

**Committee for Family Forestlands  
Minutes  
July 17, 2007**

A meeting of the Committee for Family Forestlands (CFF) was held in the Santiam Room at ODF's Salem compound. Chair Ron Cease called the meeting to order at 9:00 AM.

*Committee members present:*

Ron Cease	Peter Hayes
Gary Springer	Ned Livingston
Mike Cloughesy	Bill Arsenault

*Committee members absent:*

Greg Miller	Fritz Ellett
Vlvane Simon-Brown	

*Staff present:*

Peter Daugherty

*Guests present:*

Mike Gaudern

**Agenda Items:**

1. Review Agenda
2. CFF Annual Report
3. Issue Scan
4. Spotted Owl Recovery Plan
5. CFF Charter
6. End of Legislative Session Report
7. What's Next
8. Symposium Priority Issues
9. Other Business

Peter D told the committee about his speech in Washington DC about active forest management and the group went on to discuss various current fires across the country.

**CFF Annual Report**

The committee discussed the draft CFF annual report. The involvement of the committee members in other projects and committees should be included. Also, several committee members rotate in writing a column for the OSWA newsletter. One topic covered in the annual report will be on the status of the sale of the nursery, and the requirement for the State to continue to guarantee the availability of certain seedlings. The community forest initiative was also discussed and will be added to the work plan. The continued development and implementation of the CFF communication plan will also be included in the annual report. The group continued to review the draft report and suggest and make changes. During the presentation of the report to the Board, we should ask the Board what they think we should be working on and thank them for their support during the Symposium. Viviane,

Gary, and Ron will be making a presentation at the SAF National Meeting in Portland in late October.

Peter D and Ron will present the committee's annual report to the Board at their September 5 meeting.

### **Issue Scan**

Peter D provided the committee with a draft of the committee's topics for the Board's Issue Scan. These issues came out of the Symposium and it needs to be made clear to the Board how important these issues are to family forestland owners. Suggestions were made to improve or clarify the document.

### **Spotted Owl Recovery Plan**

Peter H mentioned a discussion he had with Bob Salenger at Portland Audubon regarding barred owls. He asked what scientific basis there was in deciding what part of the barred owls moving in is about human intervention and change of landscape as opposed to just nature. This has been a key question with this issue for a long time. There will never be conclusive evidence about either factor, but you can't really rule them out either. In regards to this recovery plan, we should include some language that indicates proceeding with the barred owl control strategy we anticipate will create some significant issues with family forestland owners. If we go ahead with the strategy, we need to present a compelling case for it. We'll get further with landowner buy-in. At this point, we don't really have compelling evidence. Two things that Peter H thinks are missing in the plan is an articulate, well-thought-out strategy for dealing with the disincentives, and adequate funding to address the current problem. The group made more editorial suggestions. Once our report is final, it will be combined with similar reports from other agencies to create one recovery plan for the entire state.

### **Legislative Report**

The Department of Forestry has been given a seat on the Invasive Species Council. The authority of the seed bank has been given to itself. It had been tied to the nursery and state land, but didn't have independent authority. It also put the development of second generation seed in its cost of operation, so we now have a mechanism for moving forward with higher quality seed. The stewardship agreement will require a rewriting of the old rules. Some significant changes were made to the Forest Resource Trust. The changes should make it a better program. We will have to rewrite the analysis of need for the federal legacy bill, which expanded the legacy program. Peter D pointed out that almost all of the bills that the agency put forward made it through the legislative session, which speaks highly of the quality of work the agency has done on them. Peter went on to explain the budget realignment process and the options we have on which funds to use to fill various positions. The department did get funding for a Sudden Oak Death position, which will be located in Coos Bay. He also explained where he's proposing the funding should go, one of which is the training/GIS position in Salem. Cutting that position several years ago has made it more difficult for newer staff, particularly in the field, to learn their jobs. We hope to get these new positions in October. Mike wanted to compliment Peter on his management foresight. Peter H brought up the perception the environmental community has that because of reduced funding, there hasn't been as much effort put into enforcement and what's the point of having the law if we're not enforcing it. We going to deal with the

conservation world one way or another and dealing with them in constructive, positive ways (such as with the Symposium) is better than putting them in a defensive position. Peter D talked about involving them more. Gary commented that the environmental community needs to step up more. He didn't see anyone from the conservation community testify at any of ODF's legislative budget hearings.

Peter H wanted some input from the committee on an idea he has about meeting with the conservation organizations that were involved the Symposium. He would like to sit down informally with them and chat about the outcomes of the Symposium, what things are they already doing. Give them credit for things we don't know they're doing. What options interest them in encouraging communication and cooperation between family forestland owners and the conservation nonprofits? What is most on their minds about the future of Oregon's forests? How do they feel about ODF and are there common goals between them and ODF? The committee liked the idea.

### **Revised Charter**

The committee reviewed and discussed the revised charter and bylaws for the CFF. In the past, the public-at-large person has been chair of the committee. It's always been that way, but should it be in the by-laws. Peter H mentioned two names that he's been recommended as possible public-at-large/chairs: Gail Achterman and Janet McClennon. Ron recommended that each member will continue to serve until they are replaced. There also discussion on what to do about members who are appointed, but just aren't active. That is a disadvantage to the committee. Peter H commented that we need to make new members' participation clear when they're invited to join the committee and maybe have some kind of orientation as well. Mike recommended George Brown, former dean of the College of Forestry. It was also suggested that for committee positions that are not designated family forestland owners, preference be given to someone who has knowledge and experience related to family forestry. That might be too restrictive, though. It was decided that Ron will call Fritz Ellett and Greg Miller about their status on the committee. Ned will serve another term. The group continued to make changes to the document.

### **What's Next**

The committee needs to figure out how best to help the department and the Board in moving forward with what came out of the Symposium. Several suggestions were discussed. Peter D spoke about the funding process at the federal level, including various grants. The group also discussed how future meetings might be scheduled, maybe longer meetings every eight weeks, instead of every six weeks.

### **Next Meeting**

September 10