

GROUP 2NE



Actions we can agree on to begin a dry forest strategy

- Question as to why we did the survey – what did we hope to get out of it?
 - ▣ Any disparity of opinion is more likely to be found outside the Forum in the general public
- There was some concern about question #67 – long term contracts between USFS and tribes. The “Strongly Disagree” in Education and Producers raised some questions.

Actions we can agree on to begin a dry forest strategy

- We agree with the basic forest health issues. Tribes and conservation are the likely stand outs. Tribes have a landscape view, conservation needs set asides.
- A comment that tribes and conservation don't see all that far apart on most forest health issues

Do we have enough information to move forward?

- Concerns about economic numbers; that's an area that needs more research to get into all the values inherent in the Forest.

Are we comfortable with the science that's been done?

- Strong YES.
- A feeling that most disagreements regarding dry forests can be resolved; deeper problem is the strategy to work with all the administrative and legal issues.

How Experimental are we willing to be to achieve ecological resilience?

- We have to change (up to a point). We wouldn't be here otherwise.
- We have to do things that haven't been done! We have a mandate to be experimental.
- It comes back to implementation. Need to know the worst case scenario and set some boundaries and establish monitoring.

Rather than focusing on restoration, can we consider a desired future direction?

- What's the difference between restoration and desired future direction? No consensus with the definition of restoration and DFD (direction or condition?).
- Depends on the stake holder: do you want to maximize growth, wildlife habitat, etc...
- There's no reason DFCs can't reflect restoration!

Can we identify areas that fit within an “Anchor Forest” concept?

- Some think it’s something that can be agreed upon.
- How big actual areas?
- How many actual forests that treatment can be applied to?

What is the regional minimum size for a working Anchor Forest?

- What do you have to do to bring in (timber) without Federal Lands, or NIPF, DNR, and Tribal to run 2 mills (capacity of 2 mills with an estimated 60 years rotation). Do the math.
- In NE WA, 1 billion board feet are needed annually to run the current infrastructure. The circles are getting bigger. All forests need to be included to make it happen: state, private, tribal, feds, NIPF.
- Is a State bonding effort a doable strategy to purchase cheap industrial lands on large scale (1 million acres)? Is there revenue that can be made from such a purchase, or is it all 30 years out? There are lots of industry lands for sale.

Are industry lands a viable part for a workable anchor forest?

- Perhaps on east side, because less value for development. Central - Industry might hold on until market goes up.
- Industrial lands tend to have the infrastructure (roads); that is very important for any anchor forest!
- Feds and State have to be a reliable part to keep up infrastructure.

Implications for managing/protecting the resilience of the following...

- Use criteria to assess which forests actually fit into an Anchor Forest. Somehow we need to synthesize a 10 million acre area into anchor forests that sustain forest infrastructure while treating health issues. Assume 1/10th is available for treatment.
- Prioritize – why talk about non-roaded areas? Start with the low hanging fruit (roaded areas) before you even attempt to discuss the other areas.
- Avoid confrontational/controversial areas!

How can we foster inter-ownership collaboration?

- Perhaps there is an optimum amount of treatment for every area, but it will not be the same over the landscape. Consensus – the bigger the better.

Will a 15 year contract be enough to invest into the infrastructure?

- Length of contract needs to be volume based; shorter contracts need bigger volume. Longer contracts (15+) need to provide consistent timber.
- 15 year contracts would be a good target to inspire investment into infrastructure: YES.

What are barriers to infrastructure & Anchor Forests from moving forward?

- Contract Length with Feds/BLM/other gov. agencies.
- Local authority contract length problems
 - ▣ USFS 10 years, BLM 10?
- The difficulty in getting the contract when using Federal assistance greatly increases costs (i.e. Davis Bacon after 50% of fed money used).
- Education can be a barrier (even with cost share programs). Initial outlay to small private owners is also a barrier.

How do we foster inter owner collaboration into actions?

- Forest Health treatments that include tax breaks as incentives.
- Stewardship funding affects a wide range of NIPF lands; education.
- Smoke management permits can be another barrier.
- The regulatory overhead specific to smoke is extremely difficult and a barrier.
- Collaboration grants to give incentive to areas to work together on forest health issues.
- A consortium of owners should be able to build a streamlined plan to work together with forest health lands.
- Simplify paperwork by the state that is required to manage your lands for forest health (simple permit, long-term)

Institutional frameworks needed to encourage testing treatment protocols?

- Possible opportunity to setup some sort of forest health knowledge exchange to know what treatments/outcomes have been tested and monitored.
- Educational framework – is there a system that takes newly found information/technology and puts it into practice? How adaptable are we in forestry today to take the risks and move forward?
- No = a belief that the structure is there for those who seek it out. But, there should be better coordination among stewardship and treatment strategies (eliminate redundancy).

Is the Anchor Forest feasible?

- Is there something we can learn from other successful models around the country/world?
- There are many mechanisms to encourage anchor forests; no development, 1/20 acres, etc..
- Conflict between private landowner rights and applying treatments. The Counties often don't promote the easements/tax breaks and programs in place to promote healthy forests. Emphasize current programs by counties and gov't agencies.

Is there a problem using Anchor Forests idea to move forward?

- Focusing on aggregates of land that can contribute to anchor forests.
- What is the benefit of calling something an Anchor Forest? Is there a need for this new terminology. Is there predictability that will be associated when you have or participate in anchor forests? What kind of additional rights do we see being applied to the owners involved in anchor forests?
- Rally communities around the anchor forest idea will take incentives. Incentive a “maintenance” of current lifestyle within Anchor Forest community. (needs an organizer that can rally and get people excited).
- There has to be a belief and commitment to being part of Anchor Forests! Guarantees should be included to inspire commitments from outside investment.
- Needs to address private land owners and get them to sign on and believe; that is by rights and incentives.

Is there a problem using Anchor Forests idea to move forward?

- We find the concept is solid; the mode of moving it forward is totally vital to its success. The idea will not sell itself to the forest owners that we need; a push will be needed to pick up momentum. Start with the lowest hanging fruit (places with infrastructure already in place). Success here will hopefully inspire new investment in other areas.

Who should be involved?

- Is there an entity that carries more trust with a wide array of stakeholders?
- A committee needs to work together and reach out to different stakeholders.
- Counties

Who should lead this effort?

- Universities
- Committee
- Economic development groups
- Small diverse task force

Potential funding sources

- USFS State and private funding.
- Tax incentives.

What additional technical info is needed?

- Where is the area, how much of each land ownership is there, identify the forests (locate) that need to be targeted.
- Biomass estimates, topographic considerations, transportation infrastructure

How do we develop public support?

- General consensus: we suck at this
- We need the social ability to take this strategy forward?

How do we encourage federal, state, and local decision makers?

- Tax rebates.
- Business tax structure/incentives.
- 1 state representative to address our interests at the state level. Don't open the doors to the state; there's a good chance that the response will be beyond critical mass. Too many toes to step on. Definitely include DNR.
- State could let long term contracts.