

McKenzie Stewardship Group

January 13, 2020 | 2:30 - 4:30 PM

EWEB Conference Room

500 E. 4th Ave, Eugene, OR

Attendees:

Darren Cross, USFS

Shadie Nimer, USFS

Gordon Culbertson, Whitewater Forests

Kyle Sullivan, ODF

Gary Jensen, UWSWCD

Daniel Dietz, MRT

Shane Kamrath, USFS

David Bishop, USFS

Karl Morgenstern, EWEB

Kirk Shimeall, CPRCD

Nancy Toth, EWEB

Jared Weybright, MWC

Trisha Maxfield, Facilitator

Welcome

Introductions: The group participated in a team building activity using the “common ground thumbball”

Minutes: The group reviewed the 11/18/19 minutes. No feedback was given. Minutes were approved.

Updates & Announcements

New Facilitator: Trish introduced herself and shared the scope of work agreed upon with the hiring subcommittee. Scope of Work: (1) Meeting facilitation, (2) planning one field trip, (3) attending forest collaborative related meetings, (4) review zones of agreement, research other groups, and present to the group for discussion, (5) develop a list of potential stewardship contracting projects and facilitate discussion on priorities, (6) review operating agreements, research other groups, and present to the group for discussion and potential amendments, (7) develop a list of potential restoration projects and facilitate discussion on priorities. Other tasks: self-assessment, support letter for new WNF Supervisor, strategic plan or visioning process.

Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition Annual Meeting: Trish passed around agendas for the RVCC Annual Meeting and asked the group if they would like her to represent MWSG at the RVCC annual meeting. The group agreed this could be a worthwhile event.

All Collabs Meeting: Springfield | Friday, Feb. 28th. | Time: TBD): Trish asked the group if there are topics they would like to see on the agenda for this meeting. The group relayed two topics: 1) Discussion around retained receipt allocation for stewardship contracts. 2) Program revenue allocation for Good Neighbor Authority program revenue in the future, as the program becomes more stable.

PNW Collaboratives Workshop: Hood River | April 9-10: Trish said she will send out the registration information when it becomes available. Hold the date.

USFS Updates: R Sale: Putting the timber sale package together. Will put out for bid in February.

West Quartz Sale: The sale should be going out in the Spring. Looking at May. **Flat Country EIS:** The EIS is almost done and will go out to the public as a draft in the next two weeks.

Environmental Groups: Darren shared with the group that the WNF will be hosting three meetings/field trips per year for environmental groups. This is something that grew out of Oregon Wild leaving the table and asking if there was a different way to get involved. Something similar has been done on the Siuslaw. They haven't figured it out yet if this is advertised to the public, or just invite for different environmental groups. Oregon Wild is taking the lead on networking for the environmental groups. There is potential for the first meeting to be held in mid-April.

Ridge Monitoring: EWEB started baseline monitoring before harvesting. They were looking to do storm baseline monitoring, however the USFS has a tight timeline and started logging before they were able to. EWEB is looking to do this type of monitoring for most stewardship contracting sales. In the future, the Forest Service might be able to help plan monitoring if they are aware of the criteria beforehand. The monitoring project is measuring turbidity, conductivity, PH, DO, temperature, total and dissolved organic carbon, nutrients etc. Data for Ridge monitoring may be available to share by the next meeting.

Finn Rock Amendment: This was the first collaborative project the group presided over and was one of the first projects that we piloted for private lands (with Dehne/Sullivan being the other). The design and approach to the project has adapted and changed over time based on lessons learned. In 2018 Finn Rock Reach project, MRT tried to bring a contractor in to do culvert replacement, but the area was unstable. The project has been delayed until 2021, however the contract agreement expires in 2020. MRT would like to change the scope of work to cover different costs: hauling trees to log staging area and laying rock to develop the staging area infrastructure. The \$8,500 would still help the project, but in a different way. Looking for support from the group because the original scope of work was agreed upon by the group. Overall, \$1.6M is needed for the project as a whole, currently \$800K is secured, and they are still looking for additional funding. The culvert work will be wrapped in later with the larger project. The group agreed to CPRC&D modifying the scope of work in the original contract.

The group discussed having a running spreadsheet to track where stewardship retained receipts have been allocated and how much of the funds have been spent. Johan has a document that itemizes how those receipts were allocated, as he has to send this to the region. CPRC&D can also give an update monthly as dollars are being spent for the money they oversee for projects.

Discussion Topics

WNF Allocating Retained Receipts Mtg: Trish shared information from the December 17th meeting with the WNF. The FS is moving to a unified budget across the forest. This increases the pressure to use "Trust Funds" (KV, K2, Stewardship Receipts) to cover the cost of meeting targets. The current "pay to play" is an allocation of 20% off the top back to the forest to cover administrative costs. For the remaining 80% the group discussed having a "floor". The current example is \$1M, anything about that "floor" would go back to the forest. There were concerns from the attendees that \$1M floor may not be fair, if a particular stewardship sale is expected to generate significant retained receipts. At the meeting it was discussed that there could be a scale to what the "floor" looks like based on this concern, and also a scale between the North vs. South districts. A recommendation to create more collaborative involvement for the money that goes back to the forest, would be to have a representative from each group participate in how the FS portion of those receipts are divided as part of the trust building process. There was concern on whether groups could actually spend more than \$1M on NEPA ready projects within 2-years. Trish mentioned she will be meeting with Jared to start developing a list of projects that include a timeline and a price tag, so we can better advocate for how much restoration the group could do. The group should also be thinking strategically in how funds are spent between retained receipts vs. GNA program revenues.

Good Neighbor Authority RFP: We still haven't seen the RFP yet, though it's understood the pot of money is \$100k-\$160k. The project must be NEPA ready, must be on FS land, and ODF must be able to complete or contract the work. ODF cannot give the money back to the FS to do the work. ODF can do a direct awarding of funds to an organization if there is a match, and we still need clarification from ODF on what this match looks like. Three projects were presented by the group and prioritized below.

1. South Fork Monitoring - \$22k: macro sampling, lab analysis for 65 samples and project management, and admin.
2. Deer Creek UAV Sampling - \$13k: UAV sampling and analysis of geomorphic change, large wood, vegetation - same contract as used in 2018-19, plus time for contract management, and admin.
3. Deer Creek Macro Sampling - \$8k: macro sampling, lab analysis for 20-ish samples, project management, and admin.

Additional GMPA Stewardship Projects:

Trish mentioned there was discussion in the notes from previous meetings on whether or not the group would like to consider the Hidden Lake sale as a stewardship contract. She asked the group if this is something they would like to consider, as the FS would need a decision by this

spring. The next stewardship sale would not be available until 2022 in Flat Country. Hidden Lake is ~10MBF with no helicopter logging, ~86 acres of regeneration, and there are no trees over 80 years old. Trish asked if we'd like to ask the Forest Service to come back with more information, but did remind the group they have gone on a field trip to this area and this was originally the groups second priority. Trish asked the group to vote by holding up fingers representing their vote: One for complete disagreement, two for more discussion, or three for agreement to move the sale forward. All voting members held up a "three", the group would like to move forward the the Hidden Lake stewardship sale. Trish will forward a recommendation memo to the MRRD.

Review if Annual Metrics: Nancy pulled up the Annual Metrics Spreadsheet to discuss with the group (see below). There was a question on whether GNA metrics should be added to the spreadsheet moving forward. Trish and Nancy will work on adding in GNA metrics. The group asked if Ridge is considered multi-party monitoring or process monitoring, Trish will follow up with this.

The group had a brief discussion on being more involved in the planning process for projects. Trish mentioned the group could look at doing a strategic plan or visioning process to see where the group wants to go in the future, as there are some people who may only be interested in the implementation aspects of project, rather than entire landscape planning. Darren mentioned a need for a restoration committee. Gordon asked for a list of partners who attend SWFC meetings.

Next Steps

- Draft support letter for WNF Supervisor position
- Share 'agenda topics' with Jen for All Collabs meeting
- Ask Johan for itemized allocation of stewardship retained receipts from past projects
- Recommendation memo for Hidden Lake Stewardship Sale
- Research process monitoring vs. multi-party monitoring
 - *Process monitoring* is looking monitoring varying processes i.e. Self-assessment. *Multit-party* monitoring essentially means diverse group involvement to set what will be monitored, as well as receiving updates.
 - Resource:
<https://www.nationalforests.org/collaboration-resources/learning-topics/multi-party-monitoring>
- Look at metrics for GNA for annual metrics
- Share list of SWFC partners who attend meetings
- Seek feedback for Annual Self-Assessment Questions

McKenzie Watershed Stewardship Group Metrics 2019

Metric	Source	2019	Comments
Number of stewardship contracts offered	USFS	1	Q sale not yet logged
Are stewardship contracts bid on?	USFS	yes	
Amount of money generated from retained receipts	USFS	0	Q sale not yet logged
Amount of funds leveraged from outside sources to use with retained receipts	Partners		Small grants - \$10,000 (Sullivan) and \$13,000 (Dehne)
Economic impacts to local area	USFS and group discussion	2,387	Two separate local contractors completed work at the two privately owned sites during 2019. Both contractors will continue to be used during 2020.
Trending data	MWSG		
Is restoration work done with Stewardship contracting addressing priority areas defined by MWC Strategic Action Plan?	MWC	yes	(work continuing on PWP properties)
Stewardship Contracting metrics			
Amount of money spent on private lands	USFS	\$2,387	Site preparation for Dehne/Sullivan
Amount of money spent on public lands	USFS	0	No Stewardship funding spent on South Fork Phase II in 2019
Goods for services	USFS		
Types of projects implemented	MWSG		
Good Neighbor Authority metrics			
Number of GNA sales on district	ODF/USFS	2	Strube Flats Deck Sale, Park Sale
Program revenue generated from sales	ODF/USFS	\$1,074,700	Program revenue used to fund projects across the forest, does not directly go to MWSG for allocating the way retained receipts do.
Funds used on McKenzie District	ODF/USFS	\$0	
Number of MWSG project priorities completed with GNA program revenue	Partners	0	
Project statistics			
Stream miles restored (planted)	USFS	0.14	Initial container stock planting at Dehne was completed during December 2019. Bare root planting will occur in Feb/Mar 2020 at both Dehne and Sullivan. Total planting area will include 0.20 stream miles.
Fencing (linear feet)	USFS		
Culvert (quantity of structures and miles of stream that will now be accessible to fish)	USFS		

Bridge (quantity of structures and miles of stream that will now be accessible to fish)	USFS		
Snags or downed woody debris (quantity)	USFS	0	
Riparian area treated for invasives (acres)	USFS	2.8	Total project area for Dehne and Sullivan
Upland forest area treated for invasives (acres)	USFS	0	
Meadow area treated for invasives (acres)	USFS	0	
Boulders or log placement (quantity and stream linear feet and/or acres)	USFS		
Road decommissioning (miles)	USFS	0	
Road improvements (drainage, brushing, sidecase pullback, etc.)	USFS	0	
Group Process			
Does group meet and share information on a regular basis?	MWSG	yes	
How many meetings were held during the year?	MWSG	6	the fewer number of meetings than usual was due to federal shutdown and losing our facilitator
How many field tours were held during the year?	MWSG	1	Ridge Stewardship sale (prior to harvest), previous thinning project (Tap Thin) and Phase 1 of South Fork McKenzie Floodplain Restoration Project
Is a diverse set of interests represented?	MWSG	yes	though Oregon Wild just left the group, so may need to think about replacing?
Are minority opinions represented and documented?	MWSG	yes	
Are stewardship group members engaged in planning and recommendation process for stewardship contracts?	MWSG	yes	The group is continuing to try and get involved earlier in the planning process.
Does US Forest Service take recommendations from group into consideration when developing contracts?	MWSG	yes	
Do group members do what they say they are going to do?	MWSG	yes	
Is process multi-party monitoring being conducted by group?	MWSG	Yes	Ridge ecological monitoring project and group self-assessment survey for process monitoring
Are we getting results expected?	MWSG	no	haven't set out clear expectations
Why or why not? Lessons learned	MWSG		
Are group members abiding by operating procedures?	MWSG	yes	
Is group able to reach consensus on decisions?	MWSG	sometimes	
Is group sharing its success with outside or external stakeholders?	MWSG	not a lot	We talk about the group with other external groups and stakeholders sometimes, but no concerted media effort other than the basic webpage hosted by CPRCD with notes posted

Are members seeking, participating and/or supporting grant applications and other funding opportunities in support of watershed protection and enhancement efforts?	MWSG	yes	Facilitation grant
---	------	-----	--------------------

McKenzie Stewardship Group

Budget Line Items	NFF - LL 602 McKenzie Stewardship Capacity			EWEB PO 16074 Facilitation			USFS 18-SA-11061800-002 McKenzie Stewardship			USFS CS-11061800-012 Facilitation			Total Funding	Total Spent to Date	Total Remaining Budget
	Spent to Date	Remaining Budget		Spent to Date	Remaining Budget		Spent to Date	Remaining Budget		Spent to Date	Remaining Budget				
Agreement Start :	4/1/2019						4/12/2018								
Agreement End :	5/1/2020	As of 12/31/19			As of 12/31/19		12/31/2022	As of 12/31/19		9/30/2021	As of 12/31/19				
CPRCD Salaries and Wages						-	1,984.09	-	1,984.09			-	1,984.09	-	1,984.09
CPRCD Travel						-	288.90	280.00	8.90			-	288.90	280.00	8.90
Contracted:						-			-			-		-	-
Facilitation	13,636.36	3,415.00	10,221.36	5,000.00	5,000.00					14,550.00	8,689.91	5,860.09	33,186.36	17,104.91	16,081.45
PWP Riparian Restoration							16,500.00	2,387.10	14,112.90			-	16,500.00	2,387.10	14,112.90
Finn Rock Reach Culvert Removal							8,500.00		8,500.00			-	8,500.00	-	8,500.00
	-	-	-			-		-	-			-		-	-
Total Direct	-	3,415.00	10,221.36	5,000.00	5,000.00	-	27,272.99	2,667.10	24,605.89	14,550.00	8,689.91	5,860.09	60,459.35	19,772.01	40,687.34
Indirect Costs	1,363.64	-	1,363.64	-	-	-	2,727.01	-	2,727.01	-	-	-	4,090.65	-	4,090.65
Total	15,000.00	3,415.00	11,585.00	5,000.00	5,000.00	-	30,000.00	2,667.10	27,332.90	14,550.00	8,689.91	5,860.09	64,550.00	19,772.01	44,777.99