

Oregon State Stewardship Coordinating Committee Meeting

August 12, 2019 - Oregon Dept. of Forestry

Santiam Room, Building D Salem Oregon

Members in Attendance/On Call:	ODF Staff:	Absent:
Kyle Abraham, SSCC Chair, ODF Private Forests Chief	Josh Barnard, Deputy Chief Private Forests	Karl Dalla Rosa, USFS S&P Forestry Jon Weck, Landowner
Eric Hartstein, OWEB	Susan Dominique, Admin. Support	Dick Courter, Consultant
Dan Logan, Landowner	Amy Singh, Forest Legacy Coordinator	Kelley Beamer, COLT
Jim Johnson, OSU Extension (phone)	Jim Gersbach, Public Affairs	Nelson Mathews, TPL
Kristin Kovalik, TPL	Ryan Gordon, Family Forestlands Coord.	Morgan Holen, OR Community Trees
Andrew Owen, NRCS		CalLee Davenport, USF&W
Clint Bentz, Private Forestland Owner	Guests:	Richard Corff (replacing Owen Wozniak)
Rod Kraemer, ODFW	Phil Chick, Arch Cape Water District	Seth Barnes, OFIC
Linda Lind, USFS State & Private	John Wros, Conservation Fund	Jim James, OSWA (Jeremy Felty, Alt.) Gary Jensen, OSWCC Taylor Murray, USDA Rex Storm, OTFS/AOL

Call to Order; Introductions and Public Comment

Abraham called the meeting to order.

Gordon: I was expecting more in person and on ZOOM but if you want to wait a few minutes you can. Also I am recording this meeting, at least the first half of the day with the presentation so that folks that are not here today can review the presentations before they make their recommendation. So heads up that we are recording right now.

Abraham: So maybe we'll do a quick round of introductions for folks, starting with folks on the phone. (Roll call attending listed above.) Great being here on this nice sunny Monday after a cloudy Saturday and Sunday, at least in the valley. So do we have any public comment? We will turn it over to, we don't have a quorum.

Gordon: Since there isn't a quorum we can't approve the minutes. If we get a quorum at some point later in the day, but otherwise we will wait until next time around.

Abraham: So I will turn it over to Amy.

Forest Legacy Program FY2021 Applications and Project Presentations – Amy Singh

Singh: So one of the main goals of today's meeting is to hear presentations from the FY2021 Forest Legacy Project applicants. And we've been doing the same process for quite a few years now so, hopefully we are familiar with the Call for Projects that we did in the spring, we got the Letter of Interest from the applicants and then we requested those applicants and project sponsors we would like to have do presentation before the Committee. We received 4 projects and asked the all to come to this meeting to do their presentations which will then inform the next phase where we will do the formal rank and review of projects, where in the packet I believe we've got a document, the Forest Legacy Scoring Guidance. This is the program's coming from the Forest Service in their call for projects this year. And the scoring guidance the panel will use in January that is made up of States and Forest Service that actually does the rank and review of projects that creates the lists that the projects are then funded off of. So we mock our process off of this. And at the end of the month we will hold scoring process where the Committee makes the recommendations on which projects that the Agency should submit to the Forest Service for funding consideration. Today, we'll hear presentations from each of the, well from 3 of the 4 projects. I did get a notification from Josh Kling at Western Rivers Conservancy that is sponsoring the Hood River Project that he has fallen ill and won't be here. At least when I closed my computer

down I didn't hear anything back from anybody that they are going to hop on remotely. But the Committee has seen that project a few times and I will throw the map up when we get to that project and just kind of give a reminder of what I can so it's familiar to you. So today the purpose is to hear, see, experience of what the projects look like from the seat of our chairs rather than going off and doing a Statewide tour of all of these applications but to try to make them come alive and get you to understand the benefits of these projects. And then we will have an opportunity to dialog which will then allow the project sponsors to go and make some updates and create their applications which you will then receive and we'll do the scoring process for those.

Gordon: We should do a field tour Amy!

Singh: That might help with getting everybody to come! So the reminder how the projects can be submitted to the Forest Service so they allow us to submit up to 3 projects for funding consideration. And we have a max amount of \$10 million dollars that we can slice and dice between the applicants. At this point in the application process I've just encouraged the project sponsors to ask for what they see the need not worrying about the \$10 million cap until we know which projects we are going to submit to the Forest Service. And then we'll make those modifications at that time. So, that's sort of the, max is 3 projects. The other thing that still remains up in the air FY2020 budget so at this point we don't know whether the two projects that we submitted last year, which were the Arch Cape Project and the Hood River Project will officially receive any funding through the FY2020 budget. Both of them have made the unofficial Forest Service list. So there is potential that they will receive them, if we look at the two leaves and assume that there is a continuing resolution funding the Program at least at the same amount than it has been at. The Hood River Project will receive funding and the Arch Cape is just right on that cusp of if there is a small reduction they may not make it if they fund the full amount and there is any other money thrown back in, it's just there in that fluid spot that could really go either way.

Krahmer: Where did those rank out?

Singh: Where? Hood River was number 11. Arch Cape was 22 out of 23. And I talked about this at the last meeting, but just a reminder for those that weren't here, one of the factors that the Panel considers is multiple projects being funded in a given year. How much money we have outstanding. Its unfortunately in our decision-making process looking at that list isn't as crystal clear as saying if it's on the list they must have thought it met the criteria and attributes. There are many factors essentially it starts off as a map process and statistical process and then people get in a room and make it a human process. So, it's hard to say yeah or nay just simply based upon where something fell onto a list last year. But I was in that room, so I have a little bit of a benefit of knowing kind of how things shaped out and it was both. Not just a simple, human side came in as well on how our projects fared last year. We tend to make things complicated. So, with all of that, I'll turn it over, could you load up the China Mountain project? I probably should have re-named them so that they are a little bit clearer. But, and we'll invite John up from the Conservation Fund that has been working on presenting this project and let you go ahead and share that with us.

Wros: Thanks for giving me the time to talk about China Mountain! This is our submission from the Conservation Fund for FY2021 for Oregon Forest Legacy Program. This is a project down on the south Oregon coast just south of Port Orford. About 50 miles from the California border in Curry County. So, this lies within the Coast Range Forest Legacy Project Area. This is an 800 acre property and getting a Forest Legacy easement is the aim and objective for this proposal and application. The Conservation Fund is taking a flyer on this one in terms of developing and pursuing the project. We identified it as a place of particular ecologic and economic significance in the region. And something that was worth a front end investment. So to date, we still haven't purchased this property but we have it under contract to buy it by the end of the month. We have the fee and timber appraisal conducted and title work due diligence and are in the process with that timber cruise and working with integrated resource management in what would be a stewardship and timber harvest plan for it. We'll get to the specific pictures and maps. But the conservation easement in this case specifically is intending to limit subdivision, increase stream setbacks and add public access to this part of the coast. We'll show you

why. So here we are on the south Oregon coast and everything about this project is location. So this is just west of the Siskiyou National Forest and just maybe a mile inland from the coast. Those are these three parcels outlined in orange here. Siskiyou National Forest and Humbug Mountain State Park and the vision for location is this. This is the best and most unique opportunity to connect the high peaks of the Siskiyou habitats and forests therein all the way to the Pacific Ocean. So this captures high alpine environments, mixed deciduous and conifer forests all the way down to the flood plains, the Elk River and associated areas. The Oregon coastal environment and amazingly in this case all the way out into the Pacific Ocean linking directly with the Red Rocks Marine Protected Area and Reserve. So the vision is that as habitat this is a corridor that could be designated with relatively small effort with this single action to connect a vast area. And as far as the Siskiyou National Forest, it borders the Oregon border for about 100 miles and never gets any closer. So there is a designated corridor that reached the Pacific and this is the logical place for it. So this came on the market and we thought it sure was a good idea. In terms of timber economy in Port Orford this has been the economy for decades there. And this in our estimation working with Integrated Resources Management doing habitat and environmental assessments, should be ongoing timber land. We are excited at the prospect of a Forest Legacy easement to achieve this and something that could contribute to the south Coast timber economy there. It fits with the political environment, fits with the social environment there. And in terms of habitat needs to see ongoing timber harvests. There is a lot of structure there, an interesting piece but it's not one in our estimation makes a lot of sense at this time to let sit as a conservation area. One hundred year old growth it makes sense to keep cutting there it needs some work. So just again location, location, location! In this slide you can see a million and a half acres in Siskiyou National Forest as it extends to the left there. And we are looking south from town. Humbug Mountain State Park is still old growth. That was never harvested. The China Mountain Forest Reserve sits right in-between them and has seen harvests several times starting in the 1950', 1960's again in the 70's and recently in 2010 on a pretty limited basis. So there is a lot of structure there a very interesting property. A lot of conservation options and a lot of timber. So straight into the importance of it, and here's where I will spend the bulk of our time. Is that as a Forest Legacy and working landscape it has a history and we'd like to see it continue have a history. It's been cut a few times. There is still significant merchantable timber on the property. It came out to about 1.1 million give or take. And that's all Doug-fir a little bit of cedar in it. It has some challenges in the market value that is discounted at about 50%. Part of it is access and part of it has to do with big steep hills. A lot of those big trees are hard to get to or already had been cut. A lot of them don't make sense to take out in a really straight-forward way because of erosion potential. So this sort of conservation timber harvest piece in our minds makes a lot of sense. It's a declining timber economy in Port Orford timber was king for decades and that has not been so recently, a downtrend for the last 30 years or so. And we would love to see this piece stay in private working timber. In terms of economic benefits not related to timber, there is a lot there. Tourism in Port Orford accounts for 17% of the employment there and this is makes tourism, it's beautiful at the Oregon coast, that's why people come there. Trails on both sides of it. It drains into the up river drainage which counts for agriculture for 9 % of the economy in Port Orford, feeding into the habitat of that Red Fish Rocks Marine Protected Area and Reserve that's the economy that's on the upswing if timber is down, fishing is up. And Port Orford which is 1200 people give or take there's between 90 and 120 jobs the city reports is related to that. So all of these lands with streams directly draining into this and its part of this habitat connectivity corridor from the high peaks of the Siskiyou out into the Pacific Ocean. This is the first one I've seen that I can truly tie timber to what's going on off shore. So it's a neat piece for the economy there. The Elk River is the primary big drainage off the north side. And that in terms of a sport fishery is a huge for the region. The Elk River is one of the last salmon strongholds. Especially wild salmon strongholds in the State of Oregon. A beautiful river the fish are large. On a given day there are a hundred drift boats going down the river at the peak of the season. The big piece that I really want to talk about is where it sits in relation to Humbug State Park. Tourism economy especially outdoor recreation economy is big there. These are particularly popular trails and defining trails for all Port Orford and last year there were 1,000 day users coming to hike them. There is camping there as well, 14,000 users and this is right up against China Mountain a piece of it so it's all related there. The Oregon Coast Trail kicks out onto Hwy. 101 there. This has some potential to contribute to public access. That trail system and importantly the big economic driver for the region Bandon Dunes Golf Club is there. This is right in the view shed of it. So, a lot of considerations both on the timber economy and non-timber economy side of things how this particular piece plays. Worth the investment for the region. We haven't reached out for political support yet. But I don't think that is going to be a hard case to make.

Threatened and Endangered Species in that part of the world are Marbled Murrelets, Northern Spotted Owls in particular. And there are no known nesting habitat sites on this particular piece. Whether or not they are there, it's got a lot of really interesting structure and just on public lands right next to it there are certainly known nesting sites. So if there are not nesting sites and habitat directly on the China Mountain piece certainly through a little bit of management probably there would be in the future, and if not certainly supports that mobility of Murrelets and Owls as they move back and forth from the coast to higher areas. Coho Salmon threatened also through the Elk River. This has two creeks on it. Bear Creek and Bear Track Creek that run directly into it. So timber management will be more specifically affects directly with those species...a whole slew of mammals, fish and birds. I've been on this property and funny enough, I'm a pretty young guy but for about 20 years I've been down there for a long time and I have seen all these things out there, bears, big cats, mountain lions, especially elk. There is a fabulous herd of elk that moves back and forth through this area. They use the open meadows and use the existing road infrastructure that's there, primitive Forest Service roads but the habitat... ODF&W ranked it as a priority one piece for crucial terrestrial habitat. I think related to a lot of those Threatened species. And the interesting in terms of unique habitat is that it still has original stands of Port Orford cedar there which is being re-planted now with a root rot resistant species. But the Port Orford species has been decimated in that whole region. They are just about gone. So this is the IUCN that called it near-threatened on their scale...but at the headwaters of Bear Creek and Bear Trap Creek there are still these original stands of Port Orford Cedar and in terms of timber management and re-planting there has been lots of...replanting this root rot resistant and variation of Port Orford cedar and this property... in a big way. Like I said it contains Bear Trap Creek, Bear Creek and Brush Creek. We talk about the two headwaters that have been identified in a number of conservation plans as needing, as threatened by new road construction and erosion related to bad timber practices, pollution, Forest Legacy would certainly address that in a timber related management plan. Both of those also drain into Brush Creek which is a big one for the Port Orford area which has been a traditional and...stream that has been displaced over the years. Has temperature limitation and has restoration work going into it right now... The Elk River as you go upstream towards Federal lands is a National Wild and Scenic River. And for all 4 of those water bodies, erosion reduction is really the aim in terms of how you would choose to harvest this parcel. How we would create a timber management plan associated with that. The original timber cruise and evaluation we had done there identified 2 drainages that he said, you can't cut this more than 50% every 10 years. It's going to wash the highway and wash the neighboring land owners. Some kind of a more restrictive and intentional harvest management plan I think would make a lot of sense and a lot of allies and would save a lot of damage to public property. And its scenic, the view from Port Orford its right in front of you. Its part of the world where the timber economy has always been there and all these areas have been clear cut before. But it can get ugly and the tourism economy would sure appreciate a more intentional approach to harvesting. So this is from there is no development on the property in terms of structures but there are a half dozen or so of these harvest roads built by the landowner and they connect to Forest Service roads in Siskiyou National Forest some of them have been built in cooperation and there are easements that go from public land to private land where cost has been shared in terms of access. And this makes sense in terms of coordination with the existing National Forest. We started there and said hey is this something that makes sense to include? Part of it is within the administrative boundary and they said man this is a bang up project and we would sure like to see it protected, BUT we don't want to incorporate this. It's not something we are able to do. The same case with State Park, wow this is a bang up project we would like to see it protected in some form, but it doesn't make sense to go into State Park as an addition to that unit. It's a really mixed set of trees that we see there. A lot of tanoak, in a bad way, meaning some of it has to come out. But there is a lot of tanoak in a good way all of those animal and bird species really benefit from the acorns that come off those trees. A big part of the ecosystem. And a species that requires a little bit of management. There is everything from 10 year old trees there to old growth virgin trees on the really high ridges that haven't been harvested? And all the structure between alders, cedars, Doug=fir, hemlocks, myrtles, madrones other hard woods. A pretty neat place. A lot of structure for habitat. A lot of those hardwoods, I am not sure they are merchantable at the moment. But the property could see some love. It makes a lot of sense to just buy and stick in conservation... So, Threatened, currently this is a private piece that the landowner inherited from his father. A pretty large timber holder in the region. They've cut it a few times, but he wants out of it. He hasn't lived in the area for a long time and he just wants to sell it. He doesn't care if it's for conservation or subdivision. And subdivision and conversion is the primary threat we are dealing with in this case. It can be sub-divided down based

on how it's zoned. Its 80 acre lots. 1/60% have been mostly what's happening in the region for home sites. People cut trees and put home sites on them which is fine. But in this case given the concept of this habitat corridor. From all the Siskiyou National Forests and Wilderness areas therein, the China Mountains, Humbug State Park, it's the one piece we'd like to see not sub-divided. That's the primary goal here. And there's real likelihood of it if he can't sell to us. This has been on the market for some time. He's looking for something else. So that's why we are taking a flyer and trying to get this done. The lack of protection, like I said, erosion is a big piece here. Hwy. 101 slides somewhat frequently in this part of the world and it has frontage to China Mountain property and a piece of Forest Legacy... through planning management and harvest restrictions. The management plan we are creating for it was to specifically address those areas where erosion potential threatens neighbors and the highway. We'd like to take care of that.

On the next slide, on the left.... And then you can see the piece that is the National Forest right? It's the only piece in the region that hasn't been checkerboard clear cut. So that's what is happening there and continuing to happen there. That is what has been completely appropriate there. And we expect that with restrictions this piece would fit right in in a way that is positive. People want to take trees there, some of the small family mills have gone but there is still demand for those trees. On the right though is a little diagram from the county viewer on how these lots are being sold and converted. The light green on the lower left side that is Humbug Mountain State Park. 101 is dividing it straight through... and here are the private lots and what is happening with them immediately adjacent. So starting on the left there is a 40 acre piece that has gone residential. Right next to it is a timber piece that was just recently sold and is now being cut. Just to the right of that clear cut, is a piece that is hitting the market very shortly. The landowner just died his kids are in Florida. They don't know what to do with it. It has established home sites on it, nothing built but that will either be sold residential or for timber. The three pieces to the right of that privately owned timberlands that has changed hands and the same piece with the timberland to the west of China Mountain that has been clear cut owned by a local timber company is going to be sold for who knows what end. The story I like to tell is that the lots are getting smaller, changing hands. So Strategic, it makes sense in terms of the corridor. That's why we are chasing it. But others think so too. So Brush Creek and Bear Trap Creek in particular and the reaches of them are identified as part of the Port Orford Watershed Action Plan. The key limiting stresses on those, are degraded riparian forest conditions. The looming threats are road and timber harvest and the recommended actions for Brush Creek are improved forest practices, reduce road stress connections, reducing runoff and reducing pollution by incentivizing low impact development. The NOAA Final Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast Coho Recovery Plan also addresses those specific reaches of those creeks in particular in this case talking about Elk River and the drainage from these lands into that. There key limiting stress identified is impaired water quality, the actions that they suggest are improved timber harvest practices. So all these things, the Nature Conservancy did their prioritization of Resilient Terrestrial Landscapes, these parcels are right in that, one of the red squares, where there is resistance to movement across that terrestrial landscape is low. Reducing subdivision would be just in line with their evaluation there. And the argument I am making as far as it being consistent with the Oregon Forest Action Plan is just in terms of how Forest Legacy fits here. I think it makes sense. And in that case the goal is to maintain the forestland base and opportunity is public and private investment in forestlands. Working with Conservation Partner for Land Trust Conservancies. In this case, the Conservation Fund is doing this. We are purchasing it in fee our intention is to partner with the Forest Service and State of Oregon to put Forest Legacy over that. And hold it and market it until we find the right conservation buyer, or timberland buyer to continue to keep the land in production. It's been identified as a priority by the Wild Rivers Land Trust. They are our partner down there in conservation. And we are willing to stick our neck out a little bit to get this into the right hands, and right condition. So compliments protected lands: Siskiyou National Forest specifically. It is adjacent to what is in the forest plan identified as Wildlife Habitat Management Areas. This is for birds, woodpeckers in particular, fish and owls. The Grassy Knob and Copper Salmon Wilderness Areas are hydrologically connected. The Elk River Wild and Scenic River is drained from this property and again that Red Fish Rocks Marine Reserve and Protected Area, I'll make the case that this timberland has an effect on that area both ecologically and in terms of the economy in Port Orford. It's immediately adjacent to Humbug State Park, which is fabulous, if you are in the region it's worth it for the great view from the top. Great trails. It's a parking lot that is full all the time. The trails connect. It makes sense. And again the Red Fish Rocks Marine Reserve. So just wanted to flash back to the map to show on the upper right are all the areas we talked about if you go further

east it's the wild Rogue River. The guy that was really pushing conservation the last 30 years down there when we started the Land Trust he was kind of a rogue actor. He would tell you that his vision was that this whole area connects to the Kalmiopsis Wilderness all the way to the northern border of the Siskiyou National Forest and he made a lot of great cases for that whether or not they are shown on the map I'm not sure. But ecologically that was his vision that this whole forest comes together. It's strategic in that this is a keystone parcel to future work also. If we can get this one done the opportunities here to work on the Elk River in doing conservation within those ranches. The Scout Ridge at Humboldt State Park there where it exits the Park is another property that is quietly on the table and all of this has been done historically by private individuals. Conservation and conservation...for practice the bill has been footed by a number of families. Which is fabulous, without the help of conservation entities. And is largely underserved by conservation. So we see this as the first step into a larger strategy that the Conservation Fund would like to see going on down there. That's a little bit more traditionally conservation minded. This piece in particular we always saw as a working landscape so we want to keep it that way. And the case I'm going to make is that this is a lot of bang for the buck. As a \$495,000 dollar Forest Legacy ask for the total project cost of \$660,000 the Conservation Fund will guarantee the match, we will look for...but will guarantee the match. That's secured so that's the actual project cost is \$1.47 million. We are working that through... and the relatively small price tag fits. And it's a relatively small project for Forest Legacy, I know and I am curious to receive feedback specifically on that end about how you fit the smaller projects into your framework. Whether or not that is positive or negative I'm not quite sure, but that is where we are. So \$495,000 dollars from the Federal Government to secure this corridor from the Siskiyou to the Pacific Ocean and beyond. So that's the idea, thank you very much. This is additional info, the two loose ends I'll point out right away is we have not connected with directly with Peter DeFazio, that will happen sooner than later. And County Commissioners. And our contact and the original visions for this was to have an easement that play with Oregon State Parks, our partner there retired a couple of weeks ago and all of a sudden maybe a month ago, became a little open-ended. So there is a need to have this discussion with the larger working group, State Parks, Department of Forestry, on who would be the appropriate easement holder in this case. It's a question that I know I have to ask from this point on. So unless there are any specific questions that's all I've got.

Singh: Thank you.

Hartstein: So thanks John that was a good presentation. So the question on the creeks, I got there is Brush Creek.

Wros: So there is Brush Creek, Bear Creek and Bear Trap Creek. Brush Creek has direct effect on the property. And I will share a little bit directly towards OWEBs interests. The other two have an effect on the Elk River and the drainage therein as it goes down to the ocean. OWEB has invested in the area in the past. They have the Keystone Reserve on the upper portion of the Elk River. And there is an active application that we are working on with Miriam and Wild Rivers Land Trust to complete that piece. There is one 20 acre little slot that is yet to be done. Those all kind of come together towards the Elk. That is the big river that this drainages affect. So Bear Creek, Bear Trap and Brush.

Hartstein: So I saw the conservation easement, what sort of riparian buffers are being discussed or haven't you gotten that far yet?

Wros: We haven't gotten that far yet. The management plan, what we have done so far was we asked for a more comprehensive timber appraisal other than just board feet and value. So this is RMI did the work and asked what would this take to really improve the habitat both in terms of the trees and structure at 100 years towards old growth status? And what would those buffers look like? Given the drainages that are there, what would make sense? And he had recommendations. But nothing at this point. The budget I presented took into account the trees that are there, how many would be lost increasing those setbacks? And we landed on about 40% of the actual land and timber value would be taken out by that. But TBD with help from partners.

Kovalik: While the Conservation Fund owns the property and you are looking for a future owner will any forest management happen under your ownership? Or is that really plated for a future owner?

Wros: Yeah, it depends on the length of the hold. We have no intention of going and taking out logs. Other parts of the world Conservation Fund has a lot of working forests in California just south in particular that we are taking logs out to pay for the project and do restoration. I don't know if economically that makes sense in this case. Restoration that would be done would be done at the advisement of... that said hey yeah we could bring in some fish money and maybe think about media actions but no, unless it went on for 3 or 4 or 5 years. No, the idea there is whoever would like to buy this I would like them to get every marketable penny that comes out. I don't want to take any trees. I would want them to want to buy it. So there are a couple of prospective buyers. There is an adjacent landowner, timber company. There are two additional family timber shops that had pursued buying this previously and they just couldn't make it... the hope is that by encumbering a recent value...

Bentz: How much does he have it for sale now?

Wros: \$1.1 million on 800 acres. And you know the truth is he wasn't too far off. His estimation was that we are going to have to punch a new road.

Singh: How long has he had it on the market?

Wros: On and off, 8 years. This was his father's property, they were... he would have it on the market until he needed trees out, he'd say, find me \$100,000 using his property just as he should and in those are where those two other buyers came in and said boy we want this. But it doesn't quite work. The dollar figure and the access thing, that's where we need the partner. We would like to do this on the first go. We have an option for a 6 month contract extension if needed. And a little bit of that depends upon what our encouragement is from this group in terms of recognition. How we chose to fund it.

Singh: Any other questions, thoughts on this one?

Owen: Do you have any thoughts on the smaller acreage?

Singh: So in general small acres for Forest Legacy does get a little concerning because it struggles to meet the attributes of national, scoring criteria. Highest points for nationally relevant down to locally relevant and smaller parcels tend to dwell more under that 'Local' area. I think this has something going for it with the connectivity and the strategic nature of it that seems like it could hit more in that higher importance level. The other thing that I was happy to hear about is that the price tag seems to reflect its size. If the price tag was in the millions for a couple of hundred acres, I think that is when people it could be strategic, but I would like to hear Andrew's thoughts on that. Because when I saw it was under a half a million dollars I thought that is a potential tool for people sitting in a room for human nature to say, well we could make some numbers whole easily rather than cutting a big project. But Andrew has history with the Program and sitting in those rooms too.

Owen: I was on the panel in 2016, I believe. Totally it gives them some flexibility when you are on the panel and you've got a bunch of 7 million dollar projects and you see some pretty significant wind, for ½ million it gives some of the reviewers the option to throw it in the upper middle of the pack, it may or may not stay there but when you say, okay we've got 60 million dollars and we've got a line for 60 million you can float some of those less expensive projects right close to that line in hopes that if you've got 60 million you might have 59 1/2 million and then you can get another project in like this. I would hinge a little bit more on the National Significance. Great presentation! But it's just hard to draw some of those national and international is a big one. The panel seems to be moving a lot to those international

ties. They are a limited bit harder to find or to draw. I think that asking amount is going to be very attractive. You can get a pretty good size chunk of land for a very reasonable price. That's one of the biggest draws. That will help a lot.

Are international ties, the export market?

Owen: I would say if you can have one bullet that you can really favor international. It just a lot of the projects, they are getting very good. Legacy is moving from what was a few really strong states to now all the states known the criteria they need. So that the pool is incredibly difficult so anytime you can have the majority of your points really tie that national significance or international you are going to be above and beyond some of the other states. Especially the interior that don't necessarily have that. So looking at some of those international markets if you could. I think hitting on the ocean/marine you've got that where Iowa doesn't. You've got some ties there that you are going to set yourselves above and beyond other states. They just don't have that. So that's going to be really attractive to the reviewers. It's different than the other projects.

Gordon: The point I guess I will make the Port Orford cedar, was root rot, but it was Asian markets. That's why it's gone. It was a cherished tree, every stem of it was not just cut, but poached.

Owen: In terms of acreage, this is pretty average, don't you think Amy? We don't get a lot of, in terms of like 50 reviews that you would go through? Right there with acreage. Like the east coast has like 12 acre projects. I think you could easily look past the size and not assign negative points to it.

Bentz: In terms of a family forest 800 acres is on the top side. These big 1,000 acre projects are commercial, industrial forestlands or state park type things. Forest Legacy is aimed at helping forestland owners, so this is a project that fits into that frame as well.

Singh: And that's where I said I think it is not isolated, 800 acres in the middle of nowhere without larger value and benefits and even as we are starting to see, there is a little bit of understanding that some projects are going to be locally or regionally really, the piece. And a recognition that that has value. Then something that can just check National boxes but isn't really different. I think that is the human side. You get the numbers, and then you look at it and say, well this had that thing and that tugged at me and I really liked that. And some of these mid-range pieces have a really good opportunity to tell that story. The family type, a future buyer doesn't have to be someone who can buy 10,000 acres right? It really opens up that potential market for this piece.

Owen: Are there any proposals for public access? I know it is hard not knowing the potential buyer. Are there going to be opportunities for public access?

Wros: That is the intention... it is immediately adjacent to State Park trails, it's immediately adjacent to Forest Service lands that have FS roads and many are continuous... and it's something we intend.

Singh: Thank you and I think that the comments from the Committee can help steer where those final bullet points come in as well for what we will review. Thanks, John.

Spence Mountain Project

Singh: We will switch then into the Spence Mountain Project and the Committee saw this project last year. Kristin with the Trust for Public Land will give us a presentation on it. And just a reminder that you've seen it before and what happened. We got a presentation, there was some turnover in terms of project 'champions' all with in TPL. But one who was on this Committee started it and then during our evaluation of it, Nelson Mathews who we worked with and worked with us on the East Moraine Project took over and now we've got... I believe at that time when we were making those final decisions Nelson had just left TPL and there were some concerns from this group in terms of capacity and

where we might have a continued champion of the project and having other projects on the table, and the thinking let's give this one more year to mature and in that time, Kristen has come on board and is now picking it up and giving us another look at this project. Thanks Kristen!

Kovalik: Thanks Amy. Maybe to just tie in a little bit, I have worked for the TPL for 22 years and recently came back to Oregon after being in Montana for a few years where we were able to complete several Forest Legacy funded projects there. SO maybe just to, I'd like to alleviate any potential concerns about the TPL involvement and with staying power with this project, now that we have re-structured our Oregon office definitely a priority project for us. And we have this property under option with the landowner. Giving it enough time to work through several grant funding cycles and making this move forward through Forest Legacy. And what is also different this time is that we do have the County Commissions support for this project. You have a letter of resolution from the County Commissioners giving their unanimous support for the project and we are working closely with them and their staff to advance this...

To re-orient members the orange dot down there in the bottom left is the property itself showing the County boundary and then also the historic boundary of the Klamath tribes' reservation. And then to zoom in a little bit showing the project area in orange and its proximity and adjacency to the primarily Upper Klamath Lake and to State Wildlife Areas and Wilderness areas, National Forest... also showing on here the Pacific Flyway which we should be able to extend that arrow both north and south... adjacency and proximity to.. the project itself is in Klamath County 7500 acres and we do have a signed option agreement with the landowner that takes us through 2021. Our purchase price will be based upon an appraisal we were really hoping to have the appraisal done but our appraiser and are experiencing with several appraisers now are in the high season.. our request is based upon preliminary appraisal work that was done... feeling comfortable with our request for \$3.7 will hold. If anything it might go down a little bit. The property itself, 86% of it is still forested. It is owned by Jeld Wen Oregon and this was part of a much larger holding that Jeld Wen had under their ownership which was originally owned by Weyerhaeuser and then Long Tom Timber. So a history of it being managed, actively managed for forestry... has recently completed a thinning on the property and they do have a management plan in place. The management plan is for them if they were to continue owning it. And so using that management plan as a starting point to build off of it to create a new management plan but also take into consideration not only timber management but the recreation benefit and wildlife and cultural benefits. Project Readiness, every photograph I'm showing are pictures from the property itself. So you obviously can get a sense of being there. But take you into the space and get a feeling of what it's like and just the scenery that surrounds it. Again, a preliminary appraisal we do have that but it has not be upgraded to federal yellow book standards, that is something to do should the project advance forward. Under options, cost-share, the TPL we do commit to securing the match that would be required for this acquisition. We would be possibly looking to State funding. We also have some private grants that are closing right now. We have a title search done, a mineral determination which is still in the works not done yet. It's one of those that if we able to advance this project through Forest Legacy we would rather incur that cost a little further down the road than to do it up front. And the Stewardship Plan again, one is complete and we will update that with our various stakeholders that are coming together. In terms of Importance? For forest and recreation economies, just a few key bullet points. This is in the East Cascades priority area, Klamath County. And from the various data I found... of forest jobs in the County... manage this property for forestry into the future would also contribute to that. Primary forest communities on the property are ponderosa and oak woodlands and then also our mixed conifer and 86% forested cover. In terms of recreation right now the property is accessible to the public so there have been some trails developed on the property through our partnership with the Klamath Trails Alliance the landowner is allowing those trails to be built so that would continue into the future. And Klamath Trails Alliance is managing those trails. They are just building them. They secured funding for them and they will continue if this property were to go into County ownership. That is something that they have committed to doing into the future. And why? The outdoor recreation industry is increasing in Klamath County right now \$1.6 billion in outdoor recreation economy. And that is something that does not fall short on the County Commissioners as well as the tourism industry there. Their Chamber of Commerce and they, from the conversations I have had, they really see Spence Mountain with its size and proximity to Klamath Falls and the National forestland really being an attribute to the County to be able to, with the trails, with the wildlife viewing, to be able to tap into that rec

economy even more. Tourism, there have been about 20 miles of trails that have been developed all of that being funded through both private and the State sources of funding through the Klamath Trails Alliance. Kids are out there. Adults are out there hiking, biking and its becoming a tourist destination in the state. Travel Oregon has been promoting it through different media, they have been a funder of the trails, so it's a growing use on the property. In terms of Importance? Its proximity to Upper Klamath Lake with for endangered species, I like the way that John said this, the property itself does not have water but whatever happens on that property will inherently have impacts to Upper Klamath Lake. Where the Short-nosed Sucker is and also other species have been identified by USFWS as being in the area, and the property could also have supported these species. Bald Eagle nests we do know present on the property have been documented as well as various migratory birds and then generally watershed protections for Klamath Lake.

And then Threats? This property is zoned forestry. It does have a destination resort overlay on the property which is this is a plan that has been mocked up by the current landowner if they were to move forward with development where that would occur both in terms of slope, soil and scenic views. Frankly it would be plotted or occur along the lake. This is the idea which has been put in front of us and also has been shared with the county commissioners if the current landowner were to go forth on this property what their intention would be. They have a history of developing their own lands. So they could do it themselves. They wouldn't necessarily need to sell it to somebody else to do it.

And these are some of the Conservation Strategies that we are tying our project back to either the goals are the same or the habitat values are connected, the species themselves. So we have several the state plans as well as some of the national plans and then especially with the North American Wildfowl Management Plan being in the Pacific Flyway. And then again coming back to the strategic it compliments already protected lands either in adjacency or proximity to those protected lands. The list of supporters that we have so far, these are all groups or agencies that we are meeting with, talking with, who have written letters of support or are committed to writing letters of support to this project because of whether that is their economic interests in the property, recreation economic interests whether that is proximity or adjacency to other lands. The County having the ownership of a piece of property and proximity to Klamath Falls and the health benefits that the property could provide to the citizens of Klamath Falls. Because it provides the opportunity for physical activity in the way of access to the trails. We also are talking with the Klamath Tribes right now. And they will be weighing in on some of the natural resource values and how they are aligned in priority with the Tribe. Another view on the property looking out to the lake.

Is there any questions?

Bentz: So, I guess I have a couple of questions. How much of Klamath Lake is currently developed? I guess I am wondering why the local people are saying that a destination resort on Klamath Lake would be a bad idea?

Kovalik: Why would a resort on Klamath Lake be a bad idea?

Bentz: Yeah. You got tourism, you got a destination resort like Sun River other places, they can be developed in a way that is friendly to all these other values that we have. Streams, trails and access, some areas could be improved in that kind of development. So why not? Why fight that?

Kovalik: I'm not hearing that there is a fight against that happening, I'm hearing that there is greater benefit to there not being development on that property. You have Running Y Resort just to the south which has been developed and has quite a few home sites that are on the market right now.

Bentz: So I can see why they would be opposed. Competition right?

Kovalik: There have been some other areas in proximity to this property that are also already planning for development and so it's that. This is where the threat piece gets tough! Because you have lands that are ready to go for development

down around Klamath County and they are not moving right now. So it's that balance of, do we want another piece of property that is right on the lake to also be plotted for development when we already have a supply and maybe a better use of this is for County-ownership, watershed protection, trail development, getting people on the land and connecting them to the wildlife areas? So, I think it is more about that balance of what do we already have available in the supply chain? And would this property be better served if protected for resource values?

Bentz: How much of the lake is, percentage is going to development? Half of it? A third? 100%? How much is actually already protected around the lake now?

Kovalik: It's still inside private ownership. Immediately to the north of this property is private lands, he has come to Forest Legacy in the past. Right?

Bentz: We looked at that parcel.

Kovalik: So he too has a destination resort overlay on his property. So that can be developed and that is on the market now. And it's a good question. And to this area here, with Running Y area and then we have a fair amount in public ownership that will not be developed. It's a great question.

Bentz: I see the brown areas are private and the green would be forest service? And...what is the orange?

Kovalik: Private Conservation lands.

Bentz: So you have ½ the lake right now under either public ownership or conservation easements today right? Okay. And Klamath Falls is where in relationship to Spence Mountain. Okay.

Kovalik: About 12 miles give or take. And there are a lot of residences at Running Y and commute to Klamath Falls and Chiloquin.

Johnson: This is Jim, I have a question, these are conservation easement that would go onto this property in addition to being transferred to the county or not?

Kovalik: No, right now we are only talking about acquiring the land in fee from the private landowner conveying the property in fee to the county. So we would not hold a conservation easement on the land prior to conveyance to the County.

Johnson: This may be a naïve and provocative question but what is the way that if the County owns it is it protected? How do we know that this property won't be up for sale for a resort in the future by a couple of County Commissioners?

Singh: SO the question of having a conservation easement on that the answer is potentially with ODF holding an easement. For this exact question that you have mentioned. And we are working on figuring this out with the East Moraine project right now and where Wallowa County is owning it and the same questions come as well. How do I connect the requirements of Forest Legacy and the grant agreement and the funding that we are getting from the Federal Government that's coming to ODF to the final outcomes and perpetual ownership in the county? And right now tools on the table an easement is definitely there where the county would donate an easement to ODF that would just say, we can't do all of these things that we are funding it for the purposes of Forest Legacy. So they couldn't subdivide it, couldn't sell it back on the open market. They couldn't convert it to non-forest uses. But that wouldn't have a monetary exchange or it's more of our assurances and less of what the benefits of the project are. So we are making sure that it's covered. Does that answer you Jim?

Johnson: Yes, thanks.

Kovalik: Any other thoughts or questions on the Spence Mountain Project?

Bentz: So this is separate from the one we looked at before?

Singh: This is not the Cam Curtis Bald Mountain, it was before my time and did see those applications. This would be just south of those ownerships.

Bentz: That was Caledonia Ranch? I think that was right adjacent.

Singh: It never received Forest Legacy funding. I think those projects made it out of Committee and went forward but never made the funding.

Kovalik: A question for the group regarding that project and Cam's project, we vacillated whether to highlight that on the map or not show that on the map. In previous applications we have highlighted other Forest Legacy funded projects to show the investment in the area and the, but I would love some feedback on that if appropriate.

Singh: My opinion would be that if that is on the market it would be worth highlighting because that would be a missed opportunity. A potential, depending what, where, and how that is sold and what becomes of it we've always had this dialog within the Forest Legacy community of are there examples of opportunities lost? Where the threat does come to fruition? And what Forest Legacy is trying to ensure doesn't happen, happened. And we haven't really found any of those yet but also recognizing that time, it might take a bit for those examples to come through so it could be, I don't think it could hurt you.

Abraham: Does dam removal affect it in any way? With threats or opportunities in the future?

Kovalik: I feel like I honed in on so many aspects of this project and that is not one that I have honed in on. That's a question I can't answer.

Abraham: Just curious.

: Klamath Lake isn't that a natural lake?

Abraham: Its artificially enhanced is what it's considered. I don't know what the status of all that is but just down the road there is planned re-introduction of some fish species as well at some point in the future.

Krahmer: I don't know the specifics, it is enhanced, and I do know that. But I'm not sure what the status is... interesting question, I think it's out there.

Owen: Does this fit into a larger strategic side of it? You've explained that. Does it fit into a larger region wide plan of stopping conversion that you could point to? Obviously you can look on a map, and say it okay it fits with the rest of the Federal lands, but is it part of a larger working group context that this region wants to move this many or percentage of lands? Does that make sense? Is that part of a larger regional strategy that you could point to?

Kovalik: I can't point to that actually. Each day I keep learning about more and more groups and partnerships and collaboratives and initiatives that are focused in the Klamath Basin. And what they particular focus is. And I know on Cam's property for instances, NRCS and were all talking about and investments in his property... and certainly the Klamath Land Trust is working with certain landowners to make improvements on their land. So there are those

examples but I don't know about any regional effort in terms of stopping conversions let's say. But if you do know I would love to hear about it.

Owen: I don't. I just didn't know if was opportunistic or strategic, a little bit of both perhaps.

Logan: As we get involved in this for 10 to 12 years, and every time it's the County Commissioners threatening always pointing out the resort overlay. It's been a while too.

Kovalik: Obviously I've jumped in this process after a few handoffs but the conversations with the County Commissioners, the focus has not at all been on the landowner stopping them doing something it's been this effort to expand their ownership, and there is a county-owned park. The sliver of green is county ownership expanding. And working with other stakeholders...

Singh: Great thanks Kristin!

Bentz: It's a beautiful piece of property. Well cared for too.

Kovalik: And this is a long term vision right? This land has been actively managed for forestry and this is a long term thinking by the county. Thanks!

Singh: Before we head into the last project with Phil, how about a quick 5 minute break?

BREAK

Singh: So we have this list from the Forest Service and again it is unofficial because the budget for this program is currently at zero. So somewhere along the line, some of our friends has gotten this list and has emailed it out. But the Forest Service will neither deny nor accept its existence but it looks like their other lists. So, this project is 21 of 22. And the full budget for the program is just over \$57.5 million dollars and when you add in administrative grants that they give to states that puts it right at the same level of funding under a continuing resolution. The past year there has only been \$1 million dollars in wiggle room below this project. But it is also many projects, this list did have the benefit of the FY2019 list, but a lot of projects are carry over and this is still very much a living document as appraisals come in and numbers firm up so it's possible that this will get higher in terms of how much money is needed to go down to it. And it has it listed at \$1 million and the ask was \$5 million last year and I see the one as an extension of, we are making good headway as far as getting the project where it needs to be. And then it's making some jumps. And the other thing, not to jump in Phil is the other thing that this project has had was a lot of forest service folks from different regions have been able to come out and see this project on different tours so we've had the benefit of getting their feedback and them getting a little more familiar with what we are trying to communicate on this project as well. So, with that, this is Phil Chick from the Arch Cape Water District and he'll give us a presentation on Arch Cape.

Chick: Thank you very much, it's nice to be back here. How fast a year goes by! Again, my name is Phil Chick I'm the manager for Arch Cape Water District here to talk to you about the Arch Cape Community Forest Project. This is a project that was born in 2017 when the North Coast Land Conservancy; Sustainable NW and our water district partnered together with the goal of establishing a community forest and protected watershed in Arch Cape. Our visioning work began in the fall of that year with the goal of establishing a community forest that was capable of maintaining clean water, forestry, recreation and conservation keeping that thriving in Clatsop County. We have been very fortunate in gaining momentum quickly for this project. And that is due to the real promise of multi-generational benefits that this property has on the regional and national level. It feels very appropriate to be going ahead with Forest Legacy Program funding for acquisition of 2100 magnificent acres of cedar, fir and hemlock forest. We are keeping our fingers crossed as Amy said. We feel like we've made some really great progress in the past year and I'm going to share that with you. Next

slide please. The community of Arch Cape lies 84 miles to the west of Portland, you can see the City of Portland here. Every year that distance seems to get a little smaller and smaller as Portland grows. Portland is the fourth or fifth fastest growing city in the nation for the past several years. Interestingly, Clatsop County is also the fastest growing county in NW Oregon outside of the Portland metro area. We have concerns with the spread of Portland and development in Clatsop County and what that might do to the forest in terms of forest fragmentation. The next slide, a peek at the Arch Cape forest, this is the community of Arch Cape. A beach community. It's bordered by the mountainous forest land. Directly behind it home habitat for rare species and salmonberry along the streams up there along Arch Cape Creek. Next slide please. This is another glimpse of the property and it shows the effects of what we have been up against for our water operations. This is __ Creek here next to the clear cuts. And Sharp Creek flows along this section. These were cut in 2014 and I think 2012. We can also see clear cuts up at the top here. And that's caused us a lot of problems as a water district in terms of erosion and sedimentation. So it's very important to us to acquire this property for watershed protection. It directly supports the safe drinking water and Clean Water Acts as we do eventually get ownership of this all forest management would be done in the highest regard to source water protection. In the past year we've made great progress in terms of public outreach in thanks to an OWEB Grant that we received. A stakeholder engagement grant. We are able to hold two community event workshops dealing with community forestry and watershed protection. We also had one scotch broom removal event. There is quite a bit of scotch broom on certain areas of the property and we were able to remove a bunch of that without the use of herbicides. Which is important to us. We launched a website and Facebook page this year and also held meaningful meetings with neighboring landowner and the former landowner Stimson Lumber and submitted newsletters out to keep people informed. Perhaps the biggest news of all was we were able to make some initial contacts with the Clatsop County Commissioners. I just received some news in June during their budget process that they are going to contribute some \$250,000 dollars to our project for match funding contingent on us receiving Forest Legacy funding. So no pressure there, but a big victory for us. We got a Purchase and Sales Agreement in the hands of the owner Onion Peak Holdings. So we will be moving forward with that shortly. We also were able to conduct a timber inventory and cruise in the past year thanks to some grant money from ODEQ and budgeted funds that our water district contributed. On the horizon will be a community advisory created for this which will sort of give rise to our forest management plan and stewardship plans which we are going to embark on this year. And last but not least we got a... this map is from our current Forest Legacy Application. The section in orange shows the 2100 acres of the Arch Cape Forest and this map also portrays the connectivity to conservation and recreational land. The North Coast Land Conservancy's Rain Forest Reserve is in this section here and Oswald West State Park, one of the most visited State parks in the State is just to the south of us. Next slide, the driving focus of the project is to maintain drinking water quality as well as drinking water quantity. We have the benefit of having the world's biggest water source just a stone's throw away in the Pacific Ocean and a lot of the water we depend on comes in the form of fog drip. Fresh water in our watershed comes off the ocean. When there is more tree mass in the forest it creates that fog and captures it rather than just let it float on by in the clear cuts. Our forest management planning effort is going to strive to approach management in a more realistic way including larger stream buffers. In the summer fog drip is about 80% of our watershed that stays in there, which is a very important factor with us having water each year. Next slide, maintaining healthy forest cover is consistent with the EPA's multiple barrier approach to drinking water protection. You can approach drinking water protection in two ways. Either source water protection or engineering principles. In 2014 we built a new plant at the cost of \$1 million and went hard into the engineering principles now for the future we are looking more at source water protection. That investment we feel will be a better long term investment, not only for safe water but also for quality of life in the area and recreation, timber harvests and keeping local control of the forest in the Arch Cape Water District. We can use this revenue to do things such as offset infrastructure projects down the line and stewardship activities as well. The Community Forest model is very appealing to us. We are working with partners to allow for increased recreational access right now. This property has been an important community asset for many years. And we take great pride in ensuring that it will continue to be. This slide shows the back side of Onion Peak as well as water intake showed improved water impoundments and photo of the NW Community Forestry Forum which was held in May 2018. We had a large group of people that toured the property then. I'm talking about forest fragmentation a little bit as the Portland Metro population increases pressures on the coastal habitats, parks, water supplies and housing are also multiplied. The communities of Arch Cape and Cannon Beach grew 40% in the last 20 years. Because of this we

are seeing development go further and further up on the east side of the highway. I signed off on all the new home buildings in Arch Cape. We have water and sewer service for them. And all these homes are on the east side of the road going deeper and deeper into the forest. Before Onion Peak Holdings purchased the property a portion of it was on the market for home sites in the hopes that the county would downsize the zoning area. The entire property is zoned F80 currently. We wouldn't be here today if it wasn't for the North Coast Land Conservancy. We call this 2 projects 1 vision. The Rainforest Reserve is the North Coast Land Conservancy's project which gave rise to the Arch Cape Forest Project. The project seeks to conserve 3500 acres of conservation value forestland owned by Onion Peak Holdings which is right above Arch Cape and adjacent to Oswald West State Park and NCLC is currently in a campaign for \$10 million dollars. There are well on their way to achieving that with a closing date of December 2021. They have many donors and most recently celebrated acquiring a community forest through the US Forest Service for a large portion of that property. This next slide shows some of the Strategic elements of the Project. The Arch Cape Forest Project compliments several existing conservation plans. We have the Rainforest Reserve as I mentioned up here as well as Oswald West State Park. North Coast Land Conservancy's Coast Edge Initiative runs from Tillamook Head in Seaside which is just outside the map all the way south to the Nehalem Bay area. In this plan if you consider the Arch Cape Water Project, North Coast Land Conservancy, OR Park and Recreation, and the City of Cannon Beach that totals to about 6800 acres of land, when you factor in the Marine Reserve right here. This is a 32 square mile area of protected lands that is a very strategic acquisition for our project and through the Forest Legacy Program. Speaking about Strategic, I would be amiss if I didn't mention Samuel Boardman who was the first superintendent of Oregon State Parks. He started his career in the 30's and 40's and went around trying to establish waysides for the State and he always felt that we had one of the best opportunities to develop one of the most outstanding National Parks in the nation in this area. Because of the mountains that just jut right out of the ocean. Today Arch Cape Water District, the Land Conservancy and other partners are poised to advance that vision of Sam Boardman. Next slide talks about some of the unique geology. This area has a geologic story as compelling as any on earth. Millions of years ago there was this epic volcanic event in Idaho with lava spouting 5000 ft. into the air going across Idaho and Oregon, following the Columbia River channel eventually going out into the ocean. Over time with tectonic uplift this lava surfaced out of the ocean and the mountain peaks we see today were once islands surrounded by an oceanic moat and they were truly Oregon's own 'Galapagos' islands millions of years ago. And where species developed there which are found nowhere else on earth today. This is a shot of Mystery Peak here, showing some of the glorious flowers that bloom there. This is a picture of the 'bowl' of Onion Peak and the Onion Peak complex. Next slide talks about some of the globally rare and unique species. One of these species is Chamber's Paintbrush which is that red flower there that is abundant on the property. As well as a plant called "Queen of the Forest". Of most interest to me, what I think is a real interesting story, is the story of that dragonfly right there. It's called the "Black Petal Tail Dragonfly" and it's only found on this property and on a neighboring peak in the area. It spends its whole life in a muddy boggy area that is dependent on that 'fog drift'. Fog comes in off the ocean and hits the first the rock it sees and drips down creating the bog. The larvae live in there for 5 years before going under metamorphosis and they come out in a couple of weeks and turn into these beautiful dragonflies and reproduce and then they are gone for another 5 years. Another interesting tidbit about the property is the creeks that run through it and the Coho salmon populations that we have. This is Arch Cape Creek and it's much like Asbury Creek as well. It's a creek that supports a salmon population without the benefit of an estuary. Estuaries have the nurturing environments for the young fish at least spend a little bit of time before they go out to sea. So these guys come in, ride a wave into the creek and they spawn. And after they are born they go out pretty quickly. I think it would be neat by some day if you could do some testing on those to see if they have some sort of genetic makeup. They are kind of like a super hero athletes! Next slide please? We have an opportunity here to balance Economic and Ecological goals matching watershed protection as I mentioned. You'll be able to help the Community offset some water infrastructure costs in the future, that's a small part of it. This forest will be a working forest as we develop our forest management plan and look into stands a little bit more this year. We are going to make some plans for that. Rough estimates show that revenues over 50 years might be anywhere from 6.4 to 10.3 million dollars. Culvert and road maintenance are expected to contribute hundreds of thousands of dollars over time to the management of this property. A major part of it is going to be recreational. There are so many people that come to the Oregon coast that we mentioned international benefits earlier today, and internationally we have many, many travelers that come here. It's a day trip for people from Portland and

that travel into Portland. And they make that quite often. Next slide, shows public funding sources. This is no secret here we are going for Forest Legacy funding! Its hopefully it will contribute 50 to 75% of our project costs. Next slide, this shows our roadmap for this. In the past year we've really leaned on community capacity building and facilitation, we've made great progress there and are heading towards establishing funding some anchor funding that can trigger a larger donor campaign to follow. Conservation planning will begin pretty soon and acquisition and financing we need to do some more diligence before we can head towards acquisition. And that's going to be a big part of the project this year. Lastly, Stewardship is where we will head once we have ownership of the project and can move forward. This is just a quick graphic of the project. Again looking at Forest Legacy funds for about 75% of the cost. We are anticipating the purchase cost \$7 million dollars. We are looking into the Clean Water Revolving Fund for a major extra portion of the cost. As well as donations, gifts and foundation grants. I was going to back up a little bit and talk about conservation we are going to start doing some stewardship work next summer on a section of road, Sharp Creek that's been threatening to slump and sink into our water source. We received a Drinking Water Source Protection Grant from OHA to take care of this. Funds are going to be used to remove a culvert and remove that road and make the Sharp Creek flow in its natural course. Re-vegetating that area. We look forward to that. As sort of the first steps in stewardship and... the watershed a little bit more. I'm about done here, next slide? This is a thank you to our supporting partners, we've established some major partners in the past year. These are people and organizations that share the same belief that this project really does highlight and showcase the very best of what clean water, forestry, conservation and recreation can offer when they are all working together. And last, thanks to all of you. Everybody wants to be that guy right there at the end of the day, looking at the ocean view here. I'd be happy to take any questions.

Kovalik: So, a real basic one, so for the FY 2020 cycle if that doesn't get funding, would it be the same proposal that was submitted for FY 2020? Or a separate phase of it?

Chick: This is the same proposal.

Kovalik: So partial funding or all of it, get all the funding available in FY20. But if partial funding comes available in FY20?

Singh: So I'm technically, if this project advances out of this process and gets submitted to the Forest Service and we should know the budget because otherwise we would be in shutdown. There should be some overlap. Technically we are supposed to highlight the acres to be protected which should reflect exactly what the money is going to. There should be that direct correlation. There has been a little bit of a shift and some greyness happening with projects that have been submitted in the last few years because of this exact scenario. If we know a week before projects are to be submitted we can't re-write our project brief. It just doesn't make sense so I can say last year when I was on the panel there were a lot of projects that we were, wait we already funded this last year! And now what are you asking us for? So my hope is we get more guidance from the Forest Service for how to handle this scenario where the money, the timeframes are getting a little grey. At some point we'll have to deal with this. But at this point, with the Forest Service there is no list, this project has zero officially and it will until, and even FY19. I have a grant from FY19 but I have never seen a list. Because it's still moving. So, it took a long time, it's complicated!

Kovalik: If partial funding is available from FY 20 and then, can you acquire x number of acres using FY 20 and do you have the flexibility with your current landowner to be able to adapt as funds are available?

Chick: We have until 2023 is our closing so we need to do everything we can possibly do.

Bentz: So was this project approved for this current cycle? Or you just don't know if there is any money in the budget? This project passed out of this Committee last year.

Singh: Yes, we've submitted this project two times to the Forest Service for consideration in FY 19, when it didn't make the list and FY 20 it's on this unofficial list and until a budget is passed there's no money for it.

Bentz: So the entire Forest Legacy Project Program has a zero budget line?

Singh: Yes, the President's budget zeros this program out. Its one committee has passed their budget and the other hasn't. The House passed a budget and the Senate hasn't so it comes back into the House's budget and we are still waiting.

Bentz: We may wind up just with a continuing resolution.

Singh: That has been the assumption programmatically in terms of how we are just being advised to assume what's going to happen until we are no longer getting continuing resolutions. It's a likely outcome. So look at last year and start to make some informed decisions about how it might play out. And that the phasing and the expectation from the Forest Service is always that you are making progress on the funds that you receive. So if we get a million, we need to start chunking this project out. We can't sit and wait on funding until we get the big check, and then go through. Their expectation is if we say we can phase it, and we want partial funding that means we have to move towards acquisition of that and if other funding comes in during that time when we are doing our due diligence, that's fine we can grow the footprint but we have to keep pushing towards completion.

Bentz: Have you guys looked at a Revenue Bond as a finance part of this project?

Chick: We've just started looking into the possibility of that.

Bentz: I don't know that there is a huge market for them, the question is do you have the ability to submit data...

Chick: It's definitely on the table. It's sort of our public outreach campaign is getting peoples feeling on that. The community thinks it's a great idea whether they can pay for it or not is the other thing we are dealing with right now.

Bentz: So there is no change to the project from the last time it was presented?

Chick: There's, well actually there is, last time it was presented that red area up there, was supposed to be a conservation easement, now Arch Cape Water District is seeking the 2100 complete acres for fee title. But since the last time you saw this... no changes.

Singh: Except in the Readiness, right? With the cost-share has now been committed, true?

Chick: With the County Commissioners? It is committed contingent upon the Forest Legacy funding.

Singh: But the last time, we didn't know where the cost-share would come from. If the funding came in, now if the funding comes in that cost-share match will be available.

Kovalik: So Amy, similar to the Spence Mountain Project the fee acquisition the State would hold the easement?

Singh: We would need some assurance that the requirements of Forest Legacy are met and the easement is a potential tool for that to happen.

Hartstein: How has that been addressed in the past with these types of projects?

Singh: So we did one fee that is held by the City of Springfield, I don't think it was a question we asked ourselves at that point in time. That was our first project. It was the Forest Legacy Program gave startup funds for your first project that is not competitive. And I just don't know. It was before my time, if we even had a dialog on that. And since that time the

requirements for Forest Legacy have been beefed up. I think there is probably two things happening. Working with DOJ in figuring out what the best mechanism for that is. And looking at how OWEB is handling it to use that for some lessons learned and tools. Great, thanks Phil.

As I mentioned there is one last project. And if Ryan, if you could just open up the Hood River and scroll through and see if there is a map. And hopefully just seeing a map, will help us to remember there is this one as I mentioned. Josh Kling from Western Rivers Conservancy has presented to us 3 times already. And Weyerhaeuser-owned property, similar circumstance, we have money for Phase 1 is two rounds of funding, so right now we have \$6 million dollars from FY18 and 19 from the Forest Service that we have in hand. Phase 2 the purple we would get a part of that if the FY20 budget is passed. We are on that list for \$5 million. So this map will have to be reconfigured and updated as that fund scenarios become more clear. So similar same project we have seen before just a different chunk of it working its way around. Things that have potentially changed, we are getting a lot closer to easement terms getting figured out. We've put a lot of energy into defining what streams setbacks we would like to include on this project. And defining some riparian management zones that we've worked on with ODF/Weyerhaeuser and Western Rivers all coming to the table and working through that. DOJ is reviewing our easement terms right now when we are close to having those finalized then an appraisal will happen and then this mapping picture will get even clearer as we start to understand what the cost/acre of this project is. So, it is a little bit evolving in terms of becoming clear what parcels we are exactly asking for but in terms of larger attributes of the project, all of that is remaining the same. Similar to the Arch Cape project in the last year we have had a lot of dialog about cost-share and how we might come up with funding. About this time last year there was an OWEB grant being put in for consideration which was likely mentioned to you guys but that project didn't receive funding so now looking at potential opportunities with other matched tracks, county land, other options are on the table but the match of this is still our biggest hole, I guess. That we are not exactly sure how this grant will be matched and the potential of maybe piecing together funding sources, match tracks, bargain sales. If anybody has any burning questions on this I could share those with Josh and make sure they are addressed but also think that we've spent a lot of energy working through some of the concerns and the evolution of this one in the past.

Kovalik: So this is new to me, how is value then determined on Phase 1 and Phase 2 if the appraisals wasn't done?

Singh: So in this property was purchased by Weyerhaeuser recently 5 years ago or so, so we have a recent purchase price in terms of the larger acquisition and then guess-timating that 40 to 60% for the easement somewhere within that ball park. When the entire property will be appraised and once the appraiser does an allocation of value and then we will start to figure out exactly how many acres we can take down with the funding that is in hand.

Kovalik: What's the request this year?

Singh: \$7 million has been their come in to ask us for 7 million and then we've, through this committee in order to make room for other projects have downscaled that. So last year we did \$5 million, but funding amounts that have been awarded from the Forest Service have been \$3.8, 2.2 and then 5 million.

Krahmer: Amy, ODF&W's is very supportive of these projects without a doubt. You mentioned there has been a lot of discussion on the riparian setbacks conversations. How do we ODF&W become involved in that discussion? I don't think we really have. Is there a possibility for that?

Singh: Yeah, I would say at this, so the effort that has happened so far has been about insuring that the classifications of the streams are correct on those. And then, we've allowed, ensuring that the setbacks from there, the other thing that has come into this is, well yes, if you are interested that is still happening and unfolding and that we can definitely look to engage. Yes, we can talk about that.

Krahmer: We have as an agency been really involved in the restoration work and investments... as well as other places. Again just trying to be part of the conversations. Seems like it's...

Bentz: So they've had 3 rounds of funding? Are we going back and asking for a 4th round now?

Singh: Let me see, I think there was a... so based on what the initial amount is what does that put us at? Its \$5 million in Legacy comes in and \$16 million over all is in that ball park. This would be the last go round if we ask for 5 and it is awarded 5. What the sort, the dialog related to Phasing has been is that the intention is to acquire the entire tree farm and that the more Phases it takes then the more times we will be working through it. So as I am seeing where you are getting that, is we have looked at this a lot and it is taking up a lot of time and space. Definitely a strategy might be to go in big with it. And clear it off the list to make room for new projects.

Kovalik: Did you say that there was no match though for the previous phases?

Singh: Match hasn't been completely secured at this point in time for the previous Phases. One of the, as all of the projects are starting to face, is one of the things we are up against is Forest Legacy happens so early and other grant funding cycles happen later. Right now while not wholly committed it is likely that the first two Phases will be matched with county funding and a purchase that the County is going to do with Weyerhaeuser, we will have those be 'match' tracks. And that will secure the first FY 18 and 19 match that's necessary. And before our hope was that an OWEB grant. So it's less likely to say that the match for this project at this point in time seems it will come from other property rather than other funding reducing the amount of funds that is needed. And that same kind of question, this is our 4th time and we still haven't had match that has raised eyebrows from the Forest Service as well.

So, hearing no other thoughts on this one, we will have the full project brief, all the applicants will finalize what their bullet points are and the project briefs and the Forest Legacy information system kind of project brief created document which limits the number of characters and bullets and all of those kinds of things will be what will be shared with you guys in the upcoming weekish that then you can use the scoring guidance in your packets here to have that scoring exercise. I would like to get the conference call date set up so that we know when we are going to go through that process. This is the in the Legacy application process this is the meeting that we need quorum at, so we've been holding that as a conference call over the last few years and have been trying to limit it only as long as we need it for this agenda item rather than a full meeting to help ensure we can get quorum. So I had proposed Friday, August 30th as a potential date just when I look at the dates for when the deadlines for the Forest Service are and how much time we might need to do all the process. Ryan mentioned that I didn't realize is that the Friday before the Labor Day weekend. So I am open to changing that. Where I am at on either side is the first round of review process from the Forest Service is Sept. 20th. So we want to let the applicant's know which projects we are submitting if their project is moving on they will start going down that path of what the Forest Service's process looks like and if they are not then we don't need them to process and put time and energy into those next steps. So I could either say, what does Friday the 30th look like for those that are here. Or let's look for a different date if we all know that is problematic. Who's got good Labor Day weekend plans?

Hartstein: I will not be there on the 30th.

Logan: I know I have another meeting, but don't remember the times.

Barnard: Its 10 to noon.

Logan: Okay so if we could work around that for me.

Kovalik: Amy, I recuse myself from that meeting?

Singh: Yes. Do we still get to count that person for quorum? Quorum just goes down one right?

Gordon: I think that is true. So we could get by with 9 people instead of 10.

Logan: You might check on that. I think it maintains the quorum requirement. It could count towards quorum.

Singh: Eric do you feel that you could send in your scores? Or have somebody make your recommendation on your behalf?

Hartstein: So if I send it in those are not counted.

Singh: It seeds the dialog.

Hartstein: I think I could at least do that. I can check, we can have a surrogate too?

Singh: Yes.

Hartstein: I'll check on that.

Bentz: I will be available on the 30th.

Owen: The morning might be best. 10 to 12?

Singh: So could we do an early? Like an 8:30 to allow time for you all to hop off? Alright. I'll float that off right away. And get to make sure that we have that full 10, and if not we'll work hard to get that full 10 so let's plan 8:30 Friday the 30th for a conference call.

Bentz: So Thursday morning the 29th you are not able to be done with your work before then?

Singh: It would just likely shorten the amount of time that you' all would have to do your scoring process. And maybe that is a question. In the past, I've tried to give you guys 2 weeks but that definitely won't happen. I've requested that applicants get updated bullets to me by the 19th. Which my goal would be to get them to you guys by the 21st. So you would need to get me your scores and then I would compile them and share them out. So you probably at this point have a week. But I know if you are anything like me it doesn't matter if I get a week or 10 days or 2 days it's going to happen right before its due so, if that is the reality and everyone is on that same page and you said 5 days, 4 days.

Bentz: Pushing back to after Labor Day is not going to give us any more time to work on it.

Singh: So the 29th would absolutely be an option.

Bentz: So if you don't get a quorum as a second choice.

Singh: Use that as a backup.

Gordon: Jim has shared that he's out on vacation August 30 to September 13th. So Jim, if we were to make it the 28th or 29th would you be able to join?

Johnson: Let's see. I do have time on the 29th. Except for 9 to 10:00.

Singh: How does the 28th or 29th work for those that are here?

Bentz: 29th at 10:00 would be fine.

Krahmer: I'll have to look I think I am out that day. I will double check.

Singh: So I will float those two options. 10am on the 29th or 8:30 on the 30th? And see where I can find quorum. Thanks. Any other Legacy related questions? Comments?

Krahmer: Maybe one. I've been chewing on this a little bit. So much of this comes down to, the reality and implementation of it comes down to the Forest Stewardship Plan and yet we never really know what that is. And so, because this is a process question. Is there a way to get more involved, this Committee actually with this Forest Stewardship planning process? Or am I missing something?

Singh: That is so...

Bentz: Is it the local stewardship forester who is doing this? Is it done here in Salem? How is that process actually managed?

Singh: Well, so the Plan is written by whomever is hired to write the Plan and then we as an Agency have the approval authority of the Plan. For the purposes of Forest Legacy the approval authority is often looked at through the lens of is this consistent with the attributes? And what we sold the project on? And in a way I would say, every so this applicant this project brief that's created and all of these bullets that are created are what we are continuously looping back to say are we still doing what we set out to do? We told this Committee that this is what this project will look like. We told the people evaluating the project that this is what this is going to look like and if we start to steer away from that information we shared then we run into where we need to come actually back to you guys to say, we are no longer doing what we said we would. Are you okay with this? And then to the Forest Service, are you okay with this? That is the guidelines what the Forest Legacy Program says what we would do. And the Stewardship Plan is meant to be the living, breathing document that changes over time. Well it is a cornerstone piece of the success of what you have set out to do. There is also the recognition that there is the ability for that to change or shift with landowner objectives. And balancing those different...at any point in time any of the importance criteria could be more important than the other. It could be economics under one, it might be habitat, recreation or scenic all of those values are being tumbled up and down.

Bentz: Is there an interim process that does occur between you and the consultant that is being hired to come up with a plan that meets...

Singh: Yeah, we are limited on one hand that we haven't done very many of these. So do we have a solid plan or process in place that I could say, here's our plan, it's still really evolving. Looking at right now the East Moraine Project and where we are really ramping up the planning process right now. There is an entire working group meeting and working on all of these different planning components and the project brief was the backbone for what they are setting out to do. And then just wrestling with this. How are we valuing all of these conservation values in terms of management at any given time and in a way it is really messy, because just as planning is messy just with the landowner, now you've got the entire community and these funders involved that is looking at that. So, no we do not have right now a process we are engaging this Committee. We might need to chew on what that might look like.

Krahmer: It's something to think about because...

Abraham: What is your interest?

Krahmer: Follow through. We have a vested interest as a Committee making the recommendation as we do and whenever we get into these forums we always ask the pointed questions what are your riparian setbacks? The answer is well we are working on that. I get it!

Bentz: I have a bigger concern and that is whether, we want to keep this a working forest. Around the partners coming to the people here with dollars here are really not interesting in working forests as much as we would be. They just want to see it preserved. So one of the concerns that I have is that these projects actually remain working forests and whatever documents are put into place have that in there. We could have 1000 foot buffer strips, nobody can do this, and they tear the roads out and all that kind of stuff. That may be their goal.

Krahmer: I think we share the same concern in seeing our values that we bring to the table as a committee reflected in the stewardship plan. I think the question from me would be for the Committee to decide how involved as a committee do we want to be in that process? And I guess at least seeing from feedback on what the final Stewardship Plan so we can firm that we are on the right track. Just seems like there is a role this committee should be playing in the stewardship planning process. You don't see it that way, Kyle?

Abraham: Well, I'm new to this whole Committee right? So I just have been here a little bit, so I am not disagreeing with you at this point. But I wonder if we haven't provided you all the information you need to get to that point? If we have not done the right thing up until then right? So there are still questions about what's going to happen or how it's going to happen when the stewardship plan is being formed. Maybe, I don't know timing-wise if those things align or not it seems like there's a communication piece or something that is not being delivered.

Barnard: And to me there is two different components here to clarify and Amy can correct me when I get this wrong, but we have two mechanisms going into place. One is the stewardship plan or some type of forest management plan. If there are any concrete obligations those actually go into the easement which is reviewed by DOJ. So if there is something there that's required, if it's supposed be a 150 foot setback because that is what ends up being negotiated that a concrete setback that affects the property value. So our though so far is that needs to be clearly stated in the easement. Its other they are going to manage for wildlife habitat or whatever it is that has got some things in there that are going to get monitored over time. So stewardship plans it's not as much as an enforcement things but monitor those on some sort of basis to say what outcomes did the landowner achieve as stated in the stewardship plan? There is actually another process set up there so, there are two different documents and to me it depends upon what component we are talking about and what was proposed in this process as far as what goes there. The mechanics.

Singh: Yeah and I would say, in particular looking back to the Hood River Project, a big part of that is because we as the Agency holding the easement hasn't yet come to the table until we have funding. Right now it's just there, not right now, but prior to this process unless negotiated in the easement terms it was just their idea. In the past when an applicant might stand and say, I want 500 foot buffers, that's one person's idea, or one partner's idea in a larger dialog that needs to occur. And you're recognizing that while we are still in that process we haven't yet said okay, this is what was said and we'd had a lot of dialog about what those setbacks would be in this group and this Committee and concerns about too big and now we've as an Agency been engaged in that dialog and haven't shared the final, where all of those negotiations settled in. So if it's an easement project but then also with some of the projects we've heard today, it's a fee title so and that brings in the idea of is there an easement that is on top? Because if an entity owns the Forest Legacy property in fee title there is no easement terms necessarily that say you will provide public access, you'll do all of these things. And that is one of the areas that our program here is a little different because most frequently our Agency would hold those properties, so you would know we are going to make it a State Forest. And in order to be a State Forest we are going to do these things. And that is a really clear process. When an entity that doesn't have a history of owning land or statutes that guide how they do that, then that's where we are coming up against saying, how do we ensure that the things we have sold to you and we've sold to the funders happen? So I'm up to here in that dialog trying to figure it out.

Bentz: Is there a legal restriction, a public entity holding an easement on land owned by a public entity?

Singh: No, merger wouldn't apply in these scenarios where all of the interests would merge together. So we are looking at how OWEB is doing things. Because they do have an easement on all properties that they fund. So if they fund a fee title acquisition they put an easement on it. If they don't they fund an easement they are holding that easement with another entity. As we get projects that don't have ODF taking title that's exactly what we are trying to figure out. Unfortunately we don't have other states to look at. We are a little different in how we are doing the program here.

Bentz: Have you an easement on the Blue Mountain property with the Heffernan's right?

Singh: Yes. So that is the only one to this point in time that we can look at and say that's how we do it. The other example that we have competitively that this committee has worked through is the Gilchrist State Forest and that... we all understood what that would mean to have a State Forest.

Krahmer: It's a good discussion, I think I'm looking at how the Committee can get more engaged in that process. It's once this goes through our scoring we don't see it. I guess in terms of transparency it seems like to me that there is a role that this Committee could play in helping to craft a Stewardship Plan. Now on that I assume there is a public comment period on stewardship plans? Correct me if I am wrong on that. That maybe even elevates my concerns a little more I was thinking that would be an alley to get more information, is that an option?

Singh: Essentially, when we are talking about an easement with a private landowner, their planning process is the same but they would go through with or without the easement. It still recognizes that it's their plan. Another opportunity that might help guide some of this which we will get into this afternoon I believe is the Forest Action Plan and the strategy if you look at what guides our program, it's the federal requirements but also the state requirements that we outline in the forest action plan and so this type of a dialog, we might be able to chew on that a little bit through that planning process to say what's the progression of how we are using this Committee or checking in through that process or what are the requirements that we would potentially add to the Stewardship Plan. But if it is an easement its really meant to be that landowner's plan and every new landowner that comes on board has the same planning opportunity to decide within the constraints what their management objectives are and recognizing again that could be for economics, it could be for habitat, it could be for preservation of old growth and for long term management and all of those are still recognized as management.

Bentz: So I guess then any easements, do you require ongoing approval of changes?

Singh: Yes.

Bentz: So you guys are still, it's kind of like what we do with Tree Farm where it's not just any plan we come up with it's a plan that has to be approved. So you guys stay in control of the approval process of these plans right?

Singh: And anything that a landowner would want to do that's not in that management plan they need to update their plan and put it in there.

Bentz: In the future if it's reflected in the Readiness Score if there is no stewardship plan it's going to be reflected and it's not going to rank, you might rank but it is going to be considered there. If in the future if there is a stewardship plan in a project that you are putting forward is that something that the panel could look at and make sure what is in the plan is reflective of your values. Maybe a band aid but a thought.

Singh: Well, I guess, I'm wondering a few things. What's the culture or concern of a landowner sharing their plan? How often would somebody say, here you go Josh here is my management plan? I don't know that how open a landowner

would be and two you would, in many of these scenarios you are looking at potential changes at hand. SO what the Conservation Funds' management plan may be on China Mountain, as soon as they sell it, it's going to change. So the readiness and idea of whether or not you have a management plan is always kind of interesting because if the easement changes how you manage the property and with many of the projects we have been looking at we are saying this is a tool to shift management, then you would assume that the management plan would shift. If you are using the easement to say, we are going to go through some sort of restoration, or some change in health of the forest, the management plan would need to be modified.

Krahmer: That's fine but it's a little concerning there is we don't know how it's going to change.

Wros: From the perspective of an applicant these are questions that will remain top dollar to answer because the reality and certainly if there was a precedent of yes we will support your project and propose it going nationally here are our recommendations associated with that...

Bentz: I would think if we had something that would also help inform but all the partners get together and discuss how to run this place if ODF said, this is what we want. That might help focus the minds of the other partners that are going to throw their two bits into what they want to see on the ground, right? I don't think there is a problem with sharing a management plan that has been federally funded. I don't see a problem with sharing the plan with the people writing the check!

Krahmer: It's a lot of money. Public money.

Gordon: So the transparency here is relevant.

Bentz: That's really different from me writing a management plan on my place.

Singh: My question was more when in the process would you ask for that information? I think the request is strengthened post-acquisition to say, here's our final. This management plan reflects all of this that has been put into it. Rather than something, just when would you ask that question?

Hartstein: So the management plan occurs *after* funding? So you wouldn't necessarily have that in place.

Bentz: That maybe is part of your review process. Twice or three times per year throw those in before you put your final stamp of approval. May that's the time to share with the Committee. We bought this and this is our plan to put it out on the ground. This is reflective of what we decided.

Krahmer: I'm not looking for it to be a big hurdle, or opposition. It's just a nice feedback loop we went through this process and here is the forest stewardship plan and get a chance to see it and 99 times out of 100 we are going to say great! We are looking to find trouble, it's just that it is a transparency issue and potentially being engaged as a Committee. Looking over the process to some extent.

Singh: And you know, we see them when they are applying and I think right now that we don't really have much to talk about so we did the Heffernan, the Blue Mountain Project. That is sort of the only thing other than the Gilchrist State Forest. But as more of these come on I hope that the we are giving you updates, you know when a new landowner comes onboard. My hope isn't put on the shelf and you never hear about them again. I think that...

Krahmer: Maybe that's the whole issue. Because maybe... can we see the Heffernan stewardship plan? FYI.

Kovalik: Amy, just being know this, is there a federal definition for what the Committee is tasked to do? Would this fall outside of that scope?

Singh: You make recommendations based upon the Program. I'd have to look at exactly what the authorizing language is. If it's the implementation, there are certain points when for instance the Forest Action Plan the Forest Service says, you will engage these Committees and this Committee is listed on that. There are certain things that we do that the Board directly guided to have a touch point with this Committee before changes or before things are implemented. I don't know what the broad language is but you make recommendations to the Program.

Owen: Some of this may come up in monitoring because you do the Legacy monitoring and the stewardship monitoring and you have to do them annually on Legacy projects so that may capture a lot of it right? Because you go in and check are they doing things that the stewardship plan says? If it's a 'no' this Committee would probably like to know that. If it is a yes then its business as usual. But each of them get monitored every year both for development, changes in land ownership and the stewardship plan gets monitored every year anyway.

Singh: Again, where I was previously at where we had a much more robust portfolio of working forest easements we gave an overview to the Committee on an Annual basis of monitoring and let you know if there were any violations that happened, or things like that. So we gave that running overview. I think that seems appropriate. Again I think the appropriate "house" for this is in our Forest Action Plan. And our Forest Legacy strategy to say that when a management plan is approved that process will provide you information. So it's transparent and we don't forget to do it a few times per year on an infrequent basis. We could use that as the place to reminder ourselves to do those things.

Gordon: We can dig a little bit and read through, it's the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 as amended in 2008 that outlines the scope and responsibilities of the State Forest Stewardship Coordinating Committee. So we can take a look in there and see if there is anything that brings a little focus to the conversation as well.

Krahmer: I don't want to keep beating this but it seems like there is a place, we haven't totally figured out yet but there does seem to be a place where we can see what the final is. That is my issue.

Abraham: I guess maybe I should know this by now but does this Committee have an operating structure? And Charter and principles?

Bentz: It does because Charter of this Committee is much larger than just stewardship. Legacy. This committee was defined to serve as a Sub-committee of the NRCS and a bunch of other things. I think it was originally put together when Oregon came up with the Forest Resource Trust. This Committee was to help oversee that as well. So there is a kind of interagency group focused on forestry. And I think these committees are however we want to use them.

Gordon: We dug into some of that. So I've got some of that we dug into that a year and a half or two ago and gave a presentation to OTAC to remind them that this Committee existed and is here to provide forestry advice if you will. And that was new to me, I didn't have any of that history and I didn't realize I'd been set up in that way. So I can pull some of that out too. We've been struggling as long as I have been here to figure out...

Bentz: It was Jim Cathcart's great idea, he had this overarching vision for what is was going to be. And Legacy began taking over 90% of our effort.

Gordon: The challenge is really with the 2008 Farm Bill, a lot of the programs these committees were established to provide guidance for haven't gone away but have shriveled to not much.

Bentz: We used to have 2 to 3 million a year in cost-share going through this place. There is a lot to talk about.

Gordon: And the Forest Resource Trust is also not actively engaging.

Bentz: They built it and funded it and the next session they robbed the money.

Gordon: They defunded it, correct.

Owen: In the ranking of these is there consideration, and I took some time off of Legacy so I am not totally up to speed on what the rules state as to having this much money, or this many projects. Do you want us to consider any of those rules when reviewing these? Or just stand alone to score?

Singh: A lot is soft rules or things that we don't know exactly how they are being. Don't let things like that inform you. The attributes of the projects, and one of the requests that we've given the Committee in the past is that as the playing field is still shifting a little bit as budgets become available we want to be as flexible as we can be up until the point that we submit projects just in case a budget comes out and we need to make some modifications. So we are asking at that larger level the project as a whole what's your, do you support the project moving forward or not? Unless this exact piece or parcel or configuration of it...

Logan: The paring down comes to the selection committee right? We wouldn't have an option to weigh in on that?

Singh: It happens fast.

Abraham: Alright, let's break for lunch.

LUNCH

Private Forests Update

Abraham: Let's get back on schedule a little bit. So as I mentioned earlier, my name is Kyle Abraham and I just became the Chief for the Private Forests Division, officially about a month ago, July 1st. You guys, remember Lena when she was in this role was the Chair for the Committee. So I've obviously got some things to learn from folks here on the operation needs... but as I became the Division Chief, Josh Barnard has become the Deputy Chief he started officially August 1st for the Deputy for the position. I'm glad to have him in that role. And basically good to have folks back in the Division. We've tried to cover a little bit of the Legislative Session ask with one of our admin folks helping out over in Building B. Actually two of them. Glad to have Ryan back in the Division, with his short stint, supposed to be 3 months and was 9 as Public Affairs Director. So we've had some, probably not news to anyone but, just transition and people moving around a lot here. Glad to finally get a few things cemented. Now Josh has a position to fill. The Field Support Manager job. And that's been send out as a developmental assignment, hopefully for the short term and have folks interested in that... so a little bit about me, but I know Rod, known him for 20 years. I started with ODF in 1998 doing fish presence/absence survey which basically means electro-fishing. Stream classification work. Worked for the Monitoring Unit for a few years. I was a stewardship forester for a number of years. Both at the Santiam office and Dallas. I worked for OWEB for a little bit as their Effectiveness Monitoring Coordinator from about 2010 through 2013 when I came back to ODF in the Private Forests Division as the Water Quality Specialist. Did that role for about 4 years and then became the Deputy Division Chief and about 2 years after that, the Division Chief. So I've been with ODF for probably 19 years and OWEB about 3 years. Pretty close to the National resources field, forest practices, monitoring, restoration, voluntary measures, incentives for quite some time. My background from OSU as a fishery biologist so have learned forestry, still learning forestry because that changes principles change over time. I'm excited to be a part of this Committee and there is lots of opportunity here trying to understand the breadth of things that you guys work with. Worked quite a bit with the Committee for Family Forestlands so there is a little bit of overlap there. Ryan and I have had some conversations about trying to have the Committees have some sort of combined meeting once or twice a year. That Committee gets

summer's off whereas this Committee get the busiest during the summer and then also then also working with the three Regional Forest Practice Committees. Those folks provide advice and comment to the Board of Forestry on policy and implementation of the FPA. A little bit about me, and some changes within the Division. And then I will talk about budget and the Wildfire Council and sort of fire season. Is there anything else people may have on their minds that they would be curious to know about?

Bentz: So you were a stewardship forester with the Santiam District in Lyons?

Abraham: Yeah. After Dwayne Jackson. He retired. So I was up there a few years with Shannon.

Bentz: I think Shannon was our forester up in the Scio area.

Abraham: I had the northern part of the District.

Bentz: So you spent time working with landowners?

Abraham: Yeah.

Bentz: Great to have you onboard!

Abraham: Thank you. It's good to be here.

Bentz: When did you graduate from Oregon State?

Abraham: It was 1997. A while ago. So our budget for the Agency was finally signed by the Governor on Friday of last week. So, you guys, I think Lena talked a little bit remember looking for the notes when we were working on that continuing resolution possibility thing. The Republican Senators walked out and there wasn't a quorum to get the agency's budget signed. And OWEB was in a similar position. But soon after people came back together and the budgets were at least voted on but not signed by the Governor until last week. I think there was 30 days she had to sign them or it becomes law anyway so they are signed and we have a budget for the Agency. That means that we are basically about even with the last biennium so... with inflation a little bit. We had the larger Agency Initiative Package which was really focused on the needs of the Agency to deal with Larger, longer fire seasons and our ability to do our core business during the summer for the other Divisions that not Protection. But additional capacity for us. We put in an Agency Policy Option Package which was not included in the Governor's budget or the Legislative Budget but there is a continuing discussion with the Governor's Wildfire Council and there is a meeting Thursday here at ODF campus where the Suppression Sub-Committee will present some draft ideas for funding recommendations to the larger Council. They are still on a path to have a recommendations to the Governor by the end of September. That's not going to be the entire package. Everything will be finalized but there will be some recommendations for the short session.

Bentz: There were a number of bills that were put forward to change fire funding. And none of those passed?

Abraham: None of those passed. There were some things, proposals for changing the Harvest Tax and the landowner contribution through the prorated. None of those passed. So our budget for the Private Forest, General Fund and Harvest Tax. General Fund at 60/40 the way it has been in the past. There were some other changes to the Protection side was Large Fire Costs, landowners would pick up more of that earlier but it didn't pass. But there are lots of discussions still on how that...

Bentz: We had to go down 2 or 3 times and tried to defeat pieces of bad legislation.

Abraham: So probably of interest to this Committee, was the Omnibus Bill HB 5050 as we have referred to before as the Christmas Tree Bill which everybody gets to hang on there something on there at the end of the session. Typically, for the Division there was \$1.7 million dollars in continuing SOD Sudden Oak Death Eradication Funding for the Curry County area. So that basically allows us to continue at the level that we have been at for the last biennium to control and contain SOD. And there was also \$250,000 to support the Governor's Wildfire Council. Thinking at least that some of that would be going for more on the Mitigation side, trying to support the Mitigation Sub-Committee and some of the modeling and prioritization work that they are going to be focused on. So, basically our budget was approved at the same level it would have been at for this biennium. No big additions or subtractions.

Gordon: We did we get funding for the position to help us recover fire costs?

Abraham: There were two, probably a blend of previous positions, but we do have 2 new accounting positions but we don't have any additional FTE. Basically approval for what we would have done anyway. And the other thing that may be related to that a little bit is even know we do have a fully funded budget for the next two years we do as an Agency have some significant cash flow issues related to funding Large fires. And our sort of billing for previous fire seasons to get some of those accounts coming back in. So it's definitely more of an internal thing but definitely effects some of the work we've been doing with contractors and others as they are waiting to get paid because we basically don't have the cash on hand for all of the previous fire seasons. \$60 or \$70 million dollars in our budget for the Fiscal year is about 10.

Bentz: Is that an insurance recovery issue or is it BLM and the Forest Service?

Abraham: It's with our federal partners both on our end to get those billings to them and also to get the invoices paid. It goes both ways, just a lot of processing and time reconciling cost-shares and getting the fires closed out. The magnitude of what we have been dealing with over the last 6 years doesn't put the process and profile that we have in place here. So Fire Season. A little bit of discussion on the Milepost 97 Fire. That was contained and turned over to the District on Friday. Thursday or Friday of this week. It was about 13,000 acres just around the Canyonville, Azalea area mixed BLM, private some Cow Creeks, and small forestland properties in there. By all accounts it was a really good catch given where we were at the time with fire season. Weather conditions, Jim was down there for 8 days, the first 2 or 3 days it was growing pretty significantly towards the south and west, and east actually too. It was pretty amazing there were lots of resources on the table, which was different than previous summer's where there have been multiple fires throughout the region. Really difficult to get resources everywhere. So there were lots of people that were excited and ready to go fight that fire as opposed to year's past where most folks were ready to be done with fire season by now. This was the first team deployment this year. And over the weekend, last week lots of fires lightning related over in Central and Eastern Oregon. There is one fire now with Team 2 the Ward Fire outside of Klamath Falls. It's about 1300 acres I think. It sounds like they got a pretty good handle on it now. They had some really significant rain the day after the Team was assigned to that fire. So they are thinking it will be a pretty short assignment for them. The numerous initial attack fires are for the Districts to...it's been relatively calm from previous years but we are still in the middle of August and things can turn around fairly quickly on the west and east side. But the days are getting shorter and the nights getting longer so things typically aren't as intense. So keeping our fingers crossed that we can get through the rest of the summer without too many more significant fires on the landscape.

Gersbach: An interesting comment we were running the numbers compared to the 10 year average, and there has actually been more fires this summer compared to the 10 year average. But last year was so bad it looks like it's a mild fire season. There's a hundred fewer fires this summer than there was last summer at the same date. But we are running slightly above, what's great is they've been catching them at under 10 acres. So initial attack is very good.

Bentz: In Douglas the FPA are on top of things for themselves?

Gersbach: I think what is significant is the Teams are all so fresh, so all these private contractors, pilots and everyone aren't like this is my 6th fire in a row. So when they went out and fighting this fire they were alert and vehicles didn't have dust layers on them and I think that helped the energy level was good. Fatigue is a factor.

Abraham: The Board of Forestry. We do have a Board meeting coming up September 4th and there will be some discussion. Typically September has been the Board's assessment of forestlands and reviewing things from a little bit larger perspective. We will have some discussion with them from each of the Divisions perspective about how the Divisions have addressed some climate change policy issues within each Division. We will talk a little bit with them and give them the annual monitoring update that we typically do for Private Forests. We also talk with them a little bit about some of the work that we've been doing in Western Oregon in regards to Large Wood recruitment analysis. As part of their update. And really kind of getting them geared up for Retreat that they do in October. This is where they go through their work plan. Talk to them about what things the Division has accomplished over the last 2 years. Some of the things that we see as emerging issues and get some feedback from them as where we spend our time as agency and mapping out the next 1 to 2 years off the work plan. And that will also lead into discussion in November. For them they will have a workshop where they will be talking about science and policy and values and how those 3 things ideally come together, but not always at the same time you are trying to make difficult policy decisions. So how do their values and beliefs weigh into their decision making process.

Bentz: So the Board has been filled out? Was down to 4 members, back up to 7?

Abraham: Back up to 7 now.

Bentz: It's a real challenge with the forestry community about some of the appointments the Governor is trying to make. So I wasn't really following, the three new appointees? Do you know where they came from?

Abraham: We have some bios for the newer Board members we can find those and send those out to folks.

Gordon: They are on the website.

Abraham: So, Brenda McComb, OSU Professor of Forest Ecosystems and Society.

Gordon: And later Dean of the Graduate School. I think her background is in forest wildlife.

Abraham: Jim Kelley, landowner in Eastern Oregon. Kimberly. He is also a business owner, Restoration Hardware out of Portland.

Gordon: He sold the business but...

Abraham: And then Joe Justice who works for Hancock on the eastside Timber Management. And since you mentioned the Board being filled out. There will be two members that terms expire in February 2020 and two more that expire in December.

Gordon: Like Nils. And Cindy expires in February and then Tom Imeson and Mike Rose.

Abraham: So 2020 will be another significant year of transition for the Board. That's all I have. Anything else you want to hear about?

Lind: I wanted to say apologies for my delay. I've been in conference calls since 8:30 this morning so back to back. I'm Linda Lind, I am the Oregon State Liaison for the Forest Service. And I know Brad usually comes to these meetings but he

has moved on to another position and they are going to fill in behind him. Most of you folks know that. So I try to sit in when I can but sorry for the late arrival.

Abraham: Thanks for making it Linda.

Gordon: Do you have any insight into filling in behind Brad? If they are going to be able to do a lateral transfer? Or are they looking to...

Lind: You know we have this big huge priority listing in the Regional Office and lots of elbows flying trying to get to the top of the list there. You know, I think they plan on flying that. I don't think it is going to be a lateral per se flying that position. Should be pretty soon, hopefully, because that is a big gap.

Abraham: I don't see Al?

Gordon: Al is not here, he's down in Klamath Falls. So he left me his presentation that I didn't get my hands on until this morning. So I can try to thumb through it a little bit but kind of change the order of things slightly. If that's alright with everybody? Maybe combine a few things. Assuming you are finished?

Forest Action Plan Updates

Gordon: I wanted to actually, we've got these last three things on the agenda, Stewardship Program Updates, Forest Action Plan some discussion about upcoming meetings. I wanted to combine some of that because I think it connects nicely to some of the discussion we had earlier and also Kyle brought up the crossover between the Committee for Family Forestlands and this Committee. So the first thing I was going to do was to talk about I think I spoke about it last time we met, but the transition that has occurred with Brad Siemens and State and Private Forestry, Forest Service. As you have heard we are waiting to see how the position is going to be filled and know what the timeline is going to be with that. That is for us in the work that we do a pretty big hole. But I know that Karl will step in and help fill that a little bit.

Lind: I'll check with Debbie while we are chatting.

Gordon: So Brad did move on to a position in Fire and Aviation Management. So he is still up in the Regional Office up in Portland I believe he is Deputy Director of Finance?

Lind: Yeah for the Fire part of finance.

Gordon: That's just an important update from the Stewardship side of things. Then I wanted to talk a little bit we have this upcoming conference call that we are looking to schedule but looking out further beyond that, the last time the CFF got together there was discussion about possibly meeting out in eastern Oregon. But we haven't settled on if it's going to happen or where but as those details come together there could be some nice opportunities for cross-over on those meetings. So I will try to keep everyone posted. I think their next conference call is September.

Abraham: That is usually when they get back together and then they develop the schedule for the next 3 or 4 meetings in September.

Gordon: So maybe more to be announced at some point in the future. But picking up on the conversation earlier kind of picking up some interest in, so basically what I am hearing is so we approved these projects and make these recommendations and then we never hear about them again. And it might be nice for the group to know what's happening out there. So the connection in my mind was if we end up in northeast Oregon for one of these joint meetings, that's where CFF might be going, so that was on my list of possibilities maybe we take a half a day on the

Heffernan property if they are amenable to that. Just talking about where it's at and what happened. I think that would be pretty helpful for folks. So I wanted to throw that out there. But while I'm on that topic, are there other topics that are of interest to this group? It's been a while since I've been gone for 9 months and it's been awhile since I threw that out there. But are there things that you 'all would be interested in? Would be involved in or learning more about?

Bentz: I'd be interested in knowing more about NRCS. Most of the cost-share money is flowing through your agency now. And just what is the forestry component of that? Because you are funding both ag and forestry projects, is it 5% or 10%? I am interested in knowing how that is working or if there are roadblocks for forestry getting funding from NRCS? I know it's been a challenge in other parts around the country and want to make sure we've got a seat at the table.

Owen: Percentage-wise. I'll peruse a little bit and try to figure out the percentage. If you look at our website a huge majority of projects that are funded are in Conservation Implementation Strategies (CIS) a huge majority are forestry. Which is delightful that we are seeing that. A lot of the work that Ryan and I are doing since I came on board here are identifying those roadblocks. I worked through eastern Oregon last week and very few roadblocks. ODF has an incredible staff out there that is delivering great for private forestry. I made a comment to the foresters that one of the Districts there was doing more work than the National Forest I just came from on private land, which is a huge feat to lift up the private. And pretty incredible to do that across mixed ownerships. So that is really what Ryan and I are doing. Let me see if I can dig around to find some year-end or annual output for forestry. It's a pretty good chunk of funding. I'll see what I can come up with.

Lind: Yeah, I wanted to probably share, a lot of you are aware or maybe not, the Governor and Under-Secretary from the Department of Agriculture will be on behalf of the Secretary will be signing a Shared Stewardship Agreement with the State of Oregon tomorrow afternoon at the Capitol. So Shared Stewardship Agreements across the west this has kind of been an emphasis of the Department of Agriculture and the Secretary. And the Chief obviously to really look at how we can kind of step up the work we are already doing in Shared Stewardship and Conservation across landscapes. How can we increase the pace and scale of that? How do we work with the states and share decision-making space and priority setting in terms of where we need to really direct resources on the landscape? Right now we are figuring out what that looks like and I know ODF has been the lead State Agency in putting that Agreement together but it is a statewide agreement that includes all stakeholders, collaboratives and partners and what have you. And there is going to be a roll-out and dialog with stakeholders that ODF is going to help facilitate. But I think that is going to really change funding priorities for the Forest Service and NRCS as well. As we look to try to be more effective in where we are putting our resources to get the biggest bang for our buck and the most impact. Maybe some time after the Agreement is signed and we start doing some of the dialog with the stakeholders to frame out what this is looking like we could do a demonstration to this group.

Gordon: Both of those topics, Shared Stewardship, and sort of an update on where we are at with the work of NRCS could be great shared topics between CFF and this Committee. I think both groups might be interested and maybe we can think about shooting in that direction. Andrew you and I could work together on it, kind of talking about where things are now and where we want to take them in the future.

Lind: And there is a nexus with the Governor's Wildfire Council, or Wildfire Response Council. And the Mitigation Committee really looking at risk assessment on the landscape and where the greatest risks are. And there's going to be some scenario planning because that map can look very different if you overlay wildlife habitat, if you overlay socio-economic issues or timber infrastructure, logging infrastructure that kind of thing, so, more to come on that. But it is an interesting time.

Krahmer: Question, is this a tier above or a spin-off with the other agreement the State has with the Good Neighbor Authority. Is this something?

Lind: This is broader, bigger. Good Neighbor Authority is a tool, mechanism so Shared Stewardship Agreements and it's broader, statewide and really looks like the biggest difference is sharing that decision-space. It's a real culture change for the Forest Service in terms of sharing that space. We are going to see how that goes at the field level! I think that is going to be the biggest obstacle.

Bentz: Your biggest issue is fire, I would imagine. Right? And ODF has the firefighting resources, right? And that's been one of the challenges is that fire starts on federal ground and it gets away and we are not good neighbors, but bad neighbors with each other. So that is part of the response is talking about that more?

Lind: And there's the Suppression Committee as well. The Mitigation Committee, originally the Governor's Executive Order was very much focused on the State and then Matt Donegan like the day before she signed the Order he got in there and convinced her that we needed to look at the federal side as well. And that is why there is some federal representation on the Mitigation Committee, so looking across those broad landscapes. This is a meeting Thursday of the Council here in Salem. It's pretty much all day. So there are going to be some report outs and those Council meetings are open to the public. The sub-committee meetings are just working meetings but these are open to the public and I think there will be some presentations if you are available.

Gordon: I think too that the connection between this group, and I think there is a nice nexus between Shared Stewardship, Federal Forest Restoration Program and our relationship with NRCS. I talked about this a little bit at the last meeting and that was just a real opportunity to prioritize where we are doing work on both the Federal lands across the State. Hopefully, through Shared Stewardship really start to leverage the Federal Forests Restoration Program to focus on the federal side and work with NRCS to create Conservation Implementation Strategies that are addressing the private land side of that puzzle and really put some kind of in-house Joint Chiefs-like projects together. I think we got some partnerships emerging to do that.

Lind: Debbie Holland said she's making a recommendation to the Regional Forester today for the selection of the position! So I hope to be able to announce by the end of the week. So there you go! I was behind the curve on that one, I didn't know about that.

Bentz: Oregon we've always been really good at interagency stuff. It's how we do things here. And so that's good news!

Lind: So, there's you know I think the Council is also looking at the reality that there is not enough money for what needs to get done. And so, I think there will be a big focus on leveraging the private sector dollars and how do we do that to get more done on the landscape. But certainly the limited funds we have we are going to be re-directing and being more strategic about that. The same with the Joint Chiefs funding as well in terms of selection of projects. Right now everybody agrees that it is the Rogue area, the southwest part of Oregon that's kind of a big hotspot. And then Eastern Oregon, of course and parts of Central. We'll see how that plays out, but I think that would be something that would be a good ongoing update with this group as we progress.

Gordon: Great! So I'm trying to string a conversation together here. Just hearing where the conversation is going, I might just dabble a little bit about what AI was going to come and talk about and that is the State Forest Action Plan. He sent me his presentation but I would be challenged to go through every single and make it seamless so I'm just going to pick and choose a little bit. So we referenced the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act earlier with some of the questions about the role of this Committee and one of the things that outlines is that every State does have a State Forest Action Plan and these get updated or renewed every 5 years and then completely re-done every 10 years. So, we are in that cycle right now. I mentioned this a little bit at our last meeting as well. And it was my hope that AI would be able to come and give you an overview of his process that he is leading with the Department. Cross-program kind of a thing because it involves not just Private Forests, not just Legacy and Stewardship but Protection and State Forests as well. Right now we are in a big data collection phase. But we need to have a revised Forest Action Plan complete and adopted

by June 2020 so we are down to less than a year now. And I've been out with the Public Affairs job for 9 months or so, so my vision for that is that this Committee is the right Committee to help provide some input and feedback as we work through that Forest Action Plan. So there is another thing to put on the list of stuff to come for this group. Some of the folks sitting around the table have a lot more history and context for the Forest Action Plan than I do probably. I was just looking at this slide and seeing the word Strategy quite a bit in those bullet-points, Strategic and Strategy. Really what the Forest Action Plan does is create an outline for where we see, as a State Agency, the important places are to make strategic investments of Federal dollars. Particularly State and Private Forestry dollars coming through these programs. As we mentioned earlier a lot of the funding for stewardship in particular has kind of dwindled quite a bit in the last 10 to 15 years. And we are seeing more of that funding coming through NRCS. Through the EQIP, Environmental Quality Incentives Program. And so continuing this sort of story and conversation, the pitch I made at the last meeting I think as we work on this Forest Action Plan, there is a nice opportunity to capture within it the way we are leveraging those partnerships, agreements and programs that we have in Oregon to put together those larger projects and to work across boundaries. I really think that's the direction we are trying to steer this thing. I had another thought, which I've lost but anyhow. I'm going to pick through this presentation a little bit, I think the point of a number of the slides up front is that I think we all know this isn't anything that is new for us in Oregon or the Department. We've had a lot of initiatives dating back quite a ways into the 70's around setting priorities for our investments. And tracking important indicators across the landscape. So we kind of have some building bodies of information. Basically, where we are at right now and what AI is looking to do is focus in two different areas. Right now we are working on the Statewide Assessments so that is really collecting a lot of different data layers that help to feed into the justification to where we see we need to make those strategic investments. And in my mind I think there is a lot of really great physical data that exists out there about what's happening on the landscape but I think we also as we are moving into the second half which is the strategy piece, so once we have all that data we start thinking about the strategy or lens we are going to use to look at it and make sense of it. That's where I really feel like this Committee could provide some help. I hope I am not speaking out of turn for AI but since he's not here I'm just going to take the Liberty to say that I think that is a nice role for this group. Because part of this, it's not just where the physical data says we need to focus, but where do we have good landowner engagement? Where do we have the right partnerships? Where do they have the infrastructure to support the work? I think these are all questions that the various agencies that are represented by this group have probably been struggling for the last 20 years at this point to try some of those investments. So I think by the end of this calendar year the idea, Josh correct me if I am wrong, but I think the idea is by the end of the calendar year is to try to wrap up the data intensive piece and shift more towards strategy. And the data piece is all the appendices at the end of the document and the strategy is the narrative part. It's that lens that says, how are we going to go about doing this? So as I said earlier I really think that that is our opportunity to pull all those different threads together that we were just talking about around the table. Which brings me back to the thing I have forgot, which is that unless the MOU has changed I believe the Shared Stewardship Agreement which is going to be signed tomorrow references the Forest Action Plan and also talks about a 20 year strategy.

Lind: Right, yes.

Gordon: So, a lot of this work will be codified in that document as well. I'm just going to slip through these slides for a minute.

Lind: And this is a requirement right? For State and Private Forestry? For the funding that the Feds provide?

Gordon: Yes. Let's see I got to remember the 4 W's. So they are asking us to focus on Water, Work, Wildfire and Wildlife. So we boil it down to the four W's. Those are the 4 primary areas that State and Private Forestry is asking us to really focusing our investments. I think that is all I'm going to say for these slides. The final thing worth mentioning and again a little bit of a repeat from the last meeting. Is the Forest Stewardship Program is also going through a modernization process. So the real quick high level background there is that Congress has been looking at that Program and saying we don't really see the value of the investment. Do a better job please of showing how these funds are actually moving the

needle on the ground. So, the Forest Service has been working through the process for the last year or so to try to meet that challenge. And it's not complete yet. I can't say for sure what the final outcomes of that are going to be but most certainly it seems like we are going to be looking at focusing those stewardship dollars into specific resource concerns and specific geographic areas around the State. So rather than having those funds and just distributing them across the board, we will be looking at matching them up with needs on the ground. So again the Forest Action Plan is looking at doing that. The update is our opportunity also to think about the interplay with Stewardship. And then another really nice sort of change in the program that is very helpful is a turn, not a turn, but rather a broadening of what that program views as an acceptable management plan. So we've got the Uniform Plan in Oregon. That's been the stewardship plan that we really focused on and funded through that program. Now, they are going to be broadening that out so that we can actually enter in and take credit for if you will a host of plans, ranging from small practice-based plans that we might do for NRCS all the way up potentially to some landscape scale stewardship planning. And that is a conversation that we are just starting with NRCS and the American Forest Foundation (AFF). So that will give us a lot more flexibility I think in terms of helping to describe how we do business and also being able to show the progress of moving from landowner engagement to getting action on the ground. Which is ultimately is the goal for the Stewardship Program and other programs.

Krahmer: Along those lines does Forestry put together a monitoring report to illustrate how that money has been spent on the ground?

Gordon: For the Stewardship Program specifically we do put together an annual report for the Forest Service and we do also conduct annual audits of Stewardship plans. I'd be happy to share that. And really part of this, as we are going through this process and thinking about all of it but also getting the wheels turning internally of how we can do a better job of collecting data, being able to track progress between programs. So our reporting is kind of siloed right now. But can we track a landowner that participates in multiple programs not just Stewardship but maybe NRCS, or Emergency Forest Restoration Program (EFRP) and again also some changes in reporting requirements for the Forest Service. I think that is kind of everything I want to say with respect to the Stewardship Program updates and Forest Action Plan. And the only other thing I talk a little about our engagement with the American Forest Foundation (AFF). I want to pause and see if anyone had any other questions, comments or if that made sense?

Bentz: That's great. Congress was talking about fixing the Federal Forest Service Fire funding problem did that happen?

Lind: The Fire Funding fix did happen. But it will take effect in 2020 and then the President's Budget came in and he reduced the Forest Service budget. So that was part of the game was that we figured we'd have our flat budget would remain so that we could continue to try to invest and instead of spending it on firefighting actually invest it in the restoration work on the ground. I think that's going to be shifting, but the fire funding fix did go through and Merkley and Widen were very much a part of that so.

Bentz: So is that basically coming out of FEMA dollars?

Lind: Yes, once it exceeds a certain amount.

Gordon: Any other? I'll just real quickly talk about our engagement with the American Forest Foundation (AFF). I know I talk a lot about NRCS, Forest Service and FSA in here, but we've also been working very closely with AFF over the last year, year and a half, it's really stepped up. We've been partnering with them on "Woods Camp". Woods Camp platform which is basically an online engagement tool that works through social media. The idea is to try to increase engagement with some of our less traditional audiences. It's something they piloted in the southeast and upper mid-West. We've been working on it out here in the West in limited areas of the State primarily in NE Oregon and SW Oregon. And we are learning a lot from it. One of the neat things is that we are able to in real time dial up or dial down how much we are putting out there. So as we move into fire season and our staff gets pulled off into other responsibilities we can dial it

back so we are not essentially writing checks that we can't cash with landowners. And we are still working on how to get that balance right. But in both of those places it's been a really nice tool. It has existed within our partnerships in the SW between ODF and OSU Extension and up in the NE OSU Extension is involved too but also Wallowa Resources. So it's been really fun to see that get rolled out. We've also been partnering with AFF on a pilot project that NRCS funded that actually allowed us and OSU Extension and Wallowa Resources to increase a little bit of capacity on the ground to help develop management plans for landowners. That has been recognized as a bottleneck to getting folks into cost-share particularly NRCS. And we are not talking about a full blown Stewardship plan, we've developed a lesser template if you will that meets all the needs for EQIP and a nice entrée for folks who really just want to start getting something done not just create a document that might sit on the shelf and collect dust. That may or may not get used. So that has really been exceeding our capacity in most places. Working with NRCS to add funding to that and extend the agreement. And if we are successful that would allow us to make a little bit more investment in the capacity to help support that work. And then finally, started a really great conversation with Angela Wells she's just started working with AFF. She's focused primarily with working with the State Tree Farm groups and she's really interested in the pilots of this landscape-scale planning for management plans. And a conversation I opened with Andrew as well, we've got a conference call tomorrow. So potentially a really nice tool for us to use. A great example would be in the Chiloquin area we have a Joint Chiefs Project. There's a lot of landowners with smaller ownerships there. That would be covered by that Joint Chiefs Project. Rather than having to go through and create a plan for each of those landowners we could potentially create a landscape-scale stewardship plan and then just tier those landowners off of that based up on their needs on their property. We are looking at something similar on the westside around oak habitat restoration as well. So really interested in where that goes. And then I would just conclude by saying that all that, all those are great opportunities for us, but it is stretching our capacity quite a bit. I'm hearing that a lot from the field, and we talked about position authority earlier, the field side has been pretty creative in finding ways to bring folks on. But that is not really a sustainable model into the future and so we have the early parts of the conversation internally to start thinking about the long term gain to find the capacity to engage with AFF, NRCS, FSA, OSU and even some of the Forest Service funding opportunities. I think that is all I have to say.

Lind: And I also think rural development as well. Is getting more involved with shared stewardship I think and I'd be looking at re-directing some of its funding. And being creative coming up with some additional funding.

Gordon: I might follow up on that.

Round Table – Partner Updates and Closing Comments

Abraham: I think that brings us to the final agenda item which is any partner updates or thoughts from you guys? Anything new in your world.

Lind: I think you heard mine from the Forest Service. And the Wildfire Council so I'm good.

Hartstein: So real quick, OWEB, for this group we are just starting to kick off a new Focused Investment Partnership in the Rogue Basin which is a **dry type** forest restoration initiative for over 6 years 6 million dollars. The partners down there are really excited to get things kicked off. On the action plan we are also revising and tweaking our FIP priorities. Including the dry type forest. And right now we have language in there saying that these aren't quite synced up so we understand that... maybe included in the Action Plan. We may not have in our priorities but we reserve the right to go back and tweak our priorities once more if the Action Plan is revealing some information that we have at this point.

Abraham: Alright so we, Amy you mentioned the date that people will get materials to review?

Singh: Yeah. The Wednesday before our meeting likely the 21st is my aim. By the 21st materials for the meeting and then I will send out an email gauging if we can get quorum on the 29th or 30th.

Lind: When is the next meeting?

Singh: Either 10 o'clock on August 29th a conference call or 8:30 on the 30th for Forest Legacy recommendations.

Lind: Hopefully we will have our person on. Because I'm going to be out of town I think.

Gordon: Looking forward from there we will just take it as it comes. I will regroup with AI around the Forest Action Plan and maybe see about a schedule of engagement with this group. And then wait to see where things shake out with CFF in terms of joint meeting. I hope at least to have one more meeting before the end of the calendar year after this one for this Committee.

Abraham: Alright, thank you all for spending the day with us. That's it!

Gordon: Thank Susan for a really great lunch as always!

Lind: Sorry I couldn't be here then, but I didn't want to eat in front of people! And for my late arrival but I'm glad I had a chance to talk about the Shared Stewardship Agreement. It will be interesting to see where we go with that.

Abraham: Meeting adjourned.