

ANNUAL JOINT STEWARDSHIP MEETING
December 15, 2022 via Zoom

Participants

Cascade Pacific & Facilitators

1. Kirk Shimeall, ASG, SSG & SUDSG Facilitator
2. Jane Barth, HSG and MPSG Facilitator
3. Kailey Kornhauser, Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative Facilitator
4. Connie Barnes, Assistant Stewardship Coordinator

SNF, USFS

1. Robert Sanchez, Supervisor
2. Katie Isacksen, Forest Planner and Stewardship Manager
3. Chelsea Monks,
4. Donnie Vogel, Hebo District Ranger
5. Hannah Smith
6. Zeke Langum
7. Kevin Bruce
8. Brandy Langum
9. Kate Richardson
10. Chuck Fisher
11. Matt Smith
12. Bill Conroy, Hebo RD
13. Paul Burns, Fisheries Biologist

Stewardship Group Participants

1. Jesse Ort, Benton County Parks and Natural Areas
2. Kathleen Westley, MRWC
3. Ann Young- Mathews, NRCS
4. Kristi Foster, TEP
5. Dave Shively, NNSLWC
6. Mizu Burgess, SWC
7. Jesse Jones, SWC
8. Bill Blackwell, ODRC
9. Andrew Esterson, IAE
10. Rosemary Pazdral, SWC Executive Director
11. Jack Singer, Pacific Forest Trust
12. Seth Mead, SSWCD
13. Paul Katen, SDWC
14. Jeff Uebel, AFRANA and MPSG
15. Jeff Hollenbeck, COC
16. Sherry Vick, LSWCD
17. Paul Atwood, ODFW
18. Conrad Ely, TEP
19. Shane Hetzler, Trout Mountain Forestry
20. Jazmin Garcia-Lawson
21. Paul Englemeyer, Portland Audubon
22. Rhonda Black, Umpqua SWCD
23. Aaron Groth,
24. Jordon Latter, Graduate Student, Audubon

Meeting Notes

I. Welcome Session

The meeting opening with remarks from Forest Supervisor Robert Sanchez. A few highlights were:

- Thank you to stewardship groups for their good work over many years
- Increase in USFS time on stewardship work as more projects and more complex projects are proposed with the increased retained receipts that have been created past few years
- 3 buckets of work/funding
- Changes in/restrictions on how can use certain “colors” of funds
- Employee turnover and constraints on filling positions

II. Stewardship Program and Funding Process Overview

Stewardship Program Lead, Katie Isacksen gave an overview of the Siuslaw National Forest’s current stewardship program structure and processes. Topics she covered included:

- Stewardship Board structure, membership, responsibilities
- Level of funding commitment anticipated into future
- Staff capacity issues related to stewardship fund cycle
- NEPA and Categorical Exclusions approach overview with more details to follow in Section 106 and Aquatics sections later in meeting

Katie also explained changes to the Coast Range Stewardship Fund Application Form and Timeline such as:

- Funding allocation: Set amount of funding available for off-forest projects rather than determining by annual retained receipts. Setting amount at \$400,000 with possibility of adding more funds at the end of a year if receipts are higher than anticipated.
- Approach: Pre-application now a firm Y/N to proceed point; assessing readiness; need well-developed project as no longer able to develop as gather input during the funding cycle; reassurance to applicants that if not ready this year can apply next year
- January 31st is pre-application deadline so project proponents need to present ideas to their stewardship group during January meetings
- Stewardship Board wants to bring back engagement with stewardship groups on on-forest retained receipts projects. They will be coming out with their list in the spring.

More information can be found in her [PowerPoint slides](#).

Her presentation was followed by a Q&A session.

Q: What is the best time of year for site visits to complex project sites with USFS specialists?

A: Advised to request a site visit as early as possible in project development work. This can be any time of year with summer being the most difficult due to fire season. Advised to think about a 2-year timeframe for developing complex projects.

Q: Paul Engelmeyer stated his request for a site visit to Poole Creek.

A: Advised to contact Katie to determine if the site meets Wyden criteria to then proceed to project development.

Q: In the past there were some conversations about using retained receipts to purchase small inholdings. This approach would help reduce fragmentation and secure blocks of habitat. Is that something that would be possible now?

A: Robert commented that he sees the stewardship groups as a place where discussion on how the USFS should invest across the landscape can take place.

Q: Could retained receipts be used to close roads in sensitive areas?

A: Retained receipts have been used for that purpose on forest. Can contact the USFS to suggest road closures. There wasn't a response about closing off-forest roads with this funding.

III. Section 106 and SHPO

Kevin Bruce presented on Section 106 requirements and funding. He gave tips for applicants then answered questions. Details can be found in [his PowerPoint slides](#). A couple key points:

- If a project is likely to have adverse effects and need mitigation the USFS likely would not want to proceed with funding the project. The USFS can only take on 2-3 complete Section 106 evaluations each year.
- When consultants do Section 106 work with the funds in a pot at CPRCD, the USFS still must spend time reviewing and signing off on consultants' reports.

Q: If we are retreating sites where we already did large wood placement in the past, would that still trigger Section 106 review?

A: The applicant should explain that the new project is for work in previously-disturbed areas. This would likely result in a "no likely adverse effects" decision. Kevin added that many of the decisions on stewardship projects could be covered in a programmatic agreement but they do not have that legally in place yet. He hopes to have such an agreement in place with SHPO within 2 years.

Q: What needs to be included in the pre-application?

A: Any existing surveys if have them and explanation of past activity at sites.

Q: If we are planting only 2" deep, would that trigger Section 106?

A: The potential for disturbance still must be assessed. Applicant should explain intended work and state prior disturbances of project site to help lead to a "no adverse effects" conclusion.

IV. Aquatics

Brandy Langum reviewed the questions related to aquatics in the Pre-Application and explained how the team would evaluate applications. Some points she made were:

- The team will evaluate whether the project focuses on species that are ESA priority when weighing the comparative benefits of aquatics projects.
- They want projects to be using the right tools to get goals met. Applications should explain what the goals are, how you plan to meet them and what issues/challenges you may be facing to develop the project. Include at minimum a 30% concept plan in pre-application. This information will help the specialists know if/how they can assist in project design.
- Their goal is to limit the amount of back and forth with applicants during the funding decision process.
- The Stream Simulation Design Manual must be followed. A link to it is included in the pre-application.
- Applicants should state clearly what portion of the overall project is to be funded by retained receipts.

Q: Will the USFS require a stamp if county is not requiring one?

A: Possibly. The USFS is most interested in structures.

V. Wrap Up Discussion

Q: There was no presentation on wildlife consultation? Are there any changes in that arena?

A: No changes yet. Some "candidate" species on the SNF may add to their workload and impact project applications if/when they get "listed."

A: The mitigation measures appendix was included in the application packet to provide information related to wildlife. Applicants are encouraged to look at that as they write proposals.

A: They are very understaffed but are hiring 3 new staff.

VI. Tee Up 2nd Bigger Picture Meeting in early 2022

CPRCD and the USFS are convening a second joint stewardship groups' meeting in early 2022. They will put out a WhenToMeet poll with February date options. This second workshop will look at the Mission, Work, Schedule in Future for the Stewardship Program. Potential agenda items are:

- Stewardship Groups: What's do you see as the mission for the coming 3-5-10 years?
- What is in the scope of work for the stewardship groups beyond retained receipts projects now that the forest-wide collaborative is up and running? (e.g. timber sales review, on-forest projects review, convening ad hoc groups around topics of common interest like beaver)
 - Collaborative Coordinator share about collaborative scope.
 - SG participants share about history of stewardship group scope as compared with recent years
- Who can be recruited to participate in stewardship groups versus collaborative given this scope?
- Ideas for meeting schedule given scope and funding timeline: Dec/Jan (project ideas), March (pre-app results), July/August (prioritize for RT), Oct (debrief RT and look ahead); field trips? Annual meeting?