



Blue Mountains Forest Partners

Our Mission

“Blue Mountains Forest Partners is a diverse group of stakeholders who work together to create and implement a shared vision to improve the resilience and well-being of forests and communities in the Blue Mountains.”

Operations Committee Meeting Agenda

Meeting Overview:

- **Date of Meeting:** May 16, 2019
- **Time:** 5:00 – 7:00 pm
- **Location:** John Day Airport Conference Room
- **Facilitator:** Mark
- **Minutes Scribe:** Pam Hardy

- **Call to Order: Introductions, changes to the agenda, agenda approval (5 minutes)**

Senator Merkley will be in Grant County 9-10 am May 30 at the Madden Bldg.

Changes to agenda: none

- **Approval of April 2018 Full Group minutes (5 minutes)**

approved

- **Ops' update (5 minutes, Mark)**

Finances are fine

Field Trips for the summer

Preview of Kerry's Talk today

Field Trip to Elk 16 – aspen tx's are striking, conifer could be better

Mark's trip to DC: Spoke with FS & NRCS leadership as well as Congressionals

Advocated for better veg mgmt in riparian areas.

- **Forest Service project updates (10 minutes, Blue Mountain & Prairie City RDs)**

Blue Mtn: Ragged Ruby & Austin comments will open soon.

Prairie City: no changes since last month

- **Presentation & discussion: Project Implementation Tracking (45 minutes, Kerry & Roy)**

Update on process that began +/- 2 years ago based on BMFP request.

[Link to PowerPoint](#)



Blue Mountains Forest Partners

19 Decisions have been signed since 2008.

600,000+ acres under NEPA signed decisions = 37% of the forest

290,000 acres are planned for some kind of Treatment. That could be commercial or PCT.

Trend toward larger projects areas & more planned prescribed fire.

76,507 acres have been treated.

On average, 70% of planned treatments are being completed.

Landsat imagery showed that fire was the biggest source of change.

Where you zoom in you can see the effects of treatments.

In some cases Landsat shows where the databases are not complete

(evidence of change within treatment boundaries that was not recorded in databases yet)

60% of the commercial treatments have been accomplished.

20% of PCT

10% of prescribed fire.

One probable reason: Commercial has to happen first.

But the cost of the rest will likely be a barrier to completion.

About 30,000 acres of Commercial shelf stock right now.

That's not a lot of shelf stock. It will get awarded next year.

But the PCT & Rx Fire takes money, and we don't have currently it,

We're way behind – have 170,000 acres of Rx Fire in shelf stock.

Q: If an area that needs Rx fire burns in a wildfire, does it count as completed?

A: Yes, if it accomplishes the goals for the land. No otherwise.

Q: Can we develop a way to see if we're getting the basal area we want?

A: It takes "training," but it might work.

All you need is a Google Earth account.

There's not currently a record of why there is a discrepancy between

- What was planned in NEPA

- What was put into FACTS as a planned project

Examples: further field inspections showed not enough actual timber volume, dropped during objections, an unexpected archeological site found

New system will have a way to track that.

Q: Can you track the acreage of tx's that required Forest Plan Amendments

A: That's not in the database. It would require an individual to review past decisions by hand.

C: Could really help with Cumulative Effects analysis, especially considering the current legal situation.

- **Presentation & discussion: Accomplishments to date on Dad's project (30 minutes, Roy)**

This was the 1st project BMFP agreed to.

See handout

We've completed less than was planned. Key reason: Skyline units were dropped from sale because they were cost prohibitive.

Offered as a timber sale, not stewardship, so RO & WO together got about 30% of KV & Salvage Sale Fund dollars. KV is for "essential reforestation". Cost to complete PCT was way more than KV funds.



Blue Mountains Forest Partners

Early lesson in donut holes around old growth. It didn't work.
Good example of "adaptive mgmt." We're not doing it any more.

There are some remaining areas that were planned for PCT, but that haven't been contracted yet.
Ed Clark is looking at the area for Rx Fire right now.

Q: Dad's is adjacent to Austin Idaho.
Could we relook at some of the Dad's area while we're doing that project?
A: That's a lot of extra work.

Discussion: burning some of the western units in Dads will be difficult because it will take a lot of hand-line to keep fire out of the roadless area immediately to the NW. There are big questions about whether it's worth the staff time. However, there are communities in the area that could be at risk with the wrong wind.

Q: Could we do a CE to light a fire in roadless area? There seemed to be agreement around the table that it's a good idea.

We'll address Damon next month.

- **Presentation and discussion: Various USFS contract mechanisms used for timber harvest/mechanical thinning (30 minutes, Roy)**

See handout

Good Neighbor Agreements: State can lay out, and administer a timber sale. They can cover their own costs, and put any dollars received back into stewardship.

There is an existing master agreement with the State of Oregon.
They use their own contracting mechanisms & their employees.
They still have to follow FS NEPA & Fish & Wildlife law
They could do the NEPA, but haven't been on the Malheur

IF it's a timber sale they use the project income to do restoration work.

It doesn't have to be commercial.
Could be fuels work which would still be paid for by the FS.

Collaboration is not required by federal legislation,
but is desired by the State of Oregon.

Stewardship Agreements:

Malheur is doing one with Wild Turkey Federation
They're going to sell the timber & do the restoration in the aspen on Starr.
The partner is expected to match funds at 20%.

10 Year Stewardship Contract is an IRSC

Contractor Selection: What is "Best Value"?

Allowed to consider more factors than just price.
Contractor offers a technical proposal: equipment, methods etc.
Past performance, benefit to the local community are key considerations



Blue Mountains Forest Partners

Product Value:

Timber sale income goes to a bunch of places including 25% to the County (but not when SRS is in place – SRS funds replace timber sale funds)
SRS funds have been more than timber sale funds would have been for the past few years at least.
Stewardship Agreements: retained receipts stay on the forest.

Good Neighbor: Forest decides where the receipts go in partnership with the State. Covers ODF costs & can even be used for NEPA. Depends on the Master Agreement.
Recent amendments allow tribes & counties to enter into these agreements.

On Dad's there probably would have been about \$40,000 more dollars on the ground for restoration if it had been done as an IRTC, rather than a timber sale.

Wyden has seen the 10-year as an example of success.
The biomass (torrefaction) investments are because of that.
The long contracts are incentive for making capital investments.

Most of the Malheur NF timber is going through the 10-year Stewardship.

Comment: Timelines are shorter under stewardship contracts. After the commercial volume is removed it often leaves very short windows to get the PCT done. It would cost less and get more restoration done if the PCT contractors had more time to complete projects. Perhaps those two time lines (time to complete the commercial removal & time to complete the PCT) could be separated.

Comment: Some would appreciate more straight up timber sales.

Q: Why?

A: Feels like there is more opportunity for competition.

At least one sale/year must be an "open" sale

The local mill is an SBA mill.

70% of the wood that comes from an SBA sale must go to an SBA mill.

Q: How much more money stays in the community as a result of stewardship

A: We're not losing the 25% that would go to State, or the Salvage etc.

There is an Ecosystem Workforce Project [paper](#) on the MNF website that offers an objective analysis.

Comment: There was a similar analysis done on the Mt. Hood. link [here](#).

In 2018 all sales were timber sales.

Iron Triangle still got most of them. Few other bids.

- **Friday field trip to Big Mosquito Planning area**

field trip cancelled

- **Other business**

- **Adjourn**

at 7:13 pm



Blue Mountains Forest Partners

Blue Mountains Forest Partners Vision, Guiding Principles, and Grounds Rules for Collaboration

Our Vision

The Blue Mountains Forest Partners represents a broad constituency of stakeholders interested in healthy forest ecosystems, economic vitality and quality of life in Grant County, Oregon. We provide the US Forest Service with proposals for management of National Forest lands, and we support the utilization of forest resources and related opportunities to strengthen local economies.

Guiding Principles

- *To promote forest restoration in Grant County, integrating ecological, economic and community needs that have been developed and/or prioritized through collaboration.*
- *To improve our ability to work collaboratively and participate actively in these issues, finding common ground for our work. Our process will be open, inclusive and encourage participation of diverse stakeholders; our meetings will provide a 'safe' space for discussion and sharing of ideas.*
- *To overcome gridlock in forest planning and implementation. The success of our work is tied to long-term sustainability of forests and communities.*

Ground Rules for Collaboration and Meeting Participation

Members and nonmembers alike are expected to abide by these ground rules

- *Respect each other in and outside of meetings.*
- *No backroom deals.*
- *Personal attacks will not be tolerated.*
- *The personal integrity and values of participants will be respected.*
- *Stereotyping will be avoided.*
- *Commitments will not be made lightly and will be kept—agreements will be honored.*
- *Disagreements will be regarded as “problems to be solved” rather than as “battles to be won.”*
- *Participants are representative of a broad range of interests, each having concerns about the outcome of the issues at hand. All parties recognize the legitimacy of the interests and concerns of others, and expect that their interests will be represented as well.*
- *Participants commit to keeping their colleagues/constituents informed about the progress of these discussions*
- *Participants commit to stating interests, problems, and opportunities. Not positions.*
- *Participants will air problems, disagreements and critical information during meetings to avoid surprises.*
- *Participants commit to search for opportunities and alternatives. The creativity of the group can often find the best solution.*
- *Participants agree to verify rumors at the meeting before accepting them as fact.*
- *Respect the facilitator and meeting agenda.*

Blue Mountains Forest Partners

"Blue Mountains Forest Partners is a diverse group of stakeholders who work together to create and implement a shared vision to improve the resilience and well-being of forests and communities in the Blue Mountains."

Sign-In Sheet: Full Group, 16 May 2019

Name	Organization	Email Address
Mark Walsh	BMEP	-
Ray Walker	USFS	
Eric Myers	USFS	eric.myers@usda.gov
Terry Kemp	TNC	
Nathan Poage	USFS	/
Don Sigurd	USFS	
Kate Cueno	USFS	
Ryan Falk	USFS	
Beth Parker	USFS	bethany.parker@usda.gov
Caleb Sturgill	ODP	
Teri Corning-Sevey	PERD USFS	teri teresa.corning-sevey@usda.gov
JESSICA KEYS	Sen Merkley	jessica.keys@merkeley.senate.gov
Craig Trubek	USFS	Craig.Trubek@usda.gov
Dave Tatchlor	CFI, Inc	

Name	Organization	Email Address
Ron Sevey	Citizen	rdsevey@gmail.com
Sarah Bush	USFS	sbush1ef@fs.fed.us
Ron Simpson	USFS	ron.simpson@usda.gov
Odele Cerny	BMFP guest	odelecerny@hughes.net
Mark Cerny	BMFP	waterfeed@gmail.com
Rick Munster	BMFP	
Kathleen Anthony	Sam Wyden	kathleen-anthony@wyden.senate.gov
James Johnston	OSU / BMFP	james.johnston@oregonstate.edu
King Williams	Tom Trimble	king.williams@gmail.com
Glen Johnston	Buckland Logging	
Tom Hardy	WELC	on file
Dave Haverhill	Grayback Logging	✓

Dads Creek WUI– By the Numbers as of 4/2019

Collaboration Started 2006 - Decision Signed 12/2009

Treatment	Planned (acres)	Completed (as of 4/9/2019)
Commercial Harvest	1,669	867
Commercial Volume (ccf)	6,697	5,906
Non-Commercial thin and Slash Treatments	1,807	1,698
Old Growth Fire Hazard Reduction	58	20
Underburning	2,520	205

Commercial Harvest

- Timber Sale awarded to Iron Triangle 8/26/2009
- 5,906 ccf (3 mmbf) volume sold for \$100,438, escalation sale
- Planned volumes are estimates of 2mbf/acre. Actual was 3.5mbf/acre
- DF (19%), PP (38%) and WF (42%)
- All Skyline units dropped from sale. Several other units dropped for marginal volume and tractor winch
- Most volume was harvested in 2013
- Sale closed 6/1/2014
- \$22,133 to the State payments
- Collected \$39,976 KV Fund, all spent
- Collected \$33,073 Salvage Sale Fund
- The balance went to road maintenance and brush disposal funds

Non-Commercial (PCT) Harvest and Slash treatments

- Cost to complete Non-commercial thin/Slash treatments = \$278,176
- Used a combination of ARRA, and appropriated funds. CFLN after 2015
- The Districts are looking at a few more planned PCT and slash treatments. Some slash piles still need burned

Old Growth Fire Hazard Reduction

- “Donut Holes” – Work 30% completed included cutting/girdle of DF/GF up to 15” DBH under old growth clumps of ponderosa pine trees. Jackpot burn the slash
- Work done by FS fire crews
- Field trip with BMFP in 2015. No more work planned at this time

Underburning

- Two small units completed to date
- Plan for 1,700 acres this year on the PCR side.

Tools Used to Complete Restoration Work on the Malheur NF

Commercial Timber

	Timber Sales (small/large)	Stewardship - Integrated Resource Timber Contract (IRTC)	Stewardship – Integrated Resource Service Contract (IRSC)	Stewardship Agreement	Good Neighbor Agreement (GNA)
Collaboration Required	N	Y	Y	Y	No, but Oregon would like GNA projects to be collaborated on.
Purpose	Sell Timber	Timber value is greater than service work cost, Restoration need meeting local and rural community need	Service work cost is greater than timber value, Restoration need meeting local and rural community need	Mutual benefit to fed and partner. Partner sells/administers the timber sale contract. To help increase capacity needs for getting work done. 20% Partner Match Required.	Mutual benefit to fed and state. State sells/administers the timber sale contract. To help increase capacity needs for getting work done. No partner match required.
Contractor Selection	Price	Best Value	Best Value	Best Value	State requirements?
Product Value	KV/SS/BD/Road Maint. Deposits. 25% to State Payments. Any leftover balance to the national treasury.	Stays on the Forest. Used for restoration work Can be used on other Stewardship Contracts on the Forest	Stays on the Forest. Used for road maintenance and restoration work.	Stays on the Forest. Covers included service work but can have retained receipts.	Stays on the Forest. Covers ODF costs, can be used for additional restoration work or NEPA. Any retained receipts go to other GNA projects
Additional Restoration Work funding	No	No	Can add additional funds	Can add additional funds	Can add additional funds
Contract Length	< 10 years, typically 3-5 Years	<10 years, typically 3-5 Years	Parent contract up to 10 years, each task order <3 years	< 3 Years	3-5 Years?

5/15/2019

25% Fund – Payment to States/Counties for roads and schools. 25% of stumpage (amount paid for timber).

KV deposits – Knutson-Vandenberg. Funds are deposited in an account to cover costs of required reforestation and to finance sale-area improvements such as pre-commercial thinning and other restoration related work. Funds can be used to cover FS salary or Contract to complete the work. Deposits subject to 25% National Overhead Rate.

SS deposits – Salvage Sale. Funds are deposited in an account to cover costs to prepare and administer future salvage sales. Deposits subject to 25% National Overhead Rate.

BD deposits – Brush Disposal. Funds are deposited in an account to cover costs to treat sale generated slash. Funds can be used to cover FS salary or Contract to complete the work. Deposits subject to 25% National Overhead Rate.

Road Maintenance Deposit – For general road maintenance fund.

Best Value – Requires a technical proposal. Proposal can include, technical approach (type of equipment, personnel, timeframes), relevant past performance, benefit to local community. Price.