

**Southern Willamette Forest Collaborative
Implementation Advisory Committee**

Thursday, February 14th, 9:00-10:30AM, Middle Fork Ranger District
"Coming together for healthy forests and communities"

Attendees: Sarah A.-P., Loren H., Sarah D., Mike B., Susan K.-O., M.G.

There is currently no specific language for economic benefit for local economy in the GNA language.

- SWFC can host training events for local workers, offering a service federal and state agencies can't.

How close will agencies work with SWFC?

Unlike stewardship contracting there isn't directive or rules that channel how we engage with collaboratives, it's open ended. ODF has a strong commitment to collaboratives and we see the value of it keeping the work moving. In the supplemental project agreement (SPA) this district (Middle Fork Ranger District) has taken extra steps to have involvement.

ODF: purposefully left it with flexible language because it could take 2 years to get to a project going, the language states there will be a committee comprised from all different groups and partnerships, all making decisions together.

ODF: What is the process you would like to put forward when approaching GNA as a collaborative?

Ask that the money stays on the forest - try to keep everything as local as possible. ODF: GNA doesn't speak to district level locality and doesn't have a process in place at the moment, so this comment is timely.

FFR: When you build a SPA it can be very broad or narrow, currently forest level SPAs allow for the money to be spent across the forest. SPA money is spent differently than stewardship dollars i.e. retained receipts = additional implementation and little monitoring. With GNA timber sales the use of program income still needs to stay on the forest, but the applications are broader, can be used for in depth monitoring, could include data collection within the projects and can also be spent on additional planning, ie: botany survey. The SPA hasn't specified if it's up front or on the back end, but there are "bins" of money to allocate ie: x amount for NEPA planning, x amount for roads, etc, the committee (mentioned above) would be over seeing the implementation and will help identify the projects within those "bins".

The collaborative is trying to account for forest wide work and a way to integrate GNA, which currently seems like a black box, and SWFC together.

ODF: The goal would be to have collaborative members as a part of the committee for implementing.

Q: At what point does the collaborative give input?

- ODF: It's open ended, we are seeking input on where the collaborative would like to step in. The first 3 sales: 1 on MFRD and 2 on McKenzie. Anticipate shifting money around on the entire forest.

It's hard to plan at that point.

FFR: We can use program income to do NEPA planning, these funds can be used to contract out NEPA planning/consultants/ experts qualified to produce CEs. The most likely place to spend money on NEPA is MFRD - most prepared for contract NEPA, therefore the priority. Ideally we want to create an equitable program that allows for "getting in line" to make sure that everyone is getting taken care of on the forest.

Ideally would like the collaborative to be involved with discussions early on, ie: before the sale area has been decided. Maybe treating the first couple sales as a pilot project so we can go in and adjust as needed when moving forward with future sales.

- FFR: Two things to think about: We know how to use stewardship contracting (SC), GNA is a different opportunity: Two advantages to using GNA over SC when implementing: You need substantial amount of contracting staff on the forest, once FS signs over on SPA, ODF will provide all the human resources pieces for the contract. The second on the contractor end, bidding on GNA is a very simple process. SC is not an easy process for small bidders - using GNA for small contractors may allow a greater use of local contractors.

Q: Straightforward timber sale because there is no embedded projects? Yes.

Q: What if we would like to prioritize local preference for contractors? No straightforward process for best value sales. Though there are ways we can pick local contractors, though it is not always guaranteed. When it comes to restoration projects, it is a little bit more difficult to pick local contractors. \$10K or less the program can appoint someone for the work.

Feels the group is very forward-thinking and could be involved with discussions and decisions on where GNA sales are happening.

ODF: GNA geography: planning area in Lowell and Rigdon, focusing on Lowell because it is closer for personnel.

FFR: 2018 farm bill added to and clarified GNA.

Q: Wondering if we can use GNA funds to work on projects that are in the watershed, but not on federal lands? FFR: Funds can only be used on federal lands. If you can use GNA program income on planning, then turn around and use stewardship contracting to implement the projects.

SWFC can lobby and be advocate for having access to the money without having to put in an application to get the funds. What does our ask become for the leadership team? We

would like to be involved at point x, describe it as a pilot. Should we draft a recommendation memo? Yes.

Looking forward maybe we just think about projects regardless of category, whatever funding fits the best based on the project/ priority.

FFR: GNA Sole source contracting: they can give an entity the money and the entity can contract the work. GNA is technically just holding the FS money at the state level, but the FS can take the money and push it into a cost share.