

*~Final~*  
Committee for Family Forestlands  
Minutes  
November 28, 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 9:05 AM.

*Committee members present:*

Ron Cease	Gary Springer
Bill Arsenault	Greg Miller
Mike Cloughesy	

*Committee members absent:*

Fritz Ellett	Ned Livingston
--------------	----------------

*Staff present:*

Bernie Bochsler, ODF	Kevin Weeks
Julie Welp, ODF	Ted Lorensen

*Guests:*

Mike Gaudern, OSWA	Rex Storm, AOL
--------------------	----------------

**Agenda Items:**

1. Review Agenda
2. Approve Minutes
3. New Committee Bylaws and Members
4. Symposium Issues and Issue Scan
5. Ballot Measure 49
6. Symposium Priority Issues
7. CFF Work Plan
8. Other Business

**Approve minutes from October 30, 2007**

The minutes from October 30, 2007, were approved with changes.

**General Information**

Kevin Weeks was introduced as the new Agency Affairs representative for the committee.

**Ballot Measures 49 and 50**

A handout was passed around that showed the breakdown by county of how each voted on ballot measure 49 (land use) and 50 (cigarette tax). Measure 49 passed with 62% of yes votes, while measure 50 was defeated with 59% of no votes. The group discussed how the passage of measure 49 affected family forestlands. In some cases family forestlands are more valuable if developed for other uses. Greg said that if

landowners are able to maintain the economics of the forestland, with the infrastructure and market to sell the timber, people will continue to keep the land in forests. If those incentives are taken away, then owners will start looking at other viable options for their land. Mike C commented that the passage of 49 tells him that Oregonians want to keep their forests and farms, so we need to come up with a system that enables landowners to remain there. Ron said that he would talk to Peter Daugherty about what's going on at the Capitol regarding this issue and we can discuss the topic more at the next CFF meeting, and make a recommendation to the Board about the CFF's position.

Ted Lorensen joined the committee after lunch to discuss measure 49. He gave his perspective of what its passage means. He feels that measure 49 has more certainty than measure 37. Measure 49 tremendously reduces what a land use action is. Under 37, claims could be brought against any State regulation or land use ordinance. Measure 49 narrowed the scope considerably down to residential uses and, specifically, the Forest Practices Act and Agriculture practices under SB1010. On the residential use side, measure 49 will likely provide a higher level of certainty that what the measure does allow will occur. The committee discussed how it seemed the regulatory elements of measure 49 was rarely mentioned in the media or in the voter's pamphlet, so voters may not have completely understood what they were voting for. The legislature needs to take responsibility for growth management, or lack thereof. The department will be meeting with Richard Whitman and the Department of Agriculture to discuss the implications of measure 49.

As the discussion continued, Ron asked Ted if he thought it was possible to sustain the business of private forestry in Oregon. Ted responded that landowners might have to turn to other alternatives because of landowner holding costs. The cost of fire suppression, for example, is huge.

Bernie later asked Ted about extending the Forest Practices Act exemption for hybrid poplar plantations from the current 12-year rotation to a 20-year rotation. The status is that the parties sat down to negotiate an agreement and they decided to give the BOF authority to review the topic and decide whether it applies to the FPA above the current age limit. The department has crafted some legislation to give this authority to the Board, but that's as far as it's gone at this point.

### **Committee Membership**

Ron commented that we really must get membership needs resolved and move on. It can be difficult to recruit new members. Possible environmental members don't want to be a "token" member. Also, some possible members wonder if the committee has much of a role to play in forestry issues. Greg suggested talking to The Nature Conservancy, as they are always looking for ways to build relationships with landowners. Bill suggested McKenzie Trust. Mike C suggested Jim Johnson, or another extension faculty member from OSU, to replace Vivian Simon-Brown. Bill will talk to Rick Barnes about serving on the committee. Another suggestion included a

representative from BLM or other public lands. Any other suggestions on new members, including ex-officios, should be sent to Ron and Peter Daugherty.

### **Issue Scan - Symposium**

Bill told the committee about a letter the issue scan workgroup submitted into the issue scan process that included three questions about the symposium's issues. First, is a particular concern already being covered in the Board's work plan? If not, is it a subcategory of a work plan topic and if it is not a subcategory, does it need to be added? Ron asked Bill what his sense was about the work group meetings, what the issue scan group accomplished and what they will present to the department and the Board. Bill thought the process itself was very good. The function of the group was to relieve some of the burden of the Board having to go through 180 issue submissions and categorizing them. The issue scan work group prioritized the resulting categories. Ron wanted to be sure that the symposium priorities are included in the Board priorities. The CFF discussed the importance of working with other organizations, departments, agencies, etc. to accomplish some of our goals. We don't do enough coalition building. The committee went on to discuss and clarify several aspects of the symposium and Board priorities. Mike C mentioned a presentation that Peter Daugherty gave at a Tree Farm meeting; Mike would like him to make that same presentation to the CFF. It was about how the department can implement some of the issues related to keeping working forests working.

### **Next Meeting**

Tentatively, January 15, 16, 17, or 22 (first choice)