

SFLO Advisory Committee Meeting

December 3, 2008 9:00-3:00

Natural Resources Building, Room 635

Meeting Attendees: Mary McDonald, Mark Hicks, Dave Sweitzer, Dave Whipple, Rick Kuykendall, Sherry Fox, Michael Ahr, Chase Davis, Phil Hess, Maurice Williamson, Ken Miller, Jim Matthews, Dan Pomerenk, Jeff Galleher, Jenni Dystra, Steve McConnell and Jeff Davis

9:00 – Introductions

9:05 – Outreach Materials:

Michael Ahr presented a new pamphlet put together by the Small Forest Landowner Office (SFLO) and others that encompasses all of the programs within the SFLO and gives a brief over view of each of the programs to inform landowners about the programs and entice them to participate.

- All feedback was positive the group likes the pamphlet.
- The pamphlet will soon be available on the SFLO website.

9:30 – Spatial Analysis Project – Mark Gray and Nicki Eisfeldt

Mark and Nicki presented an overview of the spatial analysis project that they conducted. The purpose of this analysis was to inform the US Forest Service where the funds that are being allocated to Forest Stewardship are being used, and where they would best be used on the ground in the future.

Questions & Comments:

- Ken Miller shared with the group that he was under the impression that stewardship is getting close to the end of it's funding, he was wondering what the point of the survey was?
 - Mark Gray explains that in order for the Farm bill to get any funding for next biennium this survey had to be conducted by 2010. Although only a small portion of this money will most likely go to Stewardship the bill actually funds many other programs which assist landowners.
 - Mark also suggested that the group invite Ray Abriel from the Forest Service out to explain their point of view.
 - The survey is also a good tool for prioritizing and helping to make decisions on cutting back, if need be.

10:45 – Eastside Riparian Restoration training Document- Glenn Kohler

Open discussion about the document was conducted. Comments were centered on what to include in the document and what not to include as well as where the group will go next with this material. Comments and Questions were as follows:

- Phil Hess proposed to the group that the document only include the science of imminent mortality due to insects and fire and leave out all guidance relative to prescriptions.
 - Dave Whipple and Mark Hicks agree with focusing on imminent mortality. Dealing with immanency vs. forest health are two separate issues.
- The group agreed to put the draft back in Glen's hands for updates and to leave all prescriptive language out. The idea being to wait and see what happens in the first training sessions with the document and make adjustments accordingly.
- Suggestions and edits should be sent directly to Glen who will incorporate them into the next draft, please send edits and suggestions by January 1st.
- Mary McDonald would like the caucuses to be thinking about who would represent your agency/caucus on the training steering committee for this template in fall 2009.
- Jeffrey Thomas proposed the group meet with the Cultural Resources Committee on January 13th
 - This date does not work; Mary will get in touch with chairs for other potential dates.

1:00 Summary of Small Landowner Hardwood Conversion Alternate Plans- Jeff Galleher, Jenni Dystra, Steve Pederson, Bob Penhale

In the August SLOAC meeting the group decided to have a team investigate using surveys whether or not to move forward with drafting the Harwood Conversion (conifer restoration) template. The findings and suggestions from this on the ground investigation are as follows:

Findings:

- No two sites were alike; there was large variability between all sites reviewed.
- Conifer restoration was generally poor; most sites had been replanted but were failing due to brush control issues.

- Sites that harvested on both sides of the stream were more significantly impacted than sites which harvested on only one side.
- The 5 regulatory functions we adequately protected on all sites but 1.
- Sites with heavy landowner involvement and with landowners as residents were generally more likely to follow through with vegetation management, producing better results.

Recommendations:

- Only allow 1 sided restoration plans.
- Require 190 conifer "free to grow" minimum after the 5th growing season.
- Require a forestation report after the 3rd and 5th growing season from the landowner.
- Emphasize conifer should be planted on wet site – choose the right species. Retain all conifer within a minimum of 75 ft from the stream.
- Recommend that resident (on site) landowners be allowed more flexibility with their AP(alternate plan)

Additional observation notes and ideas were passed out to the group. Mary will e-mail them out to the people who were present at the meeting (including phone participants.)

Final Comments and wrap up.

3:30 Meeting Adjourned