

Natural & Working Lands Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meetings

January 12, 2023 · 12:26 PM · ID: 273913773

Chat

Karen Lewotsky (she, her) OEC sent a chat · 12:41 PM

Lisa, if we do break up into sector-focused subgroups, will we be able to join both a subgroup and this larger group?

Joseph Vaile sent a chat · 12:45 PM

While maybe not through email, there are similar concerns with forest practices and that sector could benefit from a subgroup as well.

Teryn Yazdani (she/her), Beyond Toxics sent a chat · 12:45 PM

^^ I completely agree, I'd love to dive in more to the forestry practices to talk through concerns there

Amanda Sullivan-Astor, AOL sent a chat · 12:46 PM

One additional question: What if advisory committee members believe an individual or entity we know to be an expert is missing from an Ad Hoc Technical Group?

Lauren Anderson (she/hers) Oregon Wild sent a chat · 12:55 PM

Thank you!

Jan Lee/OACD sent a chat · 12:57 PM

I believe that NRCS needs to be added from the perspective of knowing the programs that can be used for sequestration because they also have practical experience as well as research.

Nicole Maness (she/her) Willamette Partnership sent a chat · 1:07 PM

I recommend adding definitions for: Adaptation and Avoided Conversion. I also recommend separating out Measurement, Reporting and Verification

Katie Voelke (She/Her) NCLC sent a chat · 1:09 PM

I haven't seen anything for Avoided Deforestation in definition or strategy for forests. I recommend adding.

Greg Green - Ducks Unlimited sent a chat · 1:12 PM

Restoration / Restore is a term used throughout the documents that could benefit with a definition.

Elizabeth Ruthers sent a chat · 1:14 PM

agree with Greg re 'restoration'

M Corvi (she/her) sent a chat · 1:17 PM

are we also merging in what is in the NWL proposal?

Laura Tabor, TNC sent a chat · 1:17 PM

When we do merge the documents, it would be helpful to still note/color code which definitions are "standard" vs new and customized to Oregon.

M Corvi (she/her) sent a chat · 1:29 PM

maybe label them as examples in the heading

Catherine Macdonald sent a chat · 1:30 PM

That is a great idea!

Lauren Anderson (she/hers) Oregon Wild sent a chat · 1:30 PM

I support listing them as examples

Jocelyn Bridson sent a chat · 1:31 PM

Yes, I think a list of examples may be helpful for a reader, and the resource cited provides more information.

Catherine Macdonald sent a chat · 1:34 PM

It would be great to default to NRCS definitions on practices as much as possible to avoid confusion with land managers.

Jocelyn Bridson sent a chat · 1:36 PM

Some relevant NRCS Practice standards are on this document. You can click on the number to get a definition. https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2022-10/CSAF%20Mitigation%20Activities%202023_1028.pdf

Megan Kemple sent a chat · 1:38 PM

I agree with the suggestion to use NRCS definitions if possible to avoid confusion on the part of land managers.

Lauren Anderson (she/hers) Oregon Wild sent a chat · 1:40 PM

Agree that it would be good to include beavers!

Teryn Yazdani (she/her), Beyond Toxics sent a chat · 1:40 PM

Same, that's a great highlight, Joseph!

Elizabeth Ruther sent a chat · 1:48 PM

i wonder if a definition for 'co-benefits' would be helpful. The NWL Strategy addresses co-benefits so well and so perhaps helpful to make space for that here too and will help practices discussion....

Jocelyn Bridson sent a chat · 1:48 PM

Some on-farm practices can have multiplier effects as well - for example combining no till with cover crops.

Catherine Macdonald sent a chat · 1:48 PM

Or perhaps confine the definition of "permanence" to carbon markets but suggest being more flexible regarding how we think about practices.

Amanda Sullivan-Astor, AOL sent a chat · 1:50 PM

I agree about co-benefits. We may also think about ecosystem services as well.

Lauren Anderson (she/hers) Oregon Wild sent a chat · 1:55 PM

maybe "net carbon uptake"

M Corvi (she/her) sent a chat · 1:55 PM

and co-benefits are an important consideration- should this be a definition or folded into criteria? I am not sure...

Megan Kemple sent a chat · 1:57 PM

I find that second bullet confusing. I'm not clear what "net cooling" means and the second part about biophysical effects is also confusing to me

Greg Holmess sent a chat · 1:59 PM

Would you like our comments on the specific practices below in this document in writing before the next meeting, or wait until we can discuss them as a group? I have several that we are not going to get to today.

Jocelyn Bridson sent a chat · 2:02 PM

Co-benefits can also include adaptation to climate change.

Megan Kemple sent a chat · 2:03 PM

I like the recommendation to add definitions for ecosystems services and co-benefits

Nicole Maness (she/her) Willamette Partnership sent a chat · 2:05 PM

Thank you Lisa

Greg Green - Ducks Unlimited sent a chat · 2:05 PM

ES is used, and is catch all term for environmental and societal benefits - groundwater recharge, C Sequest, water quality and efficiency, flood abatement etc