

Reviewer Comments and Responses to Questions

TABLE OF REVIEW COMMENTS

For full citations, see original comments. Otherwise, comments should be verbatim and complete (Irwin’s were retyped). (Typos were copied as is.)

Reviewers: Bisson, Emmingham, Forsman, Gresswell, Irwin, Ohmann, Oliver, Teensma

Table of Contents:

Introduction	2
General	7
Details	13
Question 1	20
Question 2	23
Question 3	39
Question 4	42
Question 5	45
Question 6	47
Question 7	50
Question 8	53
Question 9	55
Question 10	57
Question 11	59

Introduction

Reviewer	Comments
Bisson	My comments are primarily limited to the effects of the management plan on watersheds and fishery resources.
Emmingham	<p>Close reading of Chapters 2-6 of the Elliot State Forest (EST) (I did not receive Chapter 1 or any Appendices) Management Plan revealed much about the planning process, vision, goals, potential strategies and monitoring. Chapter 4 included much of the current thinking from the ecology and forestry literature about how to approach sustainable management of forests for a variety of values. It was a very useful discussion of the values of various forest features and it should be useful in guiding the other key documents (HCP, and Implementation Plan).</p> <p>The development of strategies in Chapter 5 was varied. In many cases the “strategies” listed don’t fit the definition of strategies. For example, the legal mandates for management of School Lands (page 5-4) and lists of good practices to “consider” (page 5-16), or how the Implementation Plan should be done (page 5-23). I suggest reorganizing the plan with an eye to non-ODF readers.</p> <p>I felt the need for more specific forestry or management strategies on how the various stand types will be managed (e.g. stocking levels or thinning regimes)</p>

	<p>in order to produce the desired stand structures or landscape patterns. The general quantitative guidelines for distribution of different forest types across forest and basins were useful, but specific quantitative guidelines (acres, percentages) of different stand types, successional stages, miles of stream reach, etc. were not included. In some cases no biological strategies were developed for achieving desired goals or avoiding problems. Detailed strategies for maintaining social values in a forest managed primarily for timber value and production could be better developed. For example, low cost strategies that help diversify a production forest. On the other hand, no specific or detailed strategies for achieving high levels of timber production were included either.</p> <p>Some of the questions focus on the likely success of the strategies to achieve the goals, objectives, etc. Without maps and tables that show the details of how much and where the strategies are applied, I consider such judgements to be premature. I would feel much more comfortable making such judgements based on the final HCP and Implementation Plan.</p>
Forsman	<p>I did not have time to do a complete review of the plan, but I did read the first 25 pages of Chapter 5. In general, I am happy that ODF is trying to broaden the scope of management on state lands to include more of an emphasis on maintenance of a more diverse mix of forest types and age classes. That being said, this chapter does sound a bit optimistic to me. For example, I question whether it is possible to “maximize” revenue to the Common School Fund and also manage forests to maintain healthy populations of species like Red Tree Voles, Murrelets, Spotted Owls and salmon. It sounds too good to be true, kind of like having our cake and eating it too. My guess is that you will have two reactions to this plan. People who want to believe that management can solve all ills will really like the plan, whereas those like me will wish you luck, but will continue to have serious reservations about whether you can simultaneously maximize revenue while at the same time maintaining healthy populations of native plants and animals. Below are some comments on specific parts of the chapter. In many cases, my comments are just musings and will require no response.</p> <p>My resume is as follows: I am a Research Wildlife Biologist with the U. S. Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Research Station in Corvallis. I have spent the last 30 years conducting research on spotted owls, including work on their diet, habitat use, home range areas, dispersal, molt, nest selection and behavior. In recent years I have also been conducting studies of the distribution, taxonomy, habitat and movements of red tree voles. My primary area of interest is habitat relationships of forest birds and mammals.</p>
Gresswell	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to review the revised Elliott State Forest Management Plan. I realize that development of such a comprehensive plan is</p>

	<p>a difficult and time-consuming task. It is obvious that forest management is confounded by the interplay of contentious political and scientific issues, and I want to compliment the authors for their efforts to develop a credible plan. As you requested, I have attempted to answer all the specific questions about the plan.</p> <p>Overall, I found that the plan was thorough and comprehensive. Issues that need to be addressed further are: (1) undertaking landscape-scale modeling to evaluate alternate future conditions, (2) assessing the specific prescriptions for down wood, (3) providing credible justification and strategies for salvage logging, (4) extending planning beyond individual 10-year periods, and (5) identifying how the monitoring program will be funded and when it will be initiated. The last point is especially critical because of the underlying premise that the plan will remain flexible by incorporating the concepts and strategies associated with adaptive management.</p>
Irwin	<p>I read the Elliott State Forest Management Plan and found it quite thorough and understandable, as well as commendable for its attention to a baffling set of important resources and other values. In my opinion, the Plan will go a very long way toward accounting for the competing goals and responsibilities while improving forest management over time. The document pays attention to all the contemporary buzzwords – biodiversity, sustainability, integrated resource management, adaptive management, disturbance regimes, T&E species, etc.</p> <p>Yet there were a few details that could improve the document. First, I suggest better descriptions of existing and future forest conditions. That could be done largely via maps and LMS graphics. Similarly, it would help to display graphics or tables indicating the length of time it may take for the indicated stand structures to “emerge” in the landscape. Second, the relative success of the strategy is likely to hinge upon activities in surrounding forests. The Elliott is not an isolated island, so some attention might be paid to tiering off the objectives of adjacent lands.</p> <p>Third, the description of factors influencing biological diversity and how they will interact in a dynamic landscape is incomplete. The expression of biodiversity in a region is driven both by disturbances and by physical factors that determine productivity (soils, landforms, climate, etc.). While some attention is paid to the notion of productivity via riparian management zones, the biodiversity values of the shifting forest mosaic are unlikely to be evenly distributed across the Elliott. That means that productivity could have a strong influence on response to the indicated stand structures – as in real estate sales, location matters greatly. Perhaps the best way to account for this is site index or some other indicator of productivity.</p> <p>Finally, the potential value of adaptive management experiments could be</p>

	<p>improved by details that explain specific experiments, their design and response measures. That would help identify which resources to prioritize for monitoring, which is necessary because of the expense involved with monitoring. On the other hand, perhaps it would be premature and the details could be developed in workshops with scientists such as at Oregon State University.</p>
<p>Ohmann</p>	<p>As requested, I've reviewed the draft forest management concepts and strategies for the Elliott State Forest. My response to the specific questions, along with some additional comments, are attached. I focused my review on Chapters 4 (Concepts) and 5 (Strategies), as directed, but offer some comments on the other chapters as well. Also, please note that my comments are concentrated on those parts of the Plan within my field of expertise, forest vegetation ecology.</p> <p>The Plan contains a tremendous amount of information to read and digest. Obviously a great deal of thought and effort went into its preparation. I commend the authors and the Oregon Department of Forestry on their willingness to tackle the challenges and complexities involved in implementing an integrated, ecosystem management approach to management. It's exciting to see your agency working to translate these concepts into real, on-the-ground management actions. I'm especially pleased to see monitoring and adaptive management play a prominent role in the Plan.</p> <p>Overall, I think a very credible job has been done of incorporating current scientific and technical knowledge into the Plan. My primary suggestions for improvement, which are discussed in more detail in my attached comments, are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Give more attention to the species composition of forest stands, including hardwoods (important for both biodiversity and forest health). • Summarize desired future condition (range of landscape proportions) for all cover types, including hardwoods, regeneration, old growth, and riparian, not just the 'stand structures.' • Expand reserves to apply to unmanaged forest of all stages of development, including young forest. Related to this, reconsider salvage logging in reserves, and address the attrition of old growth as a landscape component. • Incorporate information from DecAID on the abundance and distribution of dead wood. • Address the potential for thinning to reduce

	forest complexity.
Oliver	<p>Thank you for inviting me to review the Elliott State Forest Plan of the Oregon Department of Forestry. I have admired the forward-thinking approach to forest management of the Oregon Department of Forestry. This plan continues in this approach.</p> <p>I have reviewed the plan you sent me, paying specific attention to Chapters 4 & 5. As requested, I will concentrate on Chapters 4 & 5 in my review comments.</p> <p>The review comments are under several general subject headings, shown in bold below. I shall comment on both the strength of the plan and places where it needs improvement. Much of the improvement can be done through “adaptive management”—or Continuous Quality Improvement—during the first “monitoring cycle.”</p> <p>My comments are under the following headings, in the order shown here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • THE PLAN WITHIN A CONTEXT OF A DYNAMIC LANDSCAPE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Early successional issues: ○ Dense Structure ○ Snags & logs: ○ Connectivity ○ Riparian Considerations • GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE REVIEW PROCESS • PUTTING ELLIOTT STATE FOREST INTO A BROADER PERSPECTIVE <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Elliott State Forest’s contribution to “Sustainable Forestry” ○ Elliott State Forest as Public School Trust • THE DOCUMENT AS A PLAN <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Places to be More Explicit ○ Specific Chapter on How the Implementation will be done by the districts and coordinated by the ESF? ○ Silvicultural Pathways • A FEW GRAMMATICAL SUGGESTIONS