

Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee

FTLAC Orientation and TOUR

Oregon Department of Forestry
Tillamook Forest Center, Tillamook Oregon
Minutes
February 11, 2011
9:00 a.m. – 4:00 p.m.

Pursuant to notice made by press release to newspapers of general and local circulation throughout the state and distributed to persons on the mailing list of the committee and the members of the committee, a regular meeting of the Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC) was held at the Department of Forestry in Salem, Oregon.

Present Committee Members: Tim Josi, Tillamook County Commissioner, Chair; Jim Bernard, Clackamas County Commissioner, Co-Chair; Patricia Roberts, Clatsop County Commissioner; Chuck Hurliman, Tillamook County Commissioner; Mike Propes, Polk County Commissioner; Anthony Hyde, Columbia County Commissioner

Absent Committee Members: Faye Stewart, Lane County Commissioner

Present Department Staff: Doug Decker, State Forester; Nancy Hirsch, State Forests Division Chief; Mike Cafferata, Deputy Chief, State Forests Division; Andy White, Forest Grove District Forester; Mary Schmelz, Agency Affairs; Mike Bordelon, Northwest Oregon Area Director; Dan Goody, Tillamook District Forester; Tom Savage, Astoria District Forester

Present Others: Debra Birkby, Clatsop County Commissioner; Gary Springer, Oregon Board of Forestry; Gary Groth, Douglas County Woodland Assistance; Bob Van Dyk, Wild Salmon Center; Chris Jarmer, Oregon Forest Industries Council; Duane Cole, Clatsop County; Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers

Approve Minutes, Introductions

August 27, 2010 Minutes: **MOTION:** Approve minutes. All in favor. Minutes approved.

Legislative Update

Doug Decker

- HB 2736 – Provides authority to create natural resource conservation areas. Discussion of pros/cons and process.
- SB 464 - Dedicates revenue to school sub-account for revenues above certain levels. **MOTION** passed in opposition of SB464.
- HB 2597 – Established policy direction for state forests at 90% of Forest Practices Act. Discussion of preference for Board of Forestry to be the policy-setting level for State Lands. FTLAC did not take a position on HB 2597.
- HB 2598 - Provides for revenue during a one year period (exceed expenses). **MOTION** passed in opposition to HB 2598.
- SB 460 - Requires harvesting in Tillamook with moderate to high Swiss needle cast. FTLAC thought direction is not needed from the legislature. A visit to Senator George to learn about his concerns could help clarify. No motion on SB 460.

Discussion points on conservation areas:

- Looking for a durable, transparent way to recognize conservation
- Land acquisition for production acreage or for conservation lands
- Authority to look for revenue.
- Looking for benefits for counties, conservation groups, and for Oregon – a win/win/win.

The Role of FTLAC

Tim Josi and Nancy Hirsch

Charter

The FTLAC Charter was last signed in 2000. FTLAC members will refresh the signature authority page to reflect current membership.

2011 schedule

Nancy Hirsch identified dates corresponding with Board policy decisions relating to topics of interest for the FTLAC. Tim Josi will review dates and coordinate scheduling with Mary Schmelz.

Overview of State Forests History

Doug Decker

Elements leading to state forest acquisition – 1920's and forward

- Growing economy - logging
- Privately owned lands that were underproductive, over-harvested, and burned over.
- Counties were faced with liabilities due to delinquent taxes and slash. The lands were moved into state ownership “to secure benefits for future generations”.
- County leadership developed ways to put policy into action by changing tax classification or deeding land to the state (Reforestation Act)
- The Forest Acquisition Act (1939) re-worked the Reforestation Act; “achieve Greatest Permanent Value” was first added to terminology.

Management sideboards for lands shifting into state ownership (1931)

- a) Continuous forest production to promote sustained yield forest management
- b) Water conservation and watershed protection
- c) Recreation

Early language drafted about goals of State Forests

- Model for other land management
- Acquiring Lands
- State forests seen as a hedge against economy
- Watershed protection
- Sustained yield forest production

Summary comment from State Forester Decker: Management of land has evolved over time. The previous focus on *timber* management evolved into a more holistic focus on *forest* management.

Suggestion: The FTLAC members requested that the speech Governor Sprague made to the predecessor of the Portland City Club be included in the historical overview document.

Note: FTLAC members asked that it be captured in history that counties paid for reforestation with reforestation bonds.

Further materials of interest on the history of State Forests:

- Interviews with Ed Schroeder, discussing the intended management of lands
- Historical document: two volume “History of State Forests”, Paul Levesque.
- Paul Levesque’ “Purpose of Lands” document.
- Chair Josi suggested it would be beneficial for FTLAC members to review court decisions from Crabtree and Forest Development fund.

Public Comments

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers, provided public comment on the importance of the CFTLC relationship to the Board of Forestry. He noted the status quo on these lands is underperforming revenue and economic benefits, the Forest Development Fund account balance is perilously low, and that forest management plans and strategies are very conservative.

Policy Hierarchy

Board policy work that led to plan changes

Mike Bordelon

The Board of Forestry adopted the definition “healthy productive sustainable forests that provide economic social and environmental values”. A management focus was included: “in order to secure healthy productive forests, we need to actively manage to produce sustainable timber revenue”. That set the stage to develop the 2001 Forest Management Plan (FMP) that broadly considered a suite of values, which included timber revenue and wildlife conservation. A model projected that 279 mil bf of timber could be achieved while habitat goals would still be met. Upon implementation, the plan didn’t produce 279 mil bf, however habitat goals, complex forest structure, and 50% landscape advancing toward older forest structure was accomplished.

The department and Board revised the plan over the last 5-7 years. The Board adopted a 30%/50% approach to structure based management with a Species of Concern focus. This lowered the modeled results of timber harvest to 196 mil bf. Specific Performance Measures (PM’s), e.g., projecting 20% complex structure in 20 years, have made a difference in how districts develop plans and move management toward the 30% complex goal. Chair Josi commented that PM’s are helpful, but the Board should use discretion when using PM’s to frame their decisions.

GPV and Planning rule update

Mike Cafferata

Two years ago, the Board decided to review the GPV and Planning rule. The Board solicited input from the public, staff, and committees, including the FTLAC’s input to keep a management focus in the plan. The Board will probably decide upon a similar rule and perhaps make organizational changes in the GPV rule. They have reserved the option of not making any changes. Chair Josi observed that consideration of changing the GPV and Planning rule should have preceded changing the FMP.

Recreation Management and Public Education

Doug Decker

Background/Overview

The idea of creating a recreation, education, and interpretative area on state forests began with HB2501, which charged the Department of Forestry and State Parks to create a comprehensive recreation plan, resulting in the development of recreation facilities and the interpretive facility. Because the department manages the lands, it made sense for it to run the facility with the insight and

technical support of State Parks. Volunteer funds contributed to the development of campgrounds and trails. Characteristics of state forest campgrounds are that they may charge fees, use camp hosts, have primitive amenities, and encourage dispersed recreation. One count reflected 350,000 visitors in one year along the highway 6 corridor, and visitation has increased at the Tillamook Forest Center.

Advisory committees in the Tillamook, Clatsop, and Santiam forests work with partners and users to chart the future of recreation. The department has worked hard to integrate recreation into its overall business; though it is not a source of revenue, it is key to reaching out to the public about the multiple values of state forests.

Recreation: Looking forward

Mike Cafferata

The department is building recreation into its plans like any other part of its business, by district, looking forward ten years. Recreation is budgeted as a core business function. Because timber revenue supports recreation, cuts have been made to the program due to the current economic downfall.

Funding

Funding is through a partnership with State Parks, who administer an ATV fund agreement. The department has authorization to spend up to \$1 million of this fund per biennium. About \$122,000 was generated in camping fees last year. State Parks funds four positions at the Tillamook Forest Center. Additionally, the department supplemented funding with an entrepreneurial spirit, through grants from various organizations.

Doug Decker mentioned the valuable work that South Fork Crew labor contributes to the recreation program.

Field tour of recreation facilities and recent harvest units

Adjourn

Materials referenced:

- *An Historical Overview of the Establishment of State Forest Lands*
- *Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee Charter, signed 2000*
- *Forest Value emphasis graphic, Oregon Department of Forestry*
- *Oregon Forestland by Owner (as percentages) 1985 – 2009 graphic, Oregon Department of Forestry*

Next Meeting: Friday, May 6, 2011, Department of Forestry, Salem, Santiam Room, Building D