

**Southern Willamette Forest Collaborative
Outlook Collaboration Committee**

Monday, February 5th, 9:30 – 12:00PM, Middle Fork Ranger District
“Coming together for healthy forests and communities”

Participants: BJ K., Chandra L., Cindy N., Jean C., Laurie P., Loren H., Sarah D., Mike B., Michelle E., Paula H., Tanya H., Susan O., Fergus M., Jim C., Kris E., Duane B., Molly J, Rob M., Johan H. Staff: Sarah A-P., David K.

Agenda Item #1 - Transitioning to the Implementation advisory committee

The SWFC steering committee advises the committee to consider advancing the committee’s scope of work:

- a) The primary reason the Outlook committee was formed was to provide recommendations for Outlook stewardship projects. Going forwards, the District plans to implement one stewardship project a year across the district and the committee has the opportunity to continue to engage in these projects.
- b) The State and USFS have partnered under the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) agreement to allow the State Oregon Dept. of Forestry to implement restoration work on USFS land. The purpose is to increase the pace, scale, and quality of restoration on federal lands, support local economies and engage local communities through collaboration. One of the first GNA projects in Western Oregon will be on the Willamette and possibly within Outlook.
- c) Considering the expanded use of Stewardship and GNA restoration tools on the District, it makes sense for the Outlook group to transition to serve as the *Implementation Advisory Committee*.
- d) Monitoring will most likely develop as a separate committee – it will still be several years before implementation monitoring needs to be done. In the meantime, the Rigdon collaboration committee is exploring opportunities around monitoring. It might make most sense to have a stand-alone monitoring committee that can address monitoring across all SWFC projects.

Role of the Implementation Advisory Committee:

- a) The committee will look at restoration projects as an advisory group and provide recommendations and develop a broad scale scope of potential restoration projects and priorities for the District and the entire watershed.
- b) IAC might have a monthly meeting, become a little bit more formal, and pull in local expertise – potentially there could be millions of dollars earned from stewardship and GNA retained receipts that need to be funneled into restoration projects. It is important to have committee of local stakeholders to help offer recommendations.

Proposed Objectives for the Implementation Advisory Committee

- Provide recommendation for the implementation of restoration work
- Identify potential design, implementation and monitoring opportunities

- Serve as an information resource
- Seek out common ground and zones of agreement that apply to stewardship contracting
- Work across private and public boundaries for restoration activities
- Serve as an information resource and knowledge base for each other and the public

Committee Discussion and Q&A

- It is going to a while before retained receipts come in and we can continue to use the groups expertise on additional projects
- GNA Timber sale receipts would be designated for GNA restoration project funding on Forest and hopefully on District.
- GNA funds will not be able to be borrowed for fire suppression projects, they can possibly be used for restorative work to combat fire damage
- Trail work, stream restoration, etc. can be funded by GNA funds dollars.
- GNA recommendations would be filtered by the Forest Service and the State of Oregon for final project decisions.
- Oregon Dept. of Forestry, ODFW, and ODA will be involved on the State level (as each is siloed to address forest management, fish and wildlife and weeds). USFS will partner with these agencies to review and decide where dollars are spent.
- It is possible for the committee to take a field trip to look at restoration projects that ODF has implemented
- The implementation advisory committee will develop project priorities – the more organized the recommendations are coming from the group, the more weight they have.
- The District and ODF are moving slowly and will be conservative until they build more experience
- Where do receipts sit once they come in?
 - Stewardship retained receipts sit with region and GNA would sit with SPA
 - If it sits with region, will it come back to the local area? (Yes)
- Recommendations that come out of the IA committee are final and will pass through the SWFC steering committee, but SC would not tinker with them, just pass them along or not and send them back if there was an issue (clarity, conflict of interest, etc.)

Agenda Item #2 Rock stewardship after action review

Overview: facilitation and monitoring funding from ODF

-10K SWFC facilitation

-13K UO Ecosystem Workforce Program

-Over three months there were 3 field trips, 2 workshops, 5 round tables

What was planned?

Outlook Committee Recommendations for the Rock Stewardship Project included:

- Middle Fork Watershed wide stewardship area for restoration projects

- Local workforce area – #1 - businesses located in the Middle Fork Watershed, #2 businesses located within the counties that are adjacent to the Willamette National Forest, and #3 businesses located in Western Oregon.
 - The recommendation also asked for preference points for small communities within the categories
- IRTC embedded projects proposed: weed abatement, road storage, fall and leave and an optional contract item for biomass removal.

What happened?

- The watershed wide stewardship area was submitted by the District and Forest approved by the Region
- The Rock IRTC local workforce area was broader than the committee’s #1 but smaller than the #2 - including Lane, Deschutes, Douglas Counties.
- Embedded projects included weed abatement
- The project sold in September 2017 and the purchaser was Roseboro Lumber.
- Total volume was 1.7M board feet with approximately 100 acres.
- Work will likely commence this summer and the Contract must be complete in 3 years.
- After the contract work is complete and the contract “performed” then the retained receipts can be spent on additional restoration work in the stewardship area (entire watershed).
- What were criteria for bidding?
 - Best value, local area, experience, technical proposal
 - Not purchase price – this was not known until purchaser was selected

What went well?

- The project will earn more retained receipts than expected (projected \$100k)
- There will be much more funding for additional restoration work.
- It is possible that less embedded projects led to a higher bid price.
- One positive aspect of the late FY sale is that they tend to earn a higher bid amount
- The District has formed a weed committee that will be led by Molly, and they will keep the committee informed how the embedded process goes
- The bids were competitive

What can be improved?

- The sale happened during a transition of key personnel
 - There was re-learning and details were lost
- Not all of the recommended embedded work was included
- Biomass removal was not clarified in the original bid process; the way the prospectus was worded required it to be used for bioenergy (Seneca is the only nearby plant)
- Not all of the SWFC recommendations were clear or too complex (local workforce area and community size)
- No subcontractors hired from local area #1 (watershed)
- Only three bidders submitted proposals
- Embedded projects – consider if they are projects that can be done with retained receipts

- The fall and leave trees were not marked by FS and therefore couldn't be included as an embedded project (bidders could not equate the amount of revenue generated through the work process)
- Timing of the sale was an issue
 - Negative b/c the agency felt under pressure to execute the sale and there wasn't time to take risks
- Embedded projects – they are unfamiliar to some bidders - in the future the FS can include technical expert contacts
- Stewardship package and resource related projects – technical review at the Forest level before the project is posted would be helpful
- Collaborative members are welcome to attend the bidders meeting
- Subs have to give bid estimates sometimes years before the work will be done

Committee discussion:

- Were bidders comfy with drafting tech proposals
 - No, FS and collaborative got an earful about stewardship contracting
- How does our tech proposal compare to other districts? How did our request for proposal compare to others?
 - Siuslaw provides lists of reputable contractors to bidders
 - For this sale, the SWFC had a list of local contractors and called the major purchasers and offered to share
- The logging slash (or biomass) from thinning will be managed by brush disposal (BD) requirements
- FS proposal feedback – non successful bidders have a two-week window to contact the agency and review their proposal for feedback
- SWFC should host a workshop for contractors – the N. Santiam hosted one and learned that after workshop follow up with the contractors was most beneficial
- Stewardship contract bid/ review process – the collaborative can ask if a member be allowed to sit on the technical review committee

Agenda Item #3 2018 Stewardship contract projects

Jones and Staley Fires Road Side Hazard Removal

- Removal of road side hazard trees killed during the 2016 fires.
- Top priority for the Forest, will take precedence over all other sales.
- All field work except for cruising complete.
- One service item – fall and leave where skidding is not allowed.
- Expect retained receipts.

Burnt IRTC Timeline (approximately 440 Ac project northwest of Westfir)

- All field work completed except “cruising”, which will be finished in February.
- Road, KV and BD (brush disposal) plans due March 16th.
- Stewardship project proposals from committee and specialists due March 31st.
- Complete appraisal and contract and advertise middle of April.

- Award sale middle of May to allow for more risk with service items. If sale is not awarded in May, FS has time to repackage, re-advertise and sell.

Implementation Advisory Committee Input

- a) define local workforce area
- b) Consider whether to include service items in the contract or collect receipts to pay for projects afterwards. Pros and cons?
- c) Options to consider for embedded projects for Burnt IRTC

Similar Projects as Rock:

- Weed abatement
- Road decommissioning
- Fall and leave
- Biomass removal

New projects (must be covered by NEPA)

- Trail maintenance
- Mow road sides (main 4 digit roads)
- Road maintenance (1835 multiple bridges, culverts and miles of road reconditioning; 21 and 23 asphalt patching)
- Stream restoration (Coal Creek – similar to Staley Creek, large woody debris placement)
- Snag creation for wildlife habitat
- Gate installation
- Clean up landslide debris (19 road)
- Trash clean up
- Bridges and bogs

Committee Discussion

- Committee will need to consider embedded projects.
- The timeline for the project is 5 years.
- Perhaps the committee should consider slash and brush disposal as part of the planning process – should this be an embedded process the committee recommend? Rob recommends using the timber sales minimum specs to address brush disposal.
- Could we try utilizing biomass again? Are there units that would make more sense to require biomass utilization?
- If logging creates damage to trail system, they are responsible to pay for fixing the trail? (yes)
- Which restoration projects should be utilized for embedded projects or funded afterwards with the use of retained receipts?

Next Steps:

Burnt Stewardship - In the interest of efficiency the committee should meet to consider local area, embedded projects, simultaneous consideration and projects to postpone based on funding sources and timing. The committee agreed to meet in 1 month.

GNA – Katie Morrison will come and present to the Committee once the Middle Fork GNA project starts to develop.

Next committee meeting Monday, March 5th, 12:00 – 4:00 at MFRD