

**JOINT STEWARDSHIP GROUP
MEETING NOTES
January 20, 2016 10:00 to 3:30 pm
Yachats Commons
Yachats, Oregon**

Attendees:

Name	Affiliation	Name	Affiliation
Kirk Shimeall	ASG & SSG Facilitator	Jerry Ingersoll	USFS-SNF – SO
Jane Brass Barth	HSG & MPSG Facilitator	Aaron Duzik	Lincoln SWCD; HSG; ASG
Jeff Uebel	USFS-SNF – SO	Deanna Williams	USFS-SNF-SO
Vicky Mugnai	USFS-SNF-CCRD/ODNRA	Wayne Patterson	USFS-SNF – Hebo RD
Matt Mellenthin	IRM, MPSG	Marc Barnes	IRM, ASG
Dave Eisler	SSG	Casey Hawes	USFS-SNF-CCRD/ODNRA
Johnny Sundstrom	SSG	Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild, SSG, ASG
Connie Barnes	CPRCD	Elmer Ostling	AWC, ASG
Paul Engelmeyer	TWC/Audubon, ASG	Carl Ostling	Landowner
Karen Fleck-Harding	MRWC; MPSG	Kami Ellingson	USFS-SNF-SO
Carl Bauer	USFS-SNF-CCRD/ODNRA	Tom Davis	AWC, ASG
Jane Kertis	USFS-SNF-SO	Fran Recht	PSMFC, ASG
Shawn Smith	USFS-SNF-CCRD/ODNRA	Donni Vogel	USFS-SNF-CCRD/ODNRA
Jon Porier	USFS-SNF-Hebo RD	Laura Hoffman	USFS-SNF
Aaron Hutchinson	Freres Lumber, HSG	Deb Wilkins	USFS-SNF-Hebo RD
Seth Mead	Siuslaw SWCD, SSG	David Harris	TEP; HSG
Mike Kennedy	Siletz Tribe; SSG, ASG, HSG	Michele Dragoo	USFS-SNF-Hebo RD
Melissa Newman	Lincoln SWCD; ASG	Jennifer Ward	City of Corvallis, MPSG
Darin Stringer	Ecotrust	Kathy Plaza	Alsea Community Effort
Barb Trask	Alsea Community Effort		
Katie Danks	NRCS		

Welcome/Introductions/Agenda Overview

This meeting is the seventh annual gathering of the different stewardship groups on the Siuslaw National Forest. It is convened to share topical presentations, share project ideas, move forward on collaborative issues and hear and give feedback to the annual multi-party monitoring report. Presentation materials will be posted on CPRCD’s website. There was a brief introduction of the participants.

Climate Change in the Coast Range: Effects and Response on the Siuslaw National Forest Service, Presenters Jane Kertis, SNF Ecologist and Kami Ellingson, SNF Watershed Restoration Program Manager http://www.cascadepacificstewardship.org/smartlist_41/meetings-publications/meetings-publications

Climate change will be incorporated in the FS mission and strategic plan: assess risks and vulnerabilities, engage partners and manage for resilience. The FS developed a 10-point

scorecard to report accomplishments and plans for improvement on ten questions in four dimensions: organizational capacity, engagement, adaptation, and mitigation and sustainable operations. By 2015, each forest and grassland is expected to answer yes to at least seven of the ten scorecard questions, with at least one yes in each dimension. The Siuslaw has achieved eight out of the ten scorecard questions. The goal is to create a balanced approach to climate change that includes managing forests and grasslands to adapt to changing conditions, mitigating climate change, building partnerships across boundaries and preparing employees to understand and apply emerging science.

Dimensions (4)	Scorecard element (10)
Org Capacity	1. Employee education 2. Designated climate change coordinators 3. Program guidance
Engagement	
Adaptation	
Mitigation & Sustainable Consumption	4. Science and management partnerships 5. Other partnerships 6. Assessing vulnerability 7. Adaptation actions 8. Monitoring 9. Carbon assessment and stewardship 10. Sustainable operations

Roadmap to Success-the FS will respond to climate change in three connected ways

Assess

- current risks/vulnerabilities
- policies
- knowledge gaps

Engage

- with employees and stakeholders
- science and management partners
- alliances/Outreach-maintain current partnerships and develop new ones
- build understanding through education

Manage

- adaptation
- mitigation
- sustainable consumption strategies

Data from the mid-1800s to 2000 show

- a trend in increase of temps by 1.5°F (all models agree on a significant degree of warming across all seasons, minimum and maximum temperatures are rising seasonally with the greatest increase in temperature and greatest decrease in precipitation occurring in the summer)
- shifts in extreme events, sea level rise, changes in fire regime
- impacts to roads, infrastructure, vegetation, habitat

NW Oregon partnered with Conservation Biology Institute in 2014 on a pilot project involving Willamette NF, Siuslaw NF, Mt Hood NF and Salem and Eugene BLM. The project was intended to develop future climate projections, evaluate effects on select vulnerable resources, assess ecological ramifications and evaluate adaptation/mitigation actions. Study tasks examined water quality and quantity, municipal watersheds, water supply, pressures on water resources, increased pressure on infrastructure and road network by flooding and increasing tides, timing of increased rain and tidal events, restoration as mitigation, vegetation-late successional habitat, impacts to cold water habitats, wildlife T&E habitat and large wildfire potential with current, 2030 and 2050 models. Next steps: expand partnerships, evaluate coast specific issues and develop a coast vulnerability assessment by 2017. Siuslaw implementation: NEPA documents and planning will incorporate climate change assessments; adaptation actions would include and occur on non-FS lands necessitating additional partnerships.

Annual Multi-Party Monitoring Report and Discussion of Proposed Enhancements

Presenters Marc Barnes, IRM; Laura Hoffman, SNF

http://www.cascadepacificstewardship.org/smartlist_41/meetings-publications/meetings-publications

- Bio-physical and Socio Economic Accomplishments
 - FY14 monitoring goals
 - FY14 economic impacts
 - accomplishments: activities associated with IRTC contracts, on and off FS lands retained receipts projects (vegetation management, invasives control, stream, lake or wetland treatment, road work)
 - Fiddle & Morris Creeks Riparian Restoration project highlights
 - monitoring database upgrades will help with annual and cumulative reporting and be exportable to FVS format for ease of use by FS silviculture
- Goals for FY15 Monitoring:
 - continue with biophysical and economic monitoring and key in on stand exam data
- Stand growth modeling and Silvicultural pathways
 - capture what forest looks like in FVS and see where they're heading
 - characteristics common to Old-growth Douglas-fir forests; how did old growth stands develop those characteristics?
 - what are the desired future conditions (DFC)?
 - what problems are we facing when we try to move plantations to mature/old growth forest?
 - treatment v no treatment
 - what trajectory are plantations on?
 - answers to questions
 - should we be thinning: yes
 - won't they get to DFC by themselves? probably not, maybe never
 - do commercial thinnings drive stands toward our desired future condition: sort of

- is one thinning enough? no
- what silvicultural practices might we use to increase stand differentiation and prevent clumped diameter distributions in the future?
 - actively manage for the introduction of new cohorts (GAPS)
 - unthinned areas should be better distributed throughout each unit (SKIPS)
 - more thinning will be required in the future to keep the stands moving towards our DFC
- audience question about meadow restoration/creation for wildlife. The FS is looking into the long-term process of restoring early seral conditions; FS needs to read the landscape carefully and is currently developing a meadow inventory
- ArcGIS online mapping (Marc Barnes invited the audience to forward their input to him)
 - project maps will orient and inform stewardship groups
 - will be available to the public
 - will show SG boundaries/zones
 - includes layer list
 - includes tools (to measure, swipe, and capture imagery)
 - will include project stories
 - will include annual reporting

Oregon Federal Forest Health Program Overview and Update

Presenter Chad Davis, ODF

http://www.cascadepacificstewardship.org/smartlist_41/meetings-publications/meetings-publications

In 2013 Oregon began allocating money to a program, Federal Forest Health (FFH), to improve federal forest lands which comprise 60% of the state's forestland. The program's core business model is intended to improve the health of watersheds, ecological resiliency, and habitat structure and function.

- Economic and social benefits - jobs are being created by restoration projects, including non-timber jobs, program also enhances recreation
- Oregon's approach started at the ground-level; investing in collaboratives as a model works
- Emphasis started on the east-side ("dry side") of the Cascade Mountains; fire ecology was the driver
- FFH program is now shifting statewide to include projects on the west side of the Cascades; federal timber supply is a key driver in many rural economies; west side model will be more complex
- Project development grants scope out at about \$300K, collaborative planning grants scope out at approximately \$200K
- Legislature is looking for implementation this biennium
- Lean forward, be creative in approach
- This program is evolving, there is a commitment to do the work necessary in the partnership world
- In the first round of proposals this biennium, CPRCD received \$40,455 to help supplement facilitation of the four Siuslaw Stewardship groups, Monitoring, and Dunes/Smith River

Stewardship Group development. In addition, the SNF had 3 proposals funded for a total of \$228,700 for road maintenance, MAMU surveys, and sale layout.

Reflection and Renewal Discussion

Presenters Jerry Ingersoll and Jeff Uebel, SNF

- Purpose of Stewardship Groups (SG) Reflection Process
 - we're doing great work! In December 2015 the Siuslaw received an award from the FS Chief for *Meeting America's Needs* through stewardship and timber programs. Similarly, the Siuslaw received a *Rise to the Future* award in 2013 and received recognition in 2010 from the *Two Chiefs Partnership* award program recognizing efforts to promote conservation and stewardship
 - as we consider the future of SGs, how do we want our SGs to work so that we can continue to live up to our ideals about collaboration?
 - is there a place for SGs in policy and planning?
 - on the west side of the Cascades, SGs are watershed specific. Do SGs want to achieve other goals?
 - are there issues SGs want to address on a larger scale? If so, how do we best move forward with our collaboration in its current form? Is there another structure through which we can distinguish, improve or possibly transform the collaborative relationships?
 - we're doing a great job telling our story of stewardship, how do we maintain enthusiasm, participation and engage others?
 - Starting work to convene a new 5th stewardship group in the Dunes/Smith River area since that is the only part of the SNF not currently covered by a SG. Funding to CPRCD from FFHP supports work to convene this group over the next year.
 - there's an opportunity to meet with the Smith River Watershed Council this month

Sharing of Ideas for What Stewardship Groups Could Work On

- Kathy Plaza & Barb Trask - Alsea Community Effort, non-profit board members
 - Alsea is in an important watershed area
 - this non-profit made it possible to fund the community's library
 - the group is looking for collaboration on a 40-acre upslope conservation acquisition opportunity that would generate income for the library
 - acquisition would provide resource management for marbled murrelet habitat, legacy wetlands, prairie and oak
 - acquisition would provide opportunities for outdoor education and recreation, generating revenue for the community library
- Chandra LeGue, Oregon Wild
 - agrees that SGs have focused on allocating money for projects and would like to see SG involvement with the policy and planning side increase.
 - Chandra proposed that SGs might want to start smaller ad-hoc groups to work with USFS IDTs (Inter-Disciplinary Teams)
- Paul Engelmeyer, Audubon and Wetlands Conservancy
 - supports Chandra LeGue's idea

- is interested in the incorporation of the latest science in project planning
- Tripartite (land acquisition opportunities): inholdings that meet conservation principles are out there and should be a priority for SGs

Group Table Discussions took place during the lunch hour and were shared after lunch for purposes of seeding future discussions. Two primary topics emerged:

- How to best leverage the tripartite opportunity
 - there is keen interest in a strategy for acquisition protection and conservation
 - maps are needed
 - how best to prioritize candidate properties
 - issue raised by Johnny Sundstrom: is a net gain of public lands ideal? once land goes into the federal property bank there's no revolving door; consider exchanges and conservation easements instead. Jeff Uebel's response: other partners could hold the land or easement
 - Next steps: to engage and keep the conversation going SG participants will get connected with the existing SNF nuclear group working on tripartite land exchange. Paul Engelmeyer agreed to be the point person and "champion" for moving this interest of the SGs forward with SNF staff who were very open to SG involvement.

- Science in Forest Management Decisions and Project Planning
 - SGs can help make connections among those interested in latest science with agency and non-agency scientists. Can organize presentations at meetings.
 - FS (Deana Williams)to provide notification of monthly meetings
 - obtain FS timeline for planning, prioritizing
 - engage with IDT during planning not just at public comment times – how do we interact with IDT in real time? Field trips early in NEPA process have been effective. SNF open to having SG participants go out in the field with IDT members more frequently to give direct input
 - redefine monitoring, consider biological monitoring
 - citizen science approach; develop funding and alternative management opportunities; interest in testing alternative strategies
 - find "up until implementation of sales" points to get involved
 - can we utilize current information now and help get new science integrated?
 - can groups plug in post NEPA and before implementation? Where can we find the flexibility and opportunities beyond responses to scoping letters?
 - Donni Vogel advised group there's an Indian Creek Project public meeting Jan 21 in Mapleton
 - NEXT STEP to move forward on this interest area will be to create a working group of interested SG members. This will be a standing entity with members across all the SGs. The SNF will communicate with this group to figure out and then pursue ways

to increase SG involvement in planning processes and management decisions. Volunteers for the new committee are: Fran Recht, Marc Barnes, Chandra LeGue, Elmer Osterling, Dave Eisler and Karen Fleck-Harding. Donni Vogel, Jeff Uebel and Jon Poirer will champion partner dialogues during project planning stages. Jane and Kirk will communicate with the champions to find out what kind of support they would like from us as facilitators.

Local Economic Area Definition (see at end of this document)

- Siuslaw NF presented two alternative definitions for SG consideration [handout provided]
- Stewardship timber sale contracts are best value contracts, of which one key value is utilization of local workforce
- There is interest in maximizing receipts
- Currently we have four stewardship group specific definitions of “what’s local”
- We have multiple purchasers interested in bidding on stewardship contracts today; initially bidders were reluctant to bid on stewardship contracts
- FS proposed to the Roundtable that SGs come up with one definition
- There is SG interest in utilization of the local workforce as a key value
- Our current definition ends up emphasizing where sawmills are, which cannot be changed
- The FS is presenting a second draft of the definition (handout), with two alternatives, for SG consideration; the alternatives are combinable
- Members are interested in taking the alternative definitions back to WCs and SGs for discussion
- The recommendation by SGs is not binding, it can be tried for a pre-determined period of time
- Suggestion by Chandra LeGue: revisit SG local area definitions and combine so don’t have 3 different ones in Central Coast District
- Carl Ostling suggested bringing the sawmill to the land (for smaller sales)
- Karen Fleck-Harding inquired about reducing the weight of the utilization of local workforce criteria. Casey Hawes responded that there are no percentages in best value contracting (percentages are not permitted in the federal regulations that govern the award of timber sale contracts).
- Fran Recht posed a question about the technical proposal value: is the latest science expected to be a part of the proposal?; e.g., climate resiliency. Response was not currently, but an interesting idea to consider.
- Issue: local contractors are seeing out-of-area contractors do the work in their own backyard. Question from industry: how many local contractors are available in the local area? consider the larger question: what is the boost to the local economy, despite where the workers are from?
- Jerry Ingersoll: can we expand our definition of what’s local?
- Next steps: bring your recommendation to your SG, to CPRCD and directly to Jeff Uebel. Will aim to have closure on this issue by Spring Roundtable meeting.

Member Updates/Announcements

Siuslaw NF - Jeff Uebel

- Board of Directors met in December. 99% of the proposals were approved, resolution of issues (wildlife-friendly fencing) for one project was achieved and is in the hands of the RO
- Frank Davis retired, a new liaison to MSG will be appointed, position will be filled by April
- SNF org chart having to do with stewardship is updated and on CPRCD's site; SG boundary map will be linked

SNF org chart: <http://www.cascadepacificstewardship.org/shop/wpimages/siuslaw-nf-stewardship-org-chart-1-19-16-1.pdf>

Oregon Wild – Chandra LeGue

Currently working with partners to get an initiative on the ballot to reform forest practices on non-public lands. The initiative will include bans on aerial spraying and clearcutting steep slopes in drinking watersheds.

Meeting adjourned at 3:40

Siuslaw National Forest Proposal: Local Community Definition, for consideration in evaluation of Stewardship Integrated Resource Timber Contracts

Elements in Common

- Reduce the weight given to the “Utilization of Local Workforce” criterion in evaluation of technical proposals.
- Let the evaluation board review the price proposal after (only after) they have finished evaluating the technical proposal. This will give the interdisciplinary board the whole picture and might help them provide a better recommendation of best value to the contracting officer.
- Insure that the sideboards for evaluating proposals are clearly defined and understood by all evaluation board participants since the board changes for each IRTC technical review.

Alternative A: Identify two zones which would define the Local Community for Siuslaw IRTC contracts-

- a. The Hebo Zone, defined in collaboration with the Hebo Stewardship Group; and
- b. The Central Coast Zone, defined as the sum of the zones identified collaboratively by the Siuslaw, Alsea, and Marys Peak Stewardship Groups.

Sales on the CCRD would use the CCRD zone to define “local.” Sales on the HRD would use the HRD zone.

This would increase competition, allow more purchasers to participate on an equal footing in stewardship contracts, align the work of stewardship groups across the Siuslaw NF, and align with Forest Service organizational boundaries while still honoring the interest in local preference.

Alternative B (if approved by the RO):

Retain the current four zones defining Local Community. However, in evaluating technical proposals for “Utilization of Local Workforce,” consider only the contribution of field-based workers and contractors (loggers, road builders, truckers, etc). Do not give any weight to the location of the manufacturing facility to which the logs are delivered.

In other words, a purchaser with a sawmill outside the local area could still compete on an equal basis with a purchaser with a local sawmill as long as they each used local employees for the woods work. This proposal is different than the R6 Standard Template for IRTC contracts (designed to support local manufacturing infrastructure in places where sawmills are few, scattered, and dependent on Federal timber), but the Regional Stewardship Program may be willing to consider it.

This would increase competition, allow more purchasers to participate on an equal footing in stewardship contracts, and honor the individuality of each stewardship group, while retaining a local preference for woods workers.

The two alternatives could also be combined (two zones, with consideration given only for woods workers).