

**Southern Willamette Forest Collaborative
Implementation Advisory Committee Notes**

Monday, March 5th, 12:30 – 4:00PM, Middle Fork Ranger District

In attendance: Michelle E., Paula H., Jean C., Laurie P., Marcus K., Susan O., Mike B., Jim N.,
Melanie K-M., Dillon S., Sarah D, Rob M., Jon T.

Staff: Sarah A-P., Trisha M.

Agenda: Burnt Integrated Resource Timber Contract

12:30 Welcome and Intros

4.12.18 – Save the date for Stewardship Meeting in Corvallis.

12:45 Voting Procedures

Agreement Methods:

- Unanimous Agreement
- Super Majority
- Simple Majority
- Consensus

Voting Options:

- Dot voting
- Card voting

Discussion: The committee will use card voting, if there seems to be a split in consensus we will move to dot voting.

1:00 Local Workforce Area

Previous recommendation from Implementation Advisory Committee:

Zone #1 priority for businesses/residents within the Middle Fork Watershed, including all rural communities in the watershed: Dexter, Lowell, Jasper, Pleasant Hill, Oakridge and Westfir.

Zone #2 priority for businesses/residents within the following counties that are near the Willamette National Forest: Benton, Deschutes, Douglas, Lane, Linn, and Marion.

Additional local area criteria

Any priority given to local area workforce should benefit the following communities in order

- Middle fork watershed communities
- Westside Cascade/ Willamette Valley rural communities
- Western Oregon Communities

Discussion: The District did not use previous Outlook recommendations for local area due to feedback from purchasers. Some purchasers didn't fully understand the process, and therefore weren't putting in for the bid. The district didn't want to deter bidders.

- If we give complex recommendations, what is the likelihood it would be accepted?
- It's a new process for the district as well, the line officer has the authority to choose what the priority it is, whether it's by cost, value, etc.
- With this Burnt project, will the district be "blind" to the cost? –Yes, that's accurate.

Discussion: Local area criteria recommended for Rock. Being realistic, it might make sense to remove the additional Local area criteria. We should keep the map, but the additional criteria blurs the ranking system because it isn't definitive.

Discussion: What qualifies as "located" within a zone?

- For points to be allocated, do you want the purchasers to be domiciled, or do you want the employees/ contractors to be domiciled within a zone? You would evaluate them on a project-by-project basis, ultimately if subcontractors and purchasers are located within the zone, they are going to have a higher preference.
- The selection committee could use a matrix to allocate local area preference points: if purchasers and subcontractors are in the area, they get more points. If subcontractors are in the area, but the purchaser isn't, they would still get more points than if all were outside of the area.
- Overall there is agreement that prime contractors (purchasers) and subs that are domiciled in the zone should qualify.

Discussion: Should the committee use the same Local Workforce Area?

- The District may accept the same zones, given purchasers have become more familiar with the process.
- The priority zone was determined within the watershed in order to benefit the communities.
- We should keep Zone 1 even if it is the "pie in the sky," as the mission for SWFC is to create local jobs. Zone 2 is more realistic but it could incentivize the purchasers to make more of an effort to build relations with Zone 1 subcontractors to increase point potential.
- We could keep the same map but add additional counties like Klamath or N. Klamath, maybe dropping other counties, such as Benton.
- 2016 Ecosystem workforce report showed where different types of service contractors in the area are located; Benton County was included based on this information.
- Include Coos County in Zone 2? There was once logging industry on the coast, it may benefit those contractors.
 - They already get preference for being in Oregon and there aren't many contractors in the area.
 - Zone 2 is already significant.
 - There were only 3 contracts sold in that area based on ecosystem workforce study.
 - If they're farther away, they will likely bid higher, leaving less money for stewardship.

Discussion: How did the Siuslaw develop their local workforce area? Siuslaw went through the same process; they were able to support their zone 1 subcontractors, with all of the service stuff. Zone 1: Watershed, Zone 2: communities in the forest, Zone 3 Oregon.

Conclusion

- Keep the map and drop the additional local area criteria recommended for Rock
- Keep Benton County in Zone 2
- Add N. Klamath: Extend the map east to include Hwy 97 towns such as Gilcrest and Crescent, and North from 138 Diamond Lake Hwy.

2:00 Burnt stewardship IRTC – embedded projects

Discussion: It's too hard to give a specific amount at the moment for how much we can spend on embedded projects. The district is still cruising the unit for value. Q: Is it safe to assume we can use similar metrics as the Rock sale? Yes, however this figure may change.

Two ways the collaborative can allocate money

- Embedded – within contract
- Retained Receipts – wait 5 years then spend the money

Embedded Projects to Consider

Road Storage:

Discussion: Are there KV dollars to allocate to the work? District does not collect KV funds on stewardship contracts. Embedded projects can be implemented within the entire stewardship area, but it's important to remember the cost that comes with working outside of sale area (discussing roads in Hardesty area). Should it be embedded, or should it be done with retained receipts? Should we wait 5 years to have them decommissioned if it's going to benefit the overall restoration? We could preserve Rock retained receipts and embed the Hardesty road decommissioning. We also have contractors in the area that do roadwork, which could help purchasers gain priority points, but it may be more cost effective to pay contractors with retained receipts.

Biomass:

Discussion: Optional vs. mandatory projects, potential bidders are required to propose a way to handle all embedded projects. The optional projects become mandatory depending if there is excess money in the contract. Question: The contractors give a bid price for optional projects? – Yes, if there is enough funds to complete those optional projects, they will be expected to do so. This should be embedded because the equipment is already in the area. The contractor can store the material (tree tops) in one-central location, then each unit can be released, allowing a commercial business to purchase the biomass, and to pick up the material.

Trail Maintenance:

Discussion: What were the parameters for this recommendation? North side of the reservoir. We could use retained receipts and higher subcontractors, vs. a purchaser doing the work themselves.

It's going to be cheaper for a purchaser to hire their own crew, instead of hiring a trail specific subcontractor, however they may get more priority points for hiring a subcontractor in the area. It would be easier as a subcontractor to use retained receipts. When it comes to spending retained receipts, does the local workforce area specifications still apply? – Yes, we can specify. Over time we'll see more stewardship sales, with more retained receipts, as a result contracts will become more inclusive as purchasers become more familiar with the process.

Tree Planting

Discussion: Mandatory for the district

Burnt Weed Abatement

Discussion: Pre-treatment should be embedded before they bring equipment in and spread seeds.

Fall & Leave

Discussion: Not a huge priority for the Forest Service, the trees have to be marked at additional cost, can be done internally.

Overall Discussion: The total for embedded projects listed is 305k, minus the biomass costs. Some of these projects could be funded with retained receipts. This many embedded projects could deter bidders. The timber value is going to take a discount, as each embedded project is included because technical proposals have to be given for each embedded project. Plus the prime contractor is going to take their profit from the subcontractors, with retained receipts subcontractors can cut out the middle-man, which could make it cheaper and more beneficial for local workforce in the long-term. Should be thinking in terms of priority, rather than specific dollar amounts.

Conclusion:

The group voted to suggest the agency prioritize the following projects to be embedded in the Burnt IRTC:

1. Burnt Pre-Weed Treatment - Mandatory
2. Biomass – Pile for commercial - Mandatory
3. Burnt Road Storage – Mandatory
4. Hardesty road decommissioning – Optional

3:50 Next Steps

Plan for next meeting May 7th – Sending out doodle poll for specific time