the primary strategy for developing a comprehensive forest management plan,

The Board directed the Division to consider a range of production strategies and conservation measures that could include those described in the Draft Land Allocation Option, and

The Board directed the Division to model and evaluate strategies and measures that present the highest likelihood of achieving the twin goals of financial viability and improved conservation outcomes.

With no further business before the Board, Chair Imeson adjourned the public meeting at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Doug Decker



Doug Decker, State Forester and
Secretary to the Board

SP