

**Siuslaw Forest-Wide Collaborative
Formation Meeting
11/02/2020 11:00am-12:30pm Zoom**

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	NAME	ORGANIZATION
Kailey Kornhauser	SFWC Coordinator	Kirk Shimeall	Cascade Pacific RCD
Connie Barnes	Cascade Pacific RCD	Trent Seager	Sustainable NW
Sally Bernstein	Sustainable NW	Andy Geissler	AFRC
Brad Pfeifer	Hampton Lumber	Paul Lulay	Hampton Lumber
Chandre LeGue	Oregon Wild	Dave Eisler	Landowner
Fran Recht	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission	Jim Fairchild	Corvallis Audubon
Marc Barnes	IRM Forestry	Paul Engelmeyer	Portland Audubon
Greg Kennedy	Landowner	Robert Sanchez	Siuslaw NF
Kyle Sullivan	ODF		

Minutes: by Kailey Kornhauser

I. (11:00-11:30) Introductions

a. Coordinator, Staff & Stakeholders Introductions

b. How we got here (Kirk Shimeall)

- The Adaptative Management Group (AMG) (which is largely composed of individual Stewardship Grop participants) started to meet, and Cascade Pacific (CPRCD) recognized that it would be helpful to provide the forest-wide structure outside of Stewardship Groups
- CPRCD successfully got funding to explore the idea of having a Forest-wide collaborative and to support the group with Covid the funding was frozen which set the timeline back
- CPRCD will be pursuing additional funding to continue this effort beyond the scope of the grant
- This group will acknowledge past tensions while moving forward by building a process that allows all stakeholders to be heard and to increase transparency
- There will still be disagreement, but we will work together to clearly identify areas of agreement and disagreement

c. Message from Siuslaw Forest Supervisor (Robert Sanchez)

- Sent a letter to the collaborative (attached to minutes)
- He highlighted that each stakeholder will continue to maintain their individual rights to engage with projects

**Siuslaw Forest-Wide Collaborative
Formation Meeting
12/9/2020 2:00pm – 4:00pm Zoom**

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	NAME	ORGANIZATION
Marc Barnes	IRM Forestry	Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild
Sally Bernstein	Sustainable NW	Paul Lulay	Hampton Lumber
Dave Eisler	Landowner	Brad Pfeifer	Hampton Lumber
Paul Engelmeyer	Portland Audubon	Fran Recht	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Jim Fairchild	Corvallis Audubon	Trent Seager	Sustainable NW
Andy Geissler	AFRC	Kirk Shimeall	Cascade Pacific RCD
Kailey Kornhauser	SFWC Coordinator		

Minutes: by Kailey Kornhauser

Minutes Key

- Meeting minutes do not represent collaborative agreements, unless they specifically say so. They are meant to record three basic things: 1) the issue discussed, 2) the major points or questions raised in conversation, and 3) the resolution or next step if there is one. Unless specifically stated, resolutions are only the resolutions of the people present at the meetings.
- Common Abbreviations:
 - Q: Question
 - A: Answer
 - Cmt: Comment
- Highlighted items are typically those that require follow-up (suggestions for future agendas)

Meeting Notes

- I. Updates
 - a. *Process check-in*
 - In next few months we will finish the Operations Protocol and Declaration of Commitment
 - At this time individuals will continue to engage with ongoing Forest projects while we establish a way of working together

b. Governance Subcommittee

- Met on 11/19 to discuss ground rules, meeting coordination, and record keeping
- The working document and meeting minutes can be found [here](#)

c. Sand Lake Discussions

- Draft EA is out, and 30-day comment period ends 12/25
- Held small group meeting on 12/1 with some individuals who participate in the Collaborative as well as members of the IDT
- Trent and Kailey met with Bill Conroy (District Ranger) and Hannah Smith (NEPA Planner) to discuss next steps including a follow-up discussion about project tradeoffs
- Cmt: Because there are no guiding documents yet, it is important that the group identify itself before diving into too many projects.
 - Kailey: Right now we are finding a balance between getting the collaborative going while engaging in the ongoing work that individuals were already engaged with.
 - Trent: Because there is no Declaration of Commitment for this group there will not be a letter for the Collaborative to sign on to at this time. This meeting was an opportunity to practice collaboration and discuss tradeoffs, not to formally comment as a group.
 - Kailey: Subcommittees are part of the Collaborative effort, “groups” are collections of individuals engaging on ongoing projects.

d. Other updates?

- FS staff plan to hold discussion on new CEQ regulations in Spring
- North Fork Smith IDT had their second meeting, still collecting data and preparing for unit-by-unit analysis
 - Kailey is still attending those meetings as a liaison but not representing the interests of the collaborative.

II. Discussion on goals and hopes for a Forest-Wide Collaborative

- During this discussion each person in the meeting had a chance to share their own interests, goals, and hopes for a Forest-Wide Collaborative. The following list is a summary of what was shared during this discussion. This list has been divided into outcome and process goals.

Outcome goals

- Protect and implement the NWFP
- Accelerate old growth conditions
- Ensure economic benefits

- Forest restoration
- Sustainable timber products
- Avoid litigation
- Less expensive sales that all sell
- Projects with the most ecologically beneficial outcomes for the forest and watershed
- Create a monitoring framework to determine if we are working towards goals
- Support communities through jobs, restoration, timber, and restoring watershed
- Protect endangered species and habitat
- Host field trips and site visits to illustrate treatments
- Implement the Forest Plan
- Help the FS manage the forest
- Win-win solutions

Process goals for the group

- Create a space to work together
- Create a space for policy discussion
- Open discussion between FS staff, scientists, and interested parties
- Be on the forefront of solving forest restoration issues again
- Host ongoing debate about tough questions: connectivity, interior forest, buffers
- Hear and learn from each other's perspectives and unique experiences
- Talk through areas of disagreement
- Be clear about individual goals and objectives
- Be a positive voice to the FS
- Get to know each other
- Work together towards successful outcomes
- Allow SG to focus on retained receipts allocation
- Create connections across the forest landscape/ownership and approach issues from broader perspective
- Gain legitimacy with the FS
 - Create a space where everyone feels heard and respected
- Practice adaptive management
 - Stay flexible in the face of climate change
- Increase public involvement in forest management
- Provide a space for more diverse stakeholder involvement
- Serve as a consistent body with institutional memory
- Engage early with FS projects
- Develop creative solutions
- Take a long-term perspective on ecosystem and industry
- Embrace new scientific information and gray literature

III. Next-Steps

a. *Governance Subcommittee meeting 12/16*

- Upcoming meeting on 12/16 to discuss communication and organizational structure

b. *Sand Lake follow-up discussion*

- Discussion will be scheduled for some time in January.

c. *Review of past NEPA projects*

- We will begin an overview and memorialization of past NEPA processes. Kailey will be putting together summary documents for review by a subcommittee consisting of Marc B., Chandra L., Jim F., and Paul E.
- Q: What is the purpose of this review?
 - This will be a way to review past projects and to learn from the meetings and input that occurred in those processes. Everyone will review these documents, but this subcommittee will give initial feedback.
- Cmt: It will be helpful to work with SG participants who took part in informational and discussion sessions on recent NEPA projects
- Cmt: Trent will provide examples of these documents from other forests. It will be helpful for individuals to let us know if comments were part of a legal process vs. their social values and interests. This exercise is to give the collaborative a starting point.

d. *Landscape conservation science talk planning*

- Paul E. and Kailey will be working to schedule a series of science and industry speakers on topics related to the Collaborative and will work with the FS to identify a range of potential speakers
 - Cmt: We also need specialists from the FS to come to these talks. We hope to work with the FS to invite speakers and schedule talks at times that work for them.
 - Cmt: We should also consider inviting experts in logging systems as part of this series as well.

e. *Topics for next full-group meeting*

- Chuck Fisher will speak about the North Fork Smith project and Collaborative involvement
- Bill Conroy and Possibly Michele Holman will speak about their plans as District Rangers to work with the Collaborative

- Goal of the Forest is to continue working on watershed restoration projects, approaches might change, and this collaborative reflects that
 - o In vegetation program continue to use traditional timber sales as a way to implement restoration goals and stewardship timber contracts
 - o Balanced all resource approach
 - o Work that reflects the mission of the Forest Service
 - o Work is guided by the Siuslaw Forest Plan and the NWFP
 - In the future the FS will address forest plan revision which will benefit from having this collaborative group
 - He understands that the FS has not previously had the forum to have engagement on a variety of forest-level topics, hope that the collaborative can serve that purpose
- d. Message from Acting Federal Forest Restoration Program Lead ODF (Kyle Sullivan)
- The Federal Forest Restoration (FFR) program mission is to increase pace, scale, and quality of restoration on Oregon's federal forest land leveraging support of collaboratives and supporting rural communities
 - Program established in 2013, since then the program has supported collaboratives through two methods:
 - o Collaborative capacity grants administered by OWEB (this collaborative is a recipient of this grant)
 - o Technical assistance and scientific support grants that support monitoring and research support to collaboratives (ODF funds non-collaborative entities to provide TA)
 - Hope that ODF can participate as contributor and partner in restoration on the Siuslaw
 - Urgency of restoration needs requires partnership and this collaborative can provide a forum for cross-boundary work

(note: Robert and Kyle left the meeting following their introductions so that it could be a Collaborative only space)

II. (11:30-11:50) Timeline Overview & Expectations

- a. Grant Timeline (Kailey Kornhauser)
- The grant is just one framework we can use to look at work of the group, not the full scope of the group work. Shared here for full transparency.
 - Two types of documents the group will produce:
 - o Collaborative governance documents: organizational structure, operations manual (ground rules, meeting protocols, voting procedures), and a declaration of commitment (document that stakeholders sign on to, not giving up individual right to participate in a process as an individual)

- Sally Bernstein is working with Kailey Kornhauser to review best practices on other forest collaboratives and will engage with a subcommittee to build a set of these documents for this collaborative
- Review of past NEPA projects:
 - Memorialization of Indian Creek and Deadwood Project
 - We will have conversations about these (and projects before these two). We will review and discuss as a group and individually to get a sense of areas of agreement and disagreement as well as capture successes and things to improve upon in the future
 - As a collaborative we will review these past projects to inform zones of agreement
- Training and workshop opportunities will be discussed in detail in the future
- Circle back to the conversation about funding later, this grant carries support for staffing and technical assistance for the group until the end of June
- Participant question: Curious is there is the ability to go further back to review past efforts before Indian Creek? Stakeholders have been involved for over 10 years and remember positive interactions, want to look at what's changed over time as well.
 - The grant talks about going further back and one-on-one we will review projects beyond Indian Creek, it will be Kailey's job to go back and speak to individuals involved in past processes that are not actively participating in the group now
- Participant question: Kyle drew attention to the state investment idea about monitoring and research funding and the collaborative should explore these ideas.
 - Kailey asked group if they would like to hear more from Kyle and there was agreement, also potential for a subcommittee to form around monitoring and research
- Participant question: Sounded like Robert was relating the problems of the past to the previous process and that the collaborative will bring about a new process. Doesn't see the structural process as being the issue. Feels there is lack of respect for partners or other science.
 - Kailey acknowledged the frustration and pointed to the next agenda item when Trent will speak about how process may alleviate some of these frustrations.
- Trent: Circling back to the grant, Connie, Trent and Kirk wrote the grant thoughtfully to only agree to have meetings and review past projects but to make no other commitments for the group. This is so the group can work on what they are interested in but not lock the group into any specific work moving forward.

b. Group Goals (Kailey Kornhauser)

- Big picture goals that have emerged from conversations with stakeholders

- One goal is to find big picture agreements and disagreements that can help inform the Forest Service and other agency partners in NEPA projects
- We will work to create a process of engagement for everyone, and topics are brought forth by the members, open negotiation, and agreements, disagreements, and areas of concern shared with the FS for further discussion
- Some changes to how group work has happened in the past:
 - Collaborative participants will be asked to represent their organization
 - The group will work to comment on NEPA projects as a collaborative – sharing areas of agreement and disagreement
 - The collaborative will get involved in pre-scoping of NEPA process
 - Once we are fully formed, all follow up of commitments and tasks will be done by Kailey as the coordinator
 - Kailey is sitting in on the ID team meetings for the most recent NEPA project as a way to serve as a liaison, goal to improve transparency and get quick answers to collaborative questions
 - We will continue to have Collaborative meetings without agency staff so that the group can have dialogue about issues and other meetings where agency staff will be invited to respond to questions or concerns
- Trent Seager provides context on process changes:
 - New process doesn't mean interests will change
 - A different approach was demonstrated on Deadwood, if there had been more structure/process this could have been followed through
 - Tradeoffs had not been negotiated
 - FS was meeting separately with stakeholders during that process
 - AMG had been tackling tough issues but did not comment as a group, only some organizations submitted comments
- Participant: still skeptical that process will make a difference
 - Trent Seager: Can't promise that things will change except engagement, but with coordinator support past promises would be addressed at the meeting
 - Coordinator will follow-up with FS to remind them that they made commitments
 - In experience with six other forests and collaboratives, addressing structure and having paid staff to follow-up does alleviate about half the problems
 - Participant: Feels similar to Fran, feels that process will help a lot but there are negative feelings about the past especially with Deadwood, won't last too long in collaborative if Forest leadership doesn't fully commit
 - Trent: As an example, a Collaborative would have negotiated differently during Deadwood - would not have generated third alternative but

instead worked to include collaborative recommendations in the second alternative or openly say why not

- Kailey: something new about this Collaborative is that we have some new voices at the table, hoping that diverging interests will be discussed here rather than one on one with agency (like Sand Lake meetings)
- Participant: Curious to hear about how some stakeholders feel disrespected, may not have time today. AFRC had input on Deadwood and Indian Creek and would have liked to see FS do things differently on those projects especially on Matrix land, didn't get an alternative, but didn't feel disrespected. The FS shared why they didn't take his recommendation, and he disagreed and asked for it again in the next project. Andy sees the outcome and process of the project differently, seemed like there was a disagreement in the interpretation of available science
 - Kailey: won't have time to day but we will review deadwood, come to agreement about what happened so that we can move forward, important to note everyone did not get what they wanted out of that project, this collaborative could be a way to get something they want out of project
 - Trent: yes, that should be the topic of the next meeting

III. (11:50-11:55) Discussion of Missing Stakeholders (Kailey Kornhauser)

- This is intentionally a small group as it develops, doesn't mean we can't grow and include more stakeholders later
- Also begin considering who in your organization can serve as a back-up in case you can't be at a meeting
- Suggestions of voices not here:
 - Participant recommendation: Tribes, Coos Lower Umpqua, Siletz, Grand Ronde
 - Participant recommendation: Watershed council representatives
- Kirk: Confirmed that this conversation is about who needs to be in early formative discussions to address past process issues.
- Trent: we will continue to share minutes and updates with SG and watershed councils so that certain projects might bring different stakeholders
- Continue to recommend people via email or phone

IV. (11:55-12:00 Select Collaborative Formation Sub-Committee Members (Kailey Kornhauser)

- This subcommittee will begin work on collaborative documents meeting once a month. The group will recommend draft documents (governance structure, operations manual, declaration of commitment) that the full collaborative group will work to come to agreement on
- This is to help kick-start the group; leadership and other committees will form later.

- Andy G., Paul E., Marc B., and Chandra L. volunteer to be part of the sub-committee

V. (12:00-12:20) Forest-Wide Updates (Kailey Kornhauser)

- Kailey is giving updates on projects for this first meeting but in future our FS partners, such as NEPA planners and individuals from FS ID teams, will give updates so that collaborative participants can ask questions and increase transparency.
- From now on Kailey is attending ongoing ID team meetings to help infuse a collaborative process and increase communication.

a. Deadwood Update

- Signed 09/17/2020 pending litigation, timber sales can be implemented.
- Kailey had a conversation with some Deadwood ID team leadership about lessons learned from that project. Consider sharing that when we revisit the project.

b. Sand Lake Update

- Because Sand Lake (SL) began before the collaborative formed we will be getting updates as a group but we may not participate in collaborative commenting on the document.
- Turnover and Covid have delayed the process.
- Bill Conroy is new District Ranger; Hannah Smith is new NEPA planner for project
- Timeline: submitted timeline to RO, hoping to begin public comment in the coming week or two following the release of a draft EA
- Goal to release final EA by late winter or early spring
- Participant: Disappointed that collaborative won't participate in SL because a lot of the participants have been involved for years in the process and have been working and ready to collaborate
 - o Kailey: Clarification, this collaborative that is forming would have difficulty forming and participating in an ongoing process, if there is interest in the group participating it is a big lift, the FS is interested in the collaborative participating
 - o Trent: collaborative could engage in the process but may not be able to sign on to a collective letter, just don't have Collaborative agreement in place yet. Collaborative approach can still be used, could come up with ad hoc approach if that is what the group wants
 - o Participant: Supports an ad hoc approach, not a lot of controversy on SL and interest in getting started early, interested in provided guidance, unique landscape that they won't have chance to work in again, place to do early seral work

c. North Fork Smith Update

- New process getting started, ID team in a pre-scoping phase
- Kailey has attended the first meeting on 10/14/2020
- Project offers opportunity for collaborative to get involved in NEPA early
- Process being led by Chuck Fisher during pre-scoping
- Questions/comments/concerns about the project can be passed to Kailey
- IDT will come to upcoming meetings to bring updates
- Possible that this project will fall under new NEPA regs
- Very early stages, haven't identified any possible alternatives
- Starting unit by unit analysis this coming week (these meetings have been postponed)

VI. (12:20-12:30) Next-Steps (Kailey Kornhauser)

- Meetings will continue to be on Zoom for now monthly
- This meeting was internally recorded for meeting minutes, but we may record the Zoom in future for participants who can't make the meeting
- Subcommittee and Collaborative will both meet monthly so as to speed up the process and not slow down NEPA project engagement
- Expect an upcoming meeting the first week of December
- Feel free to funnel questions to Kailey to bring to FS, this will hopefully increase the speed of answers
- Attached is the new NEPA process
- Trent: Discussed potential future training proposed in grant to provide a full day workshop on collaboration which Siuslaw FS staff did in late February, will do that for collaborative participants either in outdoor covered space or online over multiple days. Look for a survey for potential dates.