



**Year
2000
goal
in sight
for
forest
plans**

Development and review of the Oregon Department of Forestry's major planning documents for state forestlands will continue through this spring and summer, culminating in final drafts of the *Western Oregon State Forests Habitat Conservation Plan* (HCP), the *Northwest Oregon State Forests Management Plan* (FMP) and district implementation plans by August or September 1999. The State Forests Program is aiming for final approval of the plans in 2000.

Protecting wildlife

In 1996, staff from the Department of Forestry and the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife began discussions with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) focused on a habitat conservation plan to cover northern spotted owls and marbled murrelets (federally listed as "threatened"). In spring 1997, the State Forests Program expanded the scope of the HCP to address salmon (coho and steelhead), and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) joined the meetings.

In 1998, the State Forests planning team offered preliminary drafts of the FMP and HCP for public review and an independent scientific analysis. This winter, the department began revising the draft strategies in response to comments received from those processes.

The revised strategies are now being considered and refined in a continuing collaborative process among the four agencies. The planning team aims to have the final-draft HCP available for review by the Board of Forestry and the Oregon State Land Board in August.

see YEAR 2000 next page

YEAR 2000

continued from front page

Board of Forestry to consider HCP

At meetings this spring and summer, the Oregon Board of Forestry will consider various aspects of the HCP and forest management plans. The public is welcome to attend and submit oral or written comment. On April 23, the Board of Forestry heard analyses of proposed strategies and alternatives from several different perspectives, including economics, wildlife, fisheries and recreation. On June 9 in Salem, the Board will consider monitoring and adaptive management. A July 23 meeting in Eugene will feature a discussion of aquatic and riparian strategies.

The Board of Forestry and the State Land Board will receive the HCP final draft late this summer and during their September meetings will decide on submittal of the draft to the federal services (USFWS and NMFS). The Board of Forestry meeting is scheduled for Sept. 8 in Salem. The submittal will also include drafts of the environmental impact statement (EIS) and the implementation agreement.

Federal review of HCP, EIS

After the HCP is submitted, the services will complete the draft of the EIS, a document required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). According to federal policy, the services have up to one year to review an HCP/EIS. During that time, the public is encouraged to assess, review and analyze the proposed HCP and related documents, including the EIS. The NEPA review includes a public comment period of at least 60 days. A final decision on the HCP is anticipated during 2000.

Forest Management Plans

Concurrent with the HCP process, the Department of Forestry is completing two forest management plans (FMPs) for the HCP plan area, covering more than 600,000 acres of state forestland in northwestern Oregon and about 20,000 acres of scattered parcels in southwestern Oregon. Work on these plans began in 1994 and has involved several rounds of public meetings and comment periods. The forest management plans cover a broad array of forest resources, while the HCP focuses on threatened and endangered fish and wildlife, and other species of concern.

Final drafts of the forest management plans will be available in September 1999, along with the HCP. These plans will be adopted by the Oregon State administrative rule process and are expected to be approved by October 2000. The rule process also involves public participation.

Next level: implementation plans

Each of the seven ODF districts in the HCP plan area is currently preparing an implementation plan to put into practice the strategies of the HCP and FMPs. Implementation plans are more detailed and cover a shorter time period than the long-range plans — about 10 years — although the plans will be revised more often than that. Elements include landscape design, land management classifications and expected resource outputs, such as habitat development, forest products and recreation. Draft district implementation plans also will be available for review fall 1999. Following final approval of the HCP and FMPs, the State Forester will approve the implementation plans.

Scientific panel reviews western Oregon Habitat Conservation Plan

Declaring it “one of the most thorough and intensive reviews ever conducted on a proposed habitat conservation plan,” Oregon State University professor John Hayes presented a summary of the 300-page *Independent Review* of the Oregon Department of Forestry’s proposed *Western Oregon State Forests Habitat Conservation Plan* (HCP) to the plan’s Public Interest Committee (PIC) in Salem in July.

A panel of 26 scientists independently selected by OSU’s College of Forestry performed the technical evaluation. The scientists are experts in areas such as wildlife and forest ecology, botany, hydrology and geomorphology. ODF contracted with the university to conduct the review to examine the scientific underpinnings of the objectives and strategies set forth in the HCP.

To help structure the review, ODF prepared a set of questions based upon concerns raised by ODF and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife Services (ODFW) and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). The reviewers were asked to assess the HCP and, peripherally, the Forest Management Plan (FMP), from which the HCP was developed, with reference to their respective technical specialties. They then answered the subset of questions related to that area of expertise.

With a focus on the conservation strategies contained in the HCP, the Independent Scientific Review (ISR) examined the sections on northern spotted owl and marbled murrelet conservation, aquatic and riparian habitat conservation, monitoring and adaptive management approaches and landscape strategies.

Two key concerns emerged from

the review: The scientists said that the conservation objectives of the plan are too general and that some of the management strategies to conserve listed wildlife species do not cite supporting scientific documentation. ODF planners pledged to correct those deficiencies in the next HCP draft by including more detail in the objectives and listing published research papers that ODF technical staff drew on to formulate the strategies.

Following receipt of the ISR report, the State Forests Program planning team assigned several technical work groups, made up of ODF and ODFW staff, to study specific sections of the scientific review and identify key issues and concerns. The wildlife biologists and foresters developed proposed changes that will be included in the next draft of the HCP. The draft revisions developed by the work groups drew on not only the analysis of the scientific group but all the comments and recommendations of the public and the PIC, a 13-member panel comprising representatives of an array of interest groups.

In his written summary of the scientific review, Hayes noted that, “with a handful of exceptions, the reviewers expressed general favor with the overall direction presented in the HCP, and several indicated that the approaches outlined represented major progress in the forest management approaches.”

ODF planner Logan Jones described the ISR as a huge undertaking. “We asked for this,” he said, “and it was money well spent.”

Public Interest Committee identifies key HCP issues

The Public Interest Committee (PIC) charged with identifying key policy and technical issues in the draft *Western Oregon State Forests Habitat Conservation Plan* (HCP) hammered out a set of recommendations for the Oregon Board of Forestry in a meeting Nov. 9 and 10 at Silver Falls Conference Center near Sublimity, Ore.

“This HCP process demonstrates once again that when good people of differing views are willing to listen to each other, good results can be reached,” said Bryan Johnston, committee chair, in assessing the 8-month process that included seven meetings.

The 13-member PIC identified several key policy and technical issues in the draft HCP. The diverse group comprising representatives of the broad spectrum of interests with a stake in the management of state forestlands took on a number of weighty topics including alignment of the HCP with the draft *Northwest Oregon State Forests Management Plan* (FMP); conservation strategies for protected and sensitive wildlife species; strategies for management of aquatic and riparian habitats; and monitoring and adaptive management.

Monitoring and adaptive management

The FMP and HCP call for active monitoring of forest habitats during implementation of the plans to determine if the management strategies are producing the desired results. Foresters will analyze this information and, if necessary, modify their approaches. The PIC recommended adding a section to the monitoring and adaptive management strategies that defines and describes a process for an informal

dispute-resolution process. The section also would include language clarifying that direct linkages for other covered species or key indicator species are needed.

Aquatic and riparian strategies

The PIC stressed the importance of ensuring the aquatic and riparian strategies are consistent with the salmon and trout protection defined in the Greatest Permanent Value administrative rule governing management of state-owned lands. Quantifiable or measurable thresholds should be included in the HCP. The PIC also recommended that the department strive for watershed assessment that is consistent with accepted protocols. The committee supported ODF’s intent to update all information and maps with new on-the-ground information as it becomes available.

Protected wildlife

The committee could not achieve consensus on the issue of listed wildlife species, the northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet. Some PIC members expressed support for the strategies proposed in the HCP, while others withheld their support pending the availability of more detail on the strategies. There was agreement that monitoring of the habitats of these species is critical to success of the plan’s conservation approaches.

Aligning the HCP and the FMP

Considerable discussion took place over the relationship of the HCP and its parent plan, the FMP. The committee concurred with the department’s declared intent to align the two documents more closely. But concerns were

raised over the need to retain the state's sovereignty and avoid unintended legal exposure.

Landscape management strategies

PIC members expressed divergent views on the issue of setting aside lands in perpetuity for an exclusive purpose. A recommendation was made that the department should strive for consistency of the FMP and HCP with existing regional wildlife species recovery plans and with the Oregon Plan for listed salmonid species. It was suggested that a statement be added to the HCP about conserving native diversity from a broader landscape perspective.

Cumulative effects

The Oregon Forest Practices Act defines cumulative effects as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the forest practice when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future forest practices regardless of what governmental agency or person undertakes such other actions." In the context of state forestlands encompassed by the HCP, the committee recommended that the department provide a better description of Structure-based Management and its tie to long-term effects on wildlife. The PIC also called on planners to describe underlying assumptions about the regional context for indicators of cumulative effects, including species, habitat and ecological indicators.

Communication and public involvement

The PIC suggested that the communications plan in the FMP be incorporated into the HCP, and that the department should solicit public involvement more actively. Monitoring data should be presented in a form easily understandable to the layperson,

and all plan-related information should be made readily accessible to the public.

Implementation agreement

The committee advised the department to add an appropriate dispute-resolution process to the HCP implementation agreement between ODF and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. A termination clause should be included as well, along with language specifying trigger mechanisms for review of the implementation agreement.

In January, the PIC presented its recommendations to the Oregon Board of Forestry in a 43-page report.

"These recommendations represent a win-win for Tillamook County and the state of Oregon," said Sue Cameron, who represented the Tillamook County Commission on the PIC. "They guarantee continued timber harvest and recognize the importance of protecting our ecosystems."

The PIC membership included Polk County Commissioner Mike Propes; Tillamook County Commissioner Sue Cameron; Chair Bryan Johnston, Dean of Atkinson Graduate School of Management, Willamette University; Sybil Ackerman, National Wildlife Federation; Cliff Adams, The Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde; Mickey Bellman, Quality Veneer and Lumber; Rod Brobeck, Oregon Wildlife Heritage Foundation; Harold J. Kalleck, Jr., Pacific Northwest 4-Wheel Drive Association; James E. McCauley, Oregon Forest Industries Council; Glen H. Spain, Pacific Coast Federation of Fishermen's Associations; Sara Vickerman, Defenders of Wildlife; and Ray Craig (ex-officio), Assistant State Forester, Oregon Department of Forestry.

Public makes comments on April 1998 draft FMPs and HCPs

Last summer, the Oregon Department of Forestry offered opportunities for the public to comment on the

draft *Northwest Oregon State Forests Management Plan* (FMP) and *Western Oregon State Forests Habitat Conservation Plan* (HCP) through public meetings in five cities.

The information sessions conducted in June and July in Salem, Portland, Corvallis, Astoria and Tillamook invited participants to divide into small groups and share their thoughts on the plans. Forestry staff captured the comments on flip charts. This “listening-post” format encouraged people who are reluctant to speak before a large group to contribute to the planning process. In addition to oral comments, the department received more than 100 written comments. Turnout for the meetings ranged

from 11 in Salem to more than 100 in Portland. Total attendance for the five sessions was more than 200 (some

citizens attended more than one meeting).

Following the meetings, ODF planners reviewed the comments and entered them into the public record. The meetings drew responses from a broad cross-section of Oregonians, including environmental, recreation, fisheries and forest-products industry interests.

Public meetings also were held in November and December 1997 to discuss earlier drafts of the strategies. These included meetings in Grants Pass and Glendale, which focused on the draft Southwest Oregon State Forest Management Plan.

Achieving goals: what to know, do

Among the written comments received in the two series of meetings were detailed technical statements on forest resource management, ranging from approval of Structure-based Management and active, integrated forest management as described in the plans, to preference for no management at all — a hands-off approach. Several objected to the amount of timber harvest proposed in the plan, and a number of comments insisted on the need for permanent reserves that would never be harvested.

Many comments addressed clearcuts, most recommending that they be minimized, restricted or banned. A few advised using clearcuts as a silvicultural tool or to provide habitat for game. Several commenters advocated managing for diverse tree species in the forests, including hardwoods. There was general agreement that all remaining old growth in state forests should be protected.

Most of the technical comments

TURNOUT FOR THE MEETINGS

RANGED FROM 11 IN SALEM

TO MORE THAN 100 IN

PORTLAND.

TOTAL ATTENDANCE

FOR THE FIVE SESSIONS

WAS MORE THAN 200.

addressed the strategies for northern spotted owls, marbled murrelets and other wildlife species and fish habitat. A few recommended that silvicultural practices be better aligned with forest products markets, and some mentioned Swiss needle cast (a Douglas-fir disease) and other forest health issues. Other technical concerns included roads, culverts, domestic water supplies and the hazards of logging steep slopes. Many people referred to the Independent Scientific Review report on the HCP and cited scientists participating in that review. There also were many who recommended strategies advocated by the National Marine Fisheries Service or used in federal forests, including riparian buffers, late-successional reserves and management approaches for particular wildlife species.

A diversity of goals

From the body of comments, it is apparent that the technical details recommended for the management strategies differ according to individual's or organization's goals for the state forests. Both oral and written comments contained statements that focused on policies and values rather than technical matters. People feel very strongly about these issues, and many relate emotionally or spiritually to the forests.

The planning process and the HCP

Many comments focused on the planning process itself, stressing the need for increased public participation in state forest planning. Some disliked the "listening post" format of the June-July 1998 meetings and preferred the public hearing format used in November-December 1997.

Of those who commented specifically on the HCP process, some recommended no HCP at all, while many felt the draft HCP strategies were in-

adequate to protect listed species and salmon. Some recommended consideration of different alternatives, particularly an alternative with large wildlife reserves. Several described the need for continued public and scientific review of HCP strategies, adaptive management and compliance.

Other comments criticized federal policies relating to HCPs, such as the "No Surprises" rule. (This rule provides assurance to the holder of an HCP that no additional land-use restrictions or financial compensation will be required after the HCP is issued. It became effective in March 1998.)

Adaptive forest management

One point of substantial interest and agreement is that the forest management plans and the HCP should be based on monitoring, research and adaptive management — both for the general approach of Structure-based Management, which some regard as untested and experimental, and the specific aquatic-riparian and wildlife strategies. Many individuals and groups, as well as the scientific reviewers, noted the general need for further research to help landowners manage for wildlife and fish. Adaptive management was seen as a way to enable the department to take advantage of improved knowledge in the future.

A new draft

The Department of Forestry is considering all public comments, including the PIC's recommendations, as well as input from scientists during revision of the FMP and HCP. Issue papers provided to the PIC in November 1998 offer an indication of the directions the department is pursuing as it revises and further develops its forest management plan and HCP strategies.

Land classification hearings draw public interest and ideas

Last January, the State Forests Program went on the road to present newly drafted administrative rules for land-base designation and land management classification to the public. In five hearings held statewide in Portland, Klamath Falls, Roseburg, Tillamook and Salem, forest planner Darrel Spiesschaert presented an overview of the two rules and hearings officer Bill Hughes conducted a formal process to receive public testimony.

Land classification rule

Most of the public comments received through the hearing process addressed the draft administrative rule that proposes a new management classification system for the state forests. Following are paraphrases of some of the key comments and the responses of the State Forests Program Planning Team:

Comment: The classification system is too complex. The Focused Stewardship classification and its sub-classes should be eliminated altogether.

Response: We acknowledge the complexity but point out that the broad array of management goals contained in the various plans and resource laws can best be fulfilled by the three levels of management emphasis delineated in the draft rule — General Stewardship, Focused Stewardship and Special Stewardship.

Comment: You need to make a clearer distinction between the General Stewardship and Focused Stewardship categories.

Response: In response to this concern, we have modified the wording of the draft administrative rule to better

distinguish the characteristics of Focused Stewardship land. Identification of resources that would prompt application of this category is tied to legal requirements or to standards conveyed in a forest management plan, a habitat conservation plan or other specific management plan.

Comment: The Aquatic and Riparian sub-class in the Focused Stewardship category should be eliminated. All such streamside habitats should be placed in a sub-class under Special Stewardship. This recommendation arises from a belief that all aquatic and riparian habitats should receive a high level of management emphasis.

Response: A number of documents affecting the management of state forestlands place high priority on aquatic and riparian areas—the administrative rule on State Forest Management Policy and Planning, the various forest management plans, conservation plans and Gov. Kitzhaber’s Executive Order to state agencies on recovery of salmonid fisheries and various statutes and regulations. It’s important to bear in mind that the aquatic and riparian habitat goals and strategies contained in ODF’s forest management plans and habitat conservation plans will drive the management of these key habitat elements, not the Land Management Classification System. Different levels of management emphasis will be needed to meet these goals and strategies. For this reason, we recommend the three classifications for aquatic and riparian habitat be retained.

Comment: A sub-class for “reference sites” should be added to Focused



ODF hearings officer Bill Hughes receives public testimony from a citizen who attended one of the five land classification hearings held in January.

Stewardship and Special Stewardship. These reference sites are needed to monitor and compare how forestry management is impacting the forest to see if the assumptions made regarding management techniques are accurate.

Response: We concur on the importance of monitoring in the management of state forestlands. The current draft administrative rule provides a sub-class of Research/Monitoring for both the Focused Stewardship and Special Stewardship classifications. One of the applications of this sub-class would be to define areas where the monitoring is occurring. As for creating a sub-class for reference sites, we think the current draft rule already provides for monitoring of management activities, and that an additional sub-class is not needed.

Land-base designation maps

Few comments were received on the draft land-base administrative rule, a set of nine computer-generated maps that depict the capability of the 800,000 acres of state forestlands to produce wood fiber. Some of the commenters misconstrued the purpose of the land designation maps, which is

limited to portraying the physical potential of the land to grow trees. The maps are merely descriptive and do not propose a land-use strategy. The other respondents sought to include information in the maps that is inconsistent with the requirements of the existing administrative rule on Land Base Designation (Oregon Administrative Rule 629-035-0040).

The public comment period on the draft land-base designation and land classification administrative rules ran through Jan. 27. ODF submitted the revised rules to the Board of Forestry for adoption at its April meeting. The next step in this process will be classification of state forestlands according to the goals and resources addressed in the long-range plans, including the HCP. ODF districts will draft these maps during the summer and early fall and will hold a 90-day public review period later in the year.

New roads manual is essential connection between FMP, HCP

Oregon Department of Forestry foresters are viewing the network of logging roads on state forests in a new light as they draft a technical manual that will guide road management and development on ODF lands statewide.

“We’re trying to define what would be the ideal transportation system and how we get there,” said Scott Wilbrecht, forest engineering coordinator with the State Forests Program.

The process currently underway to develop the *Northwest Oregon State Forests Management Plan* (FMP) and the concomitant *Western Oregon State Forests Habitat Conservation Plan* (HCP) provided the impetus to draft the *State Forests Roads Manual*, Wilbrecht said, as an essential link between those far-reaching plans and the more localized road-management and transportation plans of individual districts.

Wilbrecht credited the Oregon Plan for Salmon and Watersheds with motivating the department to inventory the network of roads on the 789,000 acres of state-managed forestlands.

“The key purpose of the inventory was to identify road-related risks to salmon,” he said. “The roads manual will supply guidance on how to use inventory information for purposes such as setting priorities and time lines to complete maintenance and road system upgrades.”

The roads manual will describe how ODF is to manage its transportation system, when and where new roads should be constructed, criteria for closing unneeded roads and how priorities for maintaining roads will be set.

Technical Services Manager Rosemary Mannix cited ODF’s ambitious

program to replace old road culverts with new designs that enhance fish passage as an example of actions already underway on state forests to benefit migratory fish.

Mannix said the roads manual is in part an update of an existing department forest engineering manual, but with new chapters that reflect the evolution in thinking on transportation planning and management of other forest resources including riparian and aquatic resources. An example is a section on road abandonment and closure, a subject not addressed in the old manual. Roads that are not needed for ongoing forest management or that present persistent water-quality risks would be among the candidates for closure.

“We may need to close some roads we’re not using,” Wilbrecht said, noting that the density of roads (miles per section) on some state forestlands may be a concern. “We don’t really know what an ideal road density is,” he said. “Obviously it will vary with the terrain you’re in.”

A committee made up of ODF staff and field engineers aims to complete the *State Forests Roads Manual* by September, when the Board of Forestry will consider the HCP for approval. Both the HCP and the FMP will make reference to the manual regarding strategies for managing forest roads.

While the chief purpose of the *State Forests Roads Manual* is to provide technical guidance to the department’s field foresters, Wilbrecht said it also will serve as an information source for citizens who are interested in how roads are used and managed on state forests.

An overview of public participation in planning of state forests

Public participation is critical to develop the best possible management for state forests. Members of the public contribute information, ideas and values that are essential to plan development. Also, the public involvement process can enhance understanding of the department's management approach.

Integration with planning

Since 1994, the Department of Forestry has carried out extensive public involvement in planning for western Oregon state forests. Public participation has been integrated with overall forest planning and covers all parts of the planning process — the two forest management plans (northwest and southwest Oregon state forests), a proposed Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Future public involvement will be sought on implementation planning and adaptive management.

The public involvement process has included newsletters, public meetings and forest tours, a toll-free phone line, information on the Web, a planning forum (focused on the forest management plan), an HCP Public Interest Committee (PIC), two scientific reviews of the forest management plan and HCP strategies, and informal contacts with groups and individuals.

Horizons: Keeping in touch

Since August 1994, ODF has published 10 issues of the *Horizons* newsletter. This newsletter is dedicated to planning for western Oregon state forests and has been published approximately twice each year.

In addition, ODF publishes the

Forest Log, a newsletter that covers all of ODF's activities. Several articles have covered the development of the forest management plans and the HCP.

Approximately 3,500 copies are mailed bimonthly to interested individuals, organizations, businesses and agencies.

Public Meetings

ODF has held more than 30 public meetings in a variety of locations over a 4-year period. Along with discussion of the forest management plans, the meetings included explanation of the need for the HCP, the HCP planning process, and the relationship between the two forest plans and the HCP.

Each round of public meetings included a written comment period. The meetings in November and December 1997, and June and July 1998 were held jointly by state and federal agencies. Representatives of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service were present, along with ODF staff. (See a summary of public comments on

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION HAS
BEEN INTEGRATED WITH
OVERALL FOREST PLANNING
AND COVERS ALL PARTS OF THE
PLANNING PROCESS — TWO
FMPS, PROPOSED HCP AND EIS.

see *PARTICIPATION*, next page

PARTICIPATION

continued from page 11

the April 1998 draft plans in this issue of *Horizons*.)

Committees help focus the plans

In 1994, ODF developed a contact group, the Northwest Planning Forum, to assist the planning team with the development and review of resource goals and strategies for management of the northwestern Oregon state forests. The 8-member planning forum represented a wide range of interests related to state forest resource management. The group first met in 1994 and completed its work in 1998. During this time, the planning forum served as a link between key constituencies and interests, assisted the planning team with the development and review of resource goals and strategies, and helped clarify issues.

In January 1998, the Board of Forestry directed ODF to establish the PIC to represent various groups with a stake in the western Oregon HCP. (See the related article on the PIC in this *Horizons*.)

Scientific reviews

In February 1996, ODF asked for scientific review of the draft strategies in the *Northwest Oregon State Forests Management Plan* (FMP). The peer review group included 10 recognized forestry, wildlife and natural resource experts. The reviewers examined the Structure-based Management strategies and other draft strategies in the forest plan, and provided extensive comments. This peer review of the draft strategies was completed in fall 1996.

In 1998, ODF arranged for another independent scientific review of the draft HCP and FMP. Professor John Hayes, Oregon State University, coor-

inated a thorough and intensive review by 26 scientists, each an expert on one or more of the major issues. The report examined the scientific underpinnings of the objectives and strategies set forth in the HCP. (The process and outcome of this review are described in a separate article in this *Horizons*.)

Public involvement through NEPA

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requires all federal government agencies to complete an environmental analysis for any of their proposed actions that affect the environment. The proposal for action may come from outside the federal government but require action by a federal agency. This is the case with ODF's request to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for an incidental take permit and approval of the western Oregon HCP. An EIS will serve as the NEPA analysis for this proposed action. Federal agencies are required to encourage and facilitate public involvement in the NEPA process.

New rules: state forest management

It became apparent during development of the HCP and the FMPs that new administrative rules on forest planning and the management of state forestlands would provide clear direction for these lands. Hearings on the draft rules were held in February and April 1996. The State Forests Program also formed a citizen advisory committee to counsel on revisions to the draft rules. This committee completed its work in July 1997, and a second set of hearings was held the following month. In that January 1998, the Board of Forestry unanimously approved new administrative rules for the management of state forestlands. [See article on land designation and classification rules in this *Horizons*.]

State Forests Program staff reorganize to boost efficiency

The State Forests Program has appointed Rosemary Mannix and Ross Holloway to fill staff positions designed to enhance the flow of scientific information to field foresters and ensure that ODF policies align with existing statutes.

Jeff Brandt is State Forests' new Research and Monitoring coordinator. His charge is to assemble a strong research and monitoring component for the *Western Oregon State Forests Habitat Conservation Plan* and the *Northwest Oregon State Forests Forest Management Plan* — an element the State Forests Program considers crucial to the success of both plans.

"They are highly motivated, enthusiastic and committed individuals," said State Forests Program Director Mike Bordelon. "Rosemary, Ross and Jeff are assets to both the State Forests Program and the Department of Forestry."

Technical Services Manager

As part of the program's new organizational structure, Rosemary Mannix filled a reformulated slot Nov. 1 entitled Manager of Technical Services.

Formerly acting Forest Biology/Technical Services manager with State Forests, Mannix will oversee staff specialists in engineering, wildlife biology, silviculture and an array of other disciplines. Under her direction, the Technical Services Section will serve as liaison to department district offices as well as program planners and policymakers to ensure the best scientific knowledge and technical information are incorporated into program operations, plans and policies.

Mannix holds a master's degree from Oregon State University in re-



New State Forests Program staff members L to R: Research and Monitoring Coordinator Jeff Brandt; Technical Services Manager Rosemary Mannix; and Policy and Planning Section Manager Ross Holloway bring experience, skill and knowledge to their positions.

source geography and a bachelor's degree from McGill University. She began her career with ODF in 1988 as a resource specialist assigned to implement provisions of the Forest Practices Act. Mannix took a leading role in developing administrative rules for the new provisions, then requested assignment as the Forest Practices Program training coordinator so she could follow up the policy development work with implementation.

In 1994, Mannix joined the State Forests Program as the Threatened and Endangered Species Policy coordinator. She helped develop policies and plans to manage listed wildlife species on state-managed forestlands.

see *NEW STAFF*, next page

NEW STAFF

continued from page 13

Mannix became acting Forest Biology/Technical Services manager in 1997. Her office is at ODF headquarters in Salem.

Policy and Planning Section Manager

As the new Policy and Planning Section Manager for State Forests, Ross Holloway will head up planning efforts on state forestlands, which include the northwest Oregon State FMP and the western Oregon HCP.

“(ROSEMARY, ROSS AND JEFF) ARE HIGHLY MOTIVATED, ENTHUSIASTIC AND COMMITTED INDIVIDUALS.”

— STATE FORESTS PROGRAM DIRECTOR MIKE BORDELON.

Holloway has led the process to develop the FMP since 1994. Another key job responsibility will be to ensure that State Forests Program policies conform to state statutes and follow the direction of the Board of Forestry and the State Land Board. He will supervise four staff specialists in the Policy and Planning Section.

Holloway holds a bachelor's degree from OSU in forestry management. He started with the department in 1977 as a trainee in the Coos District. After subsequent assignments

in the Astoria, West Lane and Tillamook districts, Holloway was promoted in 1990 to assistant to the area director for the Northwest Oregon Area. In that slot, he played a major role in the development of the Tillamook Comprehensive Recreation Plan. When the department began forest management planning for western Oregon in 1994, he was appointed as project leader for the process to develop the northwest Oregon State FMP. Holloway will work out of both the Forest Grove District Office and the Salem headquarters during a transition period.

Research and Monitoring Coordinator

Integrating information from the “hard” sciences and the social sciences into natural-resource decision-making processes has been a career focus of Jeff Brandt, newly appointed research and monitoring coordinator for the State Forests Program.

Brandt brings a solid background in research and monitoring to State Forests' research effort. In 1985, he went to work for Battelle, the world's largest, independent science and technology institute. Brandt served in various research and environmental policy-related roles with Battelle, including an assignment to the federal Environmental Protection Agency in Washington, D.C., where he helped develop the forest-effects component of the federal acid-rain research program.

He holds a bachelor's degree in biology and a master's degree in botany and plant ecology from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. Upon completion of those courses of study, Brandt traveled to Germany, where he earned a doctorate in agriculture from the University of Bonn.

1999 Board of Forestry Meeting Dates

JUNE 9	SALEM	ODF HEADQUARTERS
JULY 23	MCKENZIE BRIDGE	TBA
SEPT. 8	SALEM	ODF HEADQUARTERS
SEPT. 9	CORVALLIS	1999 FOREST ASSESSMENT SYMPOSIUM LASELLS STEWART CENTER, OSU
OCT. 22	ROSEBURG	TBA

PLEASE JOIN US



OREGON DEPARTMENT OF FORESTRY

PUBLIC AFFAIRS OFFICE

2600 STATE STREET

SALEM, OR 97310

"STEWARDSHIP IN FORESTRY"

VISIT ODF ON-LINE
www.odf.state.or.us