

# BOARD ISSUES WORK PLAN – 2008

## Issue #2: State Forests Management

Date Work Plan Approved: March 5, 2008

Contact: Nancy Hirsch, State Forests Division, Deputy Chief  
503-945-7351 [nhirsch@odf.state.or.us](mailto:nhirsch@odf.state.or.us)

<u>Contents</u>	<u>Page</u>
<b>BACKGROUND</b> .....	<b>2</b>
<b>GOAL</b> .....	<b>4</b>
<b>OBJECTIVE ONE—Adapting Forest Management Plans through the development and application of State Forest Performance Measures</b> .....	<b>4</b>
Historical Context .....	4
Current Issues .....	5
Board Products .....	5
Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement .....	5
Timeframes w/Milestones .....	5
Resources Required .....	6
Monitoring Achievement of this Objective .....	7
<b>OBJECTIVE TWO—Assessing and revising the State Forests planning, decision making, and review framework</b>	<b>7</b>
Introduction .....	7
Historical Context .....	7
Current Issues .....	7
Board Products .....	7
Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement .....	8
Timeframes w/Milestones .....	8
Resources Required .....	9
Monitoring Achievement of this Objective .....	9
<b>OBJECTIVE THREE—Identify principles of ‘Systematic Evidence Review’ that can guide the presentation of agency staff work to the Board</b> .....	<b>9</b>
Historical Context .....	9
Current Issues .....	10
Board Products .....	10
Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement .....	10
Timeframes w/Milestones .....	10
Resources Required .....	11
Monitoring Achievement of this Objective .....	11
<b>OBJECTIVE FOUR—Land Acquisitions, Exchanges and Decertification</b> .....	<b>11</b>
Historical Context .....	11
Current Issues .....	12
Board Products .....	12
Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement .....	12
Timeframes w/Milestones .....	12
Resources Required .....	13

## **BACKGROUND**

The Department of Forestry manages about 780,000 acres of forestland in Oregon, which accounts for three percent of Oregon's commercial forestland. There are five state forests; the Tillamook, Clatsop, Santiam, Sun Pass and Elliott, plus scattered tracts. Eighty-five percent of the acreage of state forests is owned by the Board of Forestry. Title to these lands was largely transferred to the Board during the 1930s and 1940s by counties that had foreclosed on the lands for non-payment of taxes. The remaining lands, the Common School Forest Lands, are managed by the Department under a cooperative agreement with the State Land Board and the Department of State Lands. About two-thirds of the Common School Land acreage is located within the Elliott State Forest in Coos and Douglas Counties. The program contains three sub-programs:

### **a. Management of Board of Forestry Lands**

Board of Forestry Lands are managed to achieve healthy, productive and sustainable forest ecosystems that, over time and across the landscape, provide a full range of social, economic and environmental benefits to the people of Oregon. Board of Forestry Lands are actively managed in a sound environmental manner to provide for sustainable timber harvest and revenue to the state and local taxing districts.

### **b. Management of Common School Lands**

The goal of Common School Forest Lands is to generate the greatest amount of revenue in the long run for the Common School Fund, consistent with sound techniques of land and timber management. Consideration is given to the need to protect soils, water, fish and wildlife habitat, recreational opportunities, and other forest values as long as this need does not significantly detract from the generation of revenue in the long run. Revenues from the program go to the Common School Fund and the Department is paid for management expenses.

### **c. Management of J. E. Schroeder Seed Orchard**

The Department cooperates with 16 private and public landowners in a program to develop genetically improved seed sources for reforestation. The seed production sub-program includes management of the 170-acre Schroeder Seed Orchard in the Willamette Valley. The orchard property and facilities are owned by the Department and managed through the State Forest Program. As a cooperating landowner, the State Forests Program share of the costs is provided from the sale of forest products from State Forest lands.

The strategic goals of the program are to:

- Actively manage state forestlands to achieve healthy, productive and sustainable forests, and contribute to Oregon communities.
- Operate as a leader that develops productive partnerships, is responsive to change, offers quality services, and is fiscally responsible.
- Promote public understanding and support for State Forests Program policy and active management.
- Be a forward-thinking workforce that is informed, engaged, understands respective roles, and is recognized and celebrated.

### **Values Created**

- Sustainable forest management in Oregon on approximately three percent of the forestland in the state
  - 657,000 acres of Board of Forestry Lands
  - 123,000 acres of Common School Lands

Values contribute to multiple *Forestry Program for Oregon* (FPFO)

- Economic contributions through active management (FPFO, Strategy C)
  - Managed to ensure sustainable levels of timber and revenue.
  - Produces 8 to 10 percent of the harvest volumes generated in the state.
  - Forest management activities on state forests provide family wage jobs for many local rural Oregon residents.
  - Produces \$ 170 to 240 million in gross revenue from both Board of Forestry Lands and Common School Forest Lands combined on a biennial basis depending on markets for timber.
- Beneficiaries
  - The 15 counties with the Board of Forestry Lands—county receipts from state forests have ranged from \$35 to 56 million per year in recent fiscal years.
    - Most of this revenue to counties is passed through to local taxing districts, with the majority going to support K–12 schools. State forests timber revenues act as a direct offset to state general fund school support, saving Oregonians millions in tax dollars each year.
  - The Common School Fund—revenue from Common School Forest lands has ranged from \$8 to 20 million annually in recent fiscal years. Receipts from Common School Forest lands have historically been the largest single contributor to the principal of the fund, other than investment returns.
- Environmental contributions (FPFO Strategies D, E, F, and G) include:
  - Forest management concepts that provide habitat for native species and properly functioning aquatic systems. These forests provide needed habitat for several threatened and endangered species, including northern spotted owls and marbled murrelets. They also provide forested watersheds for some of the most productive salmon and trout habitat on the Oregon Coast.
  - The forests are also the source of domestic drinking water for a number of smaller towns, as well as large portions of the west Portland metro area.
  - Research and cooperative monitoring efforts bring additional knowledge to forestry in Oregon.
- Social contributions (FPFO Strategy B) with focus on recreation, education and interpretation experiences—State forests are concentrated near urban areas, primarily to the west of the Portland metro area. As such, they are heavily used for outdoor recreation purposes. Uses that are prevalent and increasing annually are off-highway vehicle use, horseback riding, hiking, camping, fishing, hunting and mountain biking. Providing and maintaining quality recreation facilities and opportunities to meet these needs is an important component of state forests management.
  - Public forest education and outreach efforts: The forests play host to a variety of year-round general public and student and teacher focused forest and natural resource education programs, attracting a large number of west Portland metro area schools. Thousands of citizens and schoolchildren visit the Tillamook Forest Center annually for formal and non-formal interpretive and education programs.
  - Open and inclusive public involvement processes.
  - Forest management plan implementation advisory committee.
  - Focus groups as needed, public comment periods and workshops depending on planning level.
- Program is entirely self-funded from the revenues generated from the lands. The program operates on approximately 36 percent of the revenue generated from Board of Forestry

lands and payment for management expenses from Common School Forest lands, with the remainder going to the beneficiaries identified above.

*The Forestry Program for Oregon* highlights the importance of actively managing state forestlands using structure-based management and adaptive management.

## **GOAL**

**Support continued active management of Oregon's state forests through the use of structure-based management and implementation of science-based monitoring and evaluation (adaptive management). (Forestry Program for Oregon, Key Action E.4).**

In addition, implementation of forest management plans on state forestlands contributes to Strategy B (social and economic outputs and benefits valued by the public in a fair, balanced, and efficient manner), Strategy C (maintaining and enhancing the productive capacity of Oregon's forests to improve the economic well-being of Oregon's communities), Strategy D (protecting, maintaining, and enhancing the soil and water resources of Oregon's forests), Strategy E (contributing to the conservation of diverse native plant and animal populations and their habitats in Oregon's forests, and Strategy F (protecting, maintaining, and enhancing the health of Oregon's forest ecosystems, watershed, and airsheds within a context of natural disturbance and active management.

## **OBJECTIVE ONE—Adapting Forest Management Plans through the development and application of State Forest Performance Measures**

- Performance Measures (PMs)
  - Second Performance Measure Report
  - Continuous improvements to PMs (i.e. results of 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Recreation Assessment follow-up work)
- FMP Improvements (FMPI)
  - Strategies for Achieving the PMs on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests (CTS)

### ***Historical Context***

At its June 2004 meeting, the Board adopted a 'continuous improvement' approach for State Forests. This approach consists of a process of ongoing review rather than the 10 year review cycle identified in the Forest Management Plans (FMP). The platform for this ongoing review is a set of Performance Measures that better clarify the Board's expectation for the achievement of Greatest Permanent Value, as defined in statute and rule.

At the March 2007 meeting, the Board adopted nine PMs that will provide periodic information on the outcomes resulting from State Forest management strategies. When the PMs were adopted it was understood and anticipated that further improvements would be made over time as new or improved information became available. The Department provided the Board with the first report on the PMs at the June 2007 meeting. The second PM Report is scheduled to occur at the Board's November 2008 meeting.

During the November 2007 meeting, the Board discussed PMs specific to the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests, then adopted quantitative targets for Performance Measure 3 – Financial Contributions to Government Services and PM 6 – Wildlife Habitat, and set qualitative targets for six other PMs. The Board adopted a quantitative target for PM 5 – Forest Road Risk and Fish

Habitat at its January 2008 meeting. The Board then directed the Department to develop a management approach and strategies for these two forests that will achieve the PM targets.

### ***Current Issues***

PMs: In the first Performance Measure Report, some of the metrics were not fully developed and data was not available for other metrics. Research is continuing into sources of data for the Performance Measure metrics; however, data may not be available for all of the metrics, or if it is available, it may not be at a resolution that is meaningful to the Performance Measures for State Forests. For example, PM 7 related to recreation, referred to the results of 2<sup>nd</sup> Party Recreation Assessment Follow-Up Project as part of the information that would help inform the board in the future as they consider improvements to the PMs.

The Department will continue capturing Board comments, ideas and concerns expressed about the current PMs that will assist the Board in future discussions on improvements they would like to make. Currently, the Board has set numeric targets for PMs 3, 5, and 6 (i.e. Financial Contributions to Government Services, Forest Road Risks to Fish Habitat, and Wildlife Habitat) specific to the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests. Identification of Performance Measure targets for other state forests remains to be done.

FMPI: The current Northwest Oregon State Forest Management Plan (FMP) as applied on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests does not achieve all the PM targets recently established by the Board/ The Department is developing a management approach and associated strategies to achieve all nine of the PMs. The Department will conduct an analysis to determine how closely the management approach and strategies achieve the PMs. In addition, the Department will identify whether changes will be necessary to the FMP in order to implement this management approach.

### ***Board Products***

PMs: The second report on State Forests PMs

FMPI: Board decision related to the management approach for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests that will meet the new PM targets.

### ***Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and PUBLIC involvement***

PMs: Staff will research and analyze data for Performance Measure metrics.

FMPI:

- Staff will develop a potential management approach and associated strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests.
- Staff will review and seek input on the potential management approach and strategies with advisory committees and various interest groups.
- Staff will develop data and models to assist in the analysis of the proposed management approach and strategies and their affect on the achievement of the Performance Measure Targets.

### ***Timeframes w/Milestones***

#### **March 2008—Information/Input**

PMs: Present a staff report to the Board on the results of the Second Party Assessment of recreation and the development of a Department action plan to respond to the findings and

conclusions in the assessment. This information and the follow-up work will inform the Board in other PM processes.

FMPI: Present a 'checklist' of critical information and policy items the Board would like to track and complete in conjunction with moving forward on any recommendations for eventual management plan improvements.

#### **April 2008—Information**

FMPI: Present a status report to the Board on the initial scoping of strategies to achieve the Performance Measures on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests. As needed, update the 'checklist' of critical information and/or policy items the Board would like to track and complete in conjunction with moving forward on any recommendations for eventual management plan improvements.

#### **July 2008— Information**

PMs: If needed, staff will provide an update on work related to the Performance Measure Report, in anticipation of the presentation of the completed report in November.

FMPI: Present a status report to the Board on the progress developing strategies for achieving the Performance Measures on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests. As needed, update the 'checklist' of critical information and/or policy items the Board would like to track and complete in conjunction with moving forward on any recommendations for eventual management plan improvements.

#### **November 2008— Decision**

PMs: Staff will provide the second Performance Measure Report. The Board may discuss the relevance of these measures and associated metrics, and decide at a subsequent meeting they would like to adjust any of the measures, metrics, or targets. .

FMPI: Staff will report to the Board the results of the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forest Strategies for the Achievement of the Board of Forestry Performance Measures. The report will include recommended strategies and an analysis of how these strategies are likely to affect the nine Performance Measures. In addition, the report will identify what changes would need to be made to the FMP in order to implement these strategies. The Board may then decide to:

- Direct the Department to implement these strategies, and if necessary, start the process for revising the FMP; or
- Adjust the Performance Measures and direct the Department to develop strategies to achieve the adjusted Performance Measures.

#### **Other meetings—TBD**

#### ***Resources Required***

Staff and district resources are being re-directed to cover this topic. Staff time will be needed to develop the data, strategies, models and analysis; summarize feedback from stakeholders; and prepare presentations and discussion points for the BOF. Additional staff time will be needed if decisions result in the need for administrative rule revisions.

### ***Monitoring Achievement of this Objective***

Staff will present the BOF with updated information, results, and background information on each performance measure on a biennial basis. If decadal or other measures are adopted, staff will present the BOF with updates on these measures at the appropriate times. Improvements to the performance measures (metrics and targets) are anticipated as new information becomes available.

## **OBJECTIVE TWO— Assessing and revising the State Forests planning, decision making, and review framework.**

### ***Introduction***

The framework for State Forests management planning, decision making, and review has evolved over the past 2 decades. The adoption of performance measure targets, and the Board interest in a more timely, systematic and transparent review process, necessitates a review and revision of this framework.

### ***Historical Context***

Prior to the adoption of the Elliott State Forest management Plan (FMP) in 1995, State Forest Management plans were very limited in scope, developed internally, and were developed with limited public process. They addressed basic statutory requirements and were approved by the State Forester. Periodic review of these plans was informal, limited in scope, and done internally.

In contrast, the FMPs developed and approved in 2001 for NW and SW Oregon State Forests:

- Addressed many resources;
- Were developed with involvement and review of numerous technical specialists within and external to ODF, and had an extensive public involvement process;
- Include an “adaptive management process” ;
- Were approved by the Board of Forestry, and were the first State Forests plan to be adopted in Oregon administrative rule (OAR).

### ***Current Issues***

In March of 2007, the Board approved a set of performance measures that will serve as a means of evaluating whether management plans result in outcomes that meet “Greatest Permanent Value” (GPV) as defined in OAR. The adoption of performance measures is a new component of forest management planning and decision making, and thus it is necessary to integrate the performance measures into the current framework. In addition, the Board has expressed an interest in a more transparent process to review and adjust the performance measures and the management plans over time.

### ***Board Products***

- A State Forests planning, decision making, and review framework that identifies and describes :
  - The relationship and integration of the major components of State Forests planning (ex: performance measures, management plans);
  - The decision making authorities associated with the various planning components; and
  - The process for the review and adjustment of performance measures and plans.
- The resulting framework may be articulated in Board policy form and/or revisions to existing OARs.

Some criteria for success include creating a framework that:

- Describes the (biennial) BOF performance measure review and integrates the program adaptive management process;
- Allows for an evaluation and adjustment of the performance measures and management plans to occur in a timely, transparent, and predictable way;
- Clearly defines decision making authorities and levels associated with the review of both performance measure and program plans;
- Is legally sound and defensible, and also provides administrative flexibility so that there is a good balance between stability and responsiveness.

### ***Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement***

- Staff will develop a background paper for the Board on past and current State Forests planning, decision making, and review processes. In addition, initial issues will be identified to be further developed in the issue paper phase of the project.
- Staff will develop an issue paper for the Board that identifies possible alternative approaches and their implications.
- If requested, staff will develop a recommendation on an approach for Board of Forestry consideration.
- Stakeholder involvement will primarily be through Board meeting participation and review of Board materials. Staff will develop a summary of feedback received from stakeholders at Board meetings. If and when adjustments or additions are needed to OARs, a formal rule making process with the associated public process would be undertaken.

### ***Timeframes w/Milestones***

#### **January 2008 – Information and Discussion – Work plan**

Staff will present a work plan associated with the revision of the framework. The Board will review and comment on the work plan, and provide guidance for any revisions to the process.

#### **March 2008 - Information and Discussion - Background Paper**

Staff will present a background paper on past and current State Forests planning, decision making, and review processes. Staff will also identify initial issues associated with the development of the framework. These issues, and any identified by the Board, will be further developed in the issue paper phase of the project. The Board will review the background paper and provide comments and guidance on the development of the issue paper.

#### **June 2008— Information and Discussion - Issue paper, alternatives**

Staff will present an issue paper which outlines several alternative approaches and their implications for constructing the revised framework. The Board will provide feedback on the issue paper and alternatives. They may request additional information and/or may request that the department return to the Board with a recommendation on a preferred approach.

#### **September or November 2008 – Board Decision**

Depending on the degree of Board convergence on a preferred alternative, the Board may decide on a preferred approach, and direct the program to begin an administrative rule process revision, if necessary. If divergent views remain, additional discussion will occur on the remaining issues.



### ***Resources Required***

Staff resources are being re-directed to cover this topic. Staff time will be needed to develop the background and issues/alternatives paper, summarize feedback from stakeholders, and prepare presentations and discussion points for the BOF. Additional staff time will be needed if decisions result in the need for administrative rule revisions.

### ***Monitoring Achievement of this Objective***

These monitoring questions are related to the criteria for success noted above. The Board and program may develop evaluation questions to track success of the framework over time. Possible questions include:

- Is the BOF able to have meaningful discussions about management plan performance, and how/whether Greatest Permanent Value is being achieved?
- Is the BOF confident in the review and decision process? Do they use the framework as a means of addressing stakeholder issues, or are parallel or substitute processes developed?
- Are public input/review points clearly identified and meaningful?
- Is the planning framework legally defensible?
- Is the review and decision making process clear to the BOF, ODF, and stakeholders – are these parties able to describe the process and its elements?
- When/if adjustments are made to performance measures and/or forest management plans is it clear why they are made? Are changes made in a timely manner?
- Are the roles of science and values understood and articulated in the implementation of the framework?
- Is the time spent by the BOF on State Forests reviews manageable and efficient? Are BOF decisions made within a reasonable time frame?

## **OBJECTIVE THREE—Identify principles of “Systematic Evidence Review” that can guide the presentation of agency staff work to the Board**

### ***Historical Context***

Over the course of the past several decades, debate about natural resource management policies has been rancorous with few lasting solutions. Although a common shared principle in this debate has been to use "best available science," there continues to be concerns about the use of science and the role of scientists in natural resource policymaking. Some have hypothesized that part of the ongoing rancor has been due to lack of a credible base of scientific evidence on which to base management decisions. Others have argued that the debate has been mostly about strongly held values and different views of the world and perceptions of risk and that "better science" will not solve such conflict. Fundamentally, science cannot answer policy questions; it can only inform the choices policy makers have.

ODF has implemented a number of processes including developing a series of technical papers related to Forest Practices rule revisions which were used and discussed by the Forest Practices Advisory Committee (FPAC); and an Independent Scientific Review of the State Forests program draft Habitat Conservation Plan/Forest Management Plan.

Despite these efforts, effective and objective use of science to inform policy making on forest management can be improved. Exploration and possible implementation of “Systematic Evidence Review” (SER) may improve our processes for collecting and synthesizing technical information related to policy issues.

### ***Current Issues***

In June 2004, former Governor John Kitzhaber presented written and verbal testimony to the Board of Forestry on a number of forest policy issues. One component of his testimony focused on what he viewed as a lack of credible base of scientific evidence on which to base forest management decisions. Because of this, stakeholders may engage in "dueling science." He suggested examining a process known in the health care field as "systematic evidence review" (SER), the most rigorous form of evaluating a large body of medical evidence.

In a December 2004 workshop, and in subsequent discussion at the March 2005 BOF meeting, the Board further discussed these ideas, and inserted the exploration of SER into the Board work plan for the State Forests program (though it was recognized that SER approaches were relevant to other agency programs). ODF subsequently contracted with the Institute of Natural Resources at OSU to develop a background report on SER, and provide some options and ideas for how the concept could be applied to natural resource decision making. INR developed a report, "*Applying Systematic Evidence Reviews in Oregon Forest Policy: Opportunities and Challenges*" and presented it to the Board in early 2006. A pilot project was identified as appropriate to test this concept, and staff worked with INR to outline a pilot project to focus on questions related to the effectiveness of certain stream restoration practices.

The pilot project's primary purpose was to learn about the process of SER, and what it might provide over a traditional literature review. Secondly, the project assembled and synthesized sound technical information on a management question of interest. The pilot project was completed in early 2008.

### ***Board Products***

- The Board (and agency) will act as a catalyst for the exploration and development of SER-like approaches for natural resources.
- If the Board is interested – staff will identify a set of principles and a generalized agency process for synthesizing the "best available science" that comes before the Board. The original INR report will be used to develop these principles and process, in addition to information and perspective gained from the pilot project.

### ***Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement***

- The agency will promote the use of SER - like approaches, and promote and participate in, collaborative projects.
- Staff will develop principles that will guide the development of a general but consistent agency process for synthesizing "best available science" that comes before the Board. The goal will be to develop a somewhat consistent process for technical synthesis, without adding considerable expense and procedural steps.
- Feedback will be solicited from agency stakeholders on draft principles and screening processes.

### ***Timeframe w/Milestones***

#### **March 2008—Information**

Results of the pilot project will be shared with Board, along with initial staff thoughts on the principles and process for science assessments. Next steps will be identified.

#### **September 2008 – Information and Discussion/Decision**

If requested, staff will provide the Board with draft principles for conducting agency science assessments. The Board will modify and/or approve the principles for staff use.

### ***Resources Required***

- Staff time (multiple programs) will be required to wrap up the pilot project; develop principles and screening process; review with stakeholders; and prepare reports for BOF.

### ***Monitoring Achievement of this Objective***

Longer term monitoring questions include:

- If SER principles are adopted and applied within ODF work, is the BOF more confident in the scientific basis of their decisions? Is there less disagreement among stakeholders about the nature of the technical information?
- Are SER principles being applied more broadly in the natural resource arena?
- If principles are adopted more broadly, is there more inter-agency agreement on how to conduct science assessments? Are the collaborative assessments more cost effective than traditional approaches?
- Does the agency have the funds to apply SER-like processes?

## **OBJECTIVE FOUR—Land Acquisitions, Exchanges and Decertification’s**

### ***Historical Context***

The BOF approved Board Land Acquisition and Exchange Policy #3-1-1-002 in 1994. The policy was a result of issues the BOF had with the state receiving cash payment in a land exchange. In 1998, the BOF gave the State Forests Program direction to retain the 1994 version until elements of the policy could be codified into administrative rules.

From 1992 through 1999, seven district land exchange plans were approved by the deputy state forester. In 1999 the Department of Forestry implemented a “hold” or moratorium on land exchanges involving BOF lands to give the Department an opportunity to develop land transaction strategies and policies that furthered the goals of the Forest Management Plans being developed at that time, and to ensure the Board’s policies were consistent with the philosophies and goals outlined in the newly adopted Greatest Permanent Value rule. The moratorium applied to all exchange proposals that were not already approved in concept as outlined in established land exchange procedures. In 2001, the BOF gave staff approval to begin the rule making process for land acquisitions and exchanges. The BOF approved OAR 629-033-0000 - 0055, State Forest Land Acquisitions and Exchanges in September 2001.

In April 2003, the department provided the BOF information on the process and procedures required to carry out land exchanges and provided the BOF with a legal opinion that stated consolidation of the forest land base needed to be a factor. Since the staff presentation to the BOF, there have been two land exchanges and one acquisition that were successfully completed following the process and procedures described at the April meeting.

During the initial BOF work planning process in November 2004, the BOF considered and deferred land exchanges as part of their work plan. In 2005 the State Forests Program director issued a memo that lifted the moratorium on land acquisitions and exchanges.

At the March 2007 BOF meeting, a Staff Report and Issue Paper were presented to the BOF which provided an evaluation of the OARs governing land acquisitions and exchanges. The Staff Report recommended that the Board defer revising the current OAR for land acquisition and exchange until the results of other policy discussions surrounding alternatives for acquiring land are known. The BOF approved this recommendation.

In addition, the Staff Report stated that the State Forests program plans to:

- Finalize the draft State Forests Program policy, procedure and guidance documents based on the current rule.
- Proceed with updating district long-range acquisition and exchange plans as outlined in the State Forests Program documents mentioned above.
- Proceed with high priority acquisition and exchange opportunities as they arise.

### ***Current Issues***

The current OAR states the State Forester shall review, update, and approve long-range acquisition and exchange plans at least every 10 years. The OAR also requires Board review of the plans prior to State Forester approval. At the November 2007 BOF meeting, the updated West Oregon plan was reviewed by the Board and subsequently approved by the State Forester in accordance with the current OAR. Other districts are in the process of updating their plans which will be presented to the BOF for review prior to approval by the State Forester.

Once long-range acquisition and exchange plans have been reviewed and approved, districts will proceed with high priority acquisition and exchange proposals in accordance with program policy and procedures. These proposals will be presented to the BOF for approval.

The Department of State Lands (DSL) is in the process of evaluating their Common School Forest Land (CSFL) parcels for possible disposal in accordance with their *Asset Management Plan*. Prior to disposal of any CSFL parcels, BOF approval will be obtained for decertification of the parcels from ODF management.

### ***Board Products***

- Board review of updated district long-range acquisition and exchange plans.
- Board review and approval of acquisition and exchange proposals.
- Board review and approval of decertification of CSFL parcels prior to disposal by DSL.

### ***Research and Information Needed / Stakeholder and Public Involvement***

- Public comments will be solicited as part of the process for conducting land acquisitions and exchanges as required in the OAR.

### ***Timeframes w/Milestones***

#### **March 2008—Consent Agenda**

BOF approval of the decertification of the \$8 Mountain CSFL parcel.

#### **Future meetings—TBD**

- BOF review of district long-range acquisition and exchange plans.
- BOF review and approval of land acquisition and exchange proposals.
- BOF review and approval of decertification of CSFL parcels prior to disposal by DSL.

- BOF review of the need to revise current land acquisition and exchange, and a decision if needed.

***Resources Required***

Salem and district staff time will be needed to develop, review and process land acquisition and exchange plans; and subsequent proposals.

Salem and district staff time will also be needed to review and provide input on proposals for disposal of CSFL parcels by DSL.