**DRAFT**

Oregon Global Warming Commission Natural & Working Lands Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

3 November 2022, 1:00pm-2:30pm
Virtual Meeting Using GoToMeeting

A total of 27 individuals were in attendance – see list on website.

The process used to develop the scope of work was described, including a literature review of workforce development and training RFPs and reports conducted at the municipal and state level nationwide as well as 19 additional studies. Once the scope of work was drafted, INR staff met with workforce development and training specialists in Oregon to obtain guidance and additional input.

The group discussed the definition of natural and working lands, which originated from Senate Bill 1534:

(2) “Natural and working lands and waters” means:

(a) Lands and waters:

(A) Actively used by an agricultural owner or operator for an agricultural operation, including but not limited to active engagement in farming or ranching;

(B) Producing forest products;

(C) Consisting of forests, woodlands, grasslands, sagebrush steppes, deserts, freshwater and riparian systems, wetlands, coastal and estuarine areas, the submerged and submersible lands within Oregon’s territorial sea, watersheds, wildlands or wildlife habitats;

(D) Used for recreational purposes, including, but not limited to, parks, trails, greenbelts and other similar open space lands; or

(E) Consisting of trees, other vegetation and soils in urban and near-urban areas, including, but not limited to, urban watersheds, street trees, park trees, residential trees and riparian habitats; and

(b) Lands and waters described in paragraph (a) of this subsection that are:

(A) Held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any of the nine federally recognized Indian tribes in this state;

(B) Held in trust by the United States for the benefit of individual members of any of the nine federally recognized Indian tribes in this state;

(C) Within the boundaries of the reservation of any of the nine federally recognized Indian tribes in this state; or (D) Otherwise owned or controlled by any of the nine federally recognized Indian tribes in this state.

INR received the following suggestions from advisory committee members:

* Be clear about which sectors the consultant is addressing. Describe different ownerships in analysis. Include federal lands.
* Reach out to Wallowa Resources and other entities actually doing the work on the ground.
* Increase pace and scale of what this document describes.
* Diverse land ownership (different scales) – be as inclusive as possible regardless of who owns it. Encourage all ownerships to do due diligence. Build on existing efforts – across multiple lines.
* Including urban/greenscapes is important.
* Workforce is difficult on the coast – people can’t afford to live on the North Coast (and Hood County). Also the greatest potential for carbon sequestration – place-based ability for people to live and work in those places.
* ODA has extensive information on ag lands and where they are located. 45 SWCDs are working with people on these practices and could provide inventory. Coalition of Oregon Land Trusts has 300,000 acres among members who have lands that could provide inventory.
* We have a lot of different kinds of working lands. Natural infrastructure (when a community buys a forest and maintains it sustainably) – natural infrastructure for source water protection. Inclusive to think of it as a working landscape – either using a natural system or mimicking a process of a natural system in a built system. Include these kinds of projects, which are often administered by different entities.
* The financial feasibility/viability of programs on private land should be stated/considered as part of this analysis. A lot of farmers are not making a family wage.
* Range of existing education opportunities and how it can be plugged into these – community college programs for forest technicians that feed into other groups/businesses/working forest efforts.
* Include accounting for future skillsets that we may not be anticipating now in a climate-compromised future, and new policies that we will need (e.g., wildfire smoke, extreme precipitation events, etc.).
* We may not be tapping into all of the possible ideas out there – innovation, etc. – let’s not just stay in the lane we are comfortable with.
* We need to think forward and anticipate – climate smart is all about doing this – it’s a framework for approaching new situations and set ourselves up to be successful.
* Struggling with the scope of this project – and how they might do a gap analysis.
* We could consider the potential for adoption of new practices – consider scale of practices.
* Are we involving the SWCDs? Higher level of American Society of Agronomy – where farmers get their information. Who are the experts landowners go to?
* Training – clarify language in purpose re: capacity and training.
* How do different programs that provide technical assistance as well as grant programs (e.g., ODF – fuels reduction work, NRCS – grants) – provide a few examples.
* May be technical sources and information available – finding and accessing them as a landowner – some of the existing programs that, e.g., soil health – aren’t realistic; when landowner or industry is looking for advice, it’s not a one size fits all. Geographically, rainfall, soil types – very diverse – ensure what is being pitched considers those differences throughout Oregon – flexible and regionally based.
* Workforce training – need to clarify exactly the kind of training we need to accomplish our goals, and the capacity to address site-specific conditions across a range of places – consider in scope of work.
* Workforce – what do we mean by it? Is a landowner part of the workforce if they are working the land? There’s a lot of technical assistance happening across the state, but so much more is needed. Spell out we are talking about boots on the ground as well as farmers/landowners that need additional information/grants/soil scientists.
* Commonality of creating a contextual framework – whether you’re a technical assistant or run a chain saw – need to have a grounding in why you are doing it – understanding of why it is important, what it means, and how it fits into a larger picture.
* “Programs” – how does workforce development tie into programs?
* Career development spectrum – FFA – 4H – Programs at Oregon Farm Bureau – these are places for young and developing farmers – traditional sources.
* Community college educational track that would help educate people that were working on farms about the arc of moving up through a management chain on a particular piece of property. Look at curricula that look at the birth to death arc – not just for summer jobs, but to create a future. Opportunities to look at next pieces/steps.
* Has there been outreach to Business Oregon or two entities at U of 0?
* There are re-entry workforce programs for incarcerated individuals – consider that population.
* Community is described differently – communities of color, rural communities – can we define these? Rural communities does not denote farmers because farmers and ranchers are not considered in the communities.
* Consider asking people that respond to the RFQ and people that actually implement the project produce the methodology/results in a digestible presentation (PPT).
* Farmers, ranchers and forestland **owners** need to be mentioned more in the document.
* Traditional ecological knowledge – Indigenous TEK – make that change.
* Farmers and ranchers are not owners – include land mangers.

**ACTION ITEM:** Members were asked to send any specific changes to the document using track changes to Lisa DeBruyckere and Lisa Gaines by November 17, 2022. Upon receipt of all track changes, edits will be incorporated and members will receive two documents – a marked up document showing the suggested edits, and a document with all edits incorporated. The proposed final draft version will be shared with members at the December meeting.

Members were reminded that the Scope of Work will be an RFQ, not an RFP. This means that the OGWC would not be soliciting bids, but would be asking entities to describe their methodology and a ballpark price for completing the work. The Commission could then draft an RFQ upon finding available funding to complete the work.

Lisa DeBruyckere then shared a few slides on the key questions that technical teams will be addressing as they develop activity-based metrics and a methodology for inventory of greenhouse gas emissions and carbon sequestration on natural and working lands.