

**Southern Willamette Forest Collaborative
Implementation Advisory Committee**

Thursday, November 8th, 9:00 – 10:30

“Coming together for healthy forests and communities”

Attendees: Susan K-O, Sarah D., Loren H., Kathy N., Laurie P., Yohan, Don, Fallia, Fergus M.,
Staff: Sarah A-P, Trisha M

FY19 Stewardship project recommendation

Topwood centralization: It's outside of the 35 miles for Oakridge to use as firewood, but will probably be used for firewood in the valley.

Discussion: Do we want to keep zone 2, or do we want to transition to Lane County as zone 2 in order to keep the 25% going to the county = more money in the county going into schools and other beneficial programs. Lane County is currently supportive of stewardship contracts, having county commissioner support is important to maintain this support.

Do we have the people available for the jobs within the zone to complete the work, i.e. thinning logger. Finding a way to benefit companies that are employing workers from rural areas. This is why we have zones broken up, so we are still primarily focusing on the local area – there is a need for a monitoring program to see how effective the zoning is at employing workers in the area.

How does everyone feel about making zone 2 Lane County? It makes sense to keep the county on board. Can we make 4 zones, to better keep the money in Oregon?

There is a need to make the memo less complicated, while highlighting the principal place of business, while giving credit to employers who have workers in the area. Example: Two purchasers in Lane County so they have equal points, finding a way to benefit the company that has workers in the watershed.

Seems too complicated because the company can't control people, subcontractors, etc., if they end up retiring, or being unable to complete the job, the prime contractor will end up having to select a different subcontractor.

Finding a way to credit companies who have a history of hiring workers within the watershed.

Q: Is it a common occurrence to have high turnover for employees in prime contractors?
Yes, so it would be hard to have a points system that is accurate.

Q: How close are points on these sales? We didn't really do a points system, it was more so making sure that all the contractors were acceptable.

Q: Did you guys consider past performance? Yes.

Q: Is there any way # of employees from the watershed could be included in the past performance? Most people didn't meet zone 1 because we have so few – which is why we are trying to find other ways to credit the bidder for employees.

Q: Is there any way we can get them to list their employees from zone 1? It seems iffy if we aren't assigning any weight to it.

Wording for memo: Demonstrate that you have subcontractors or employees from zone 1. It would all strictly be trust based but could be included in past performance. There are a lot of purchasers who don't like to touch stewardship contracts because of the technical proposals. As a part of the technical proposal could include “describe your influence on the local area - % of employees, etc.”

The people who look at the contracts come from many different departments, so there is a sense of diversity in the process – having someone from SWFC while deciding on a purchaser was a good way to represent collaborative values.

Charter Review

- **Scope/ Focus:** Including target local benefit, workforce, restoration for the watershed.
- **Membership:** Should we have a way of vetting members to keep people who only attend a couple meetings for self-interest? Could edit it to be a non-voting member for a certain amount of meetings, have them review all prior decisions and the committee has to vote them in by consensus. If you are representing a group the group can only have one vote – having individuals identify their affiliation. Is there any way we can cap the amount of voting members?
- **Voting:** Recommendation memos are signed by people who are present, that way if someone isn't present to vote they won't be listed on the memo as voting.

Planning Restoration Shared Learning

GNA Update

Cain Creek TS is going to generate less program income than initially estimated. Initial estimate was \$186k now looking like \$95k: GNA doesn't have to have collaborative involvement

Discussion: GNA doesn't quite have the capacity they need right now, but the Willamette is ready to try a start-to-finish contract. The reason it's important to have collaborative involvement is so we can catch some of the problems up front. Sending out a reminder that the collaborative should be involved with GNA because that's the way it was pitched to legislators – seems a link is missing with the SO.

It is important to catch up on the collaborative side, advocating on the forest level at the all-collaboratives meeting for us to be a part of GNA.

In order to meet the goals for Rigdon, we need to be up to speed on GNA because of the amount of work.

Next Steps