

**State Forests Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, April 13<sup>th</sup>, 2007**  
**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>**

**Members Present:** Vergie Ries, Gregg Cline (for Mike Bordelon), Barbara Lee (for State Forests Program), Wayne Naillon, Nancy Spieler, Dave Bowden, Ginny Van Loo, April Olbrich, Phil Cogswell, Barrett Brown, Rex Storm, Mark McCollister, Carolyn Eady, Klaus Puettmann and Jill Bradford.

**Others Present:** Mike Totey, Tom Savage, Ross Holloway, Andy White, Todd Reinwald, Larry Dorland, Jim Paul, Jeff Brandt, Rob Nall, Chris Jarmer, Ron Zilli, Jeff Foreman, Roger Welty, Barb Moore, Erik Marcy, Laurie O’Nion, and Colleen Kiser.

**No morning public comment.**

**Meeting Summary and Annual Report Approval**

The December and February meeting summaries were approved. The 2006 Annual Report was approved with a minor change to the member listing.

**Housekeeping**

**SFAC Charter Revision:**

Todd Reinwald presented the changes to the charter. Areas of change include; the removal of the SW FMP, addition of the customers category, addition of success indicators, and additional language in the decision making process section. Rex Storm provided suggestions for changes to the success indicators. He feels that the feedback from the committee does not necessarily need to be positive but can take the form of constructive feedback. He also suggests that the committee guidance should help improve the implementation of the plans not necessarily that ODF utilizes the committee’s input. Barrett Brown feels that the wording works well for the committee in that the feedback provided to ODF is regarding their role and value. Phil Cogswell suggested including management activities under the plans in the scope and priority section. Carolyn Eady feels that the BOF should be included as a customer since in the past; BOF has asked for the committee to provide their specific input on topics that are timely (i.e. SNC and Adaptive Management). Dave Bowden was bothered by the section “Boundary Conditions” were it said the committee does not have decision-making authority. This language refers to the fact that SFAC does not have policy making authority. Todd will clarify this section. The discussion about the name of the committee will be held until Mike Bordelon returns. A draft of the charter with additional edits and clarification will be brought to the June meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting Summary reflects key issues, discussions and decisions, not verbatim language.

**SFAC Meeting Timeline:**

The meeting timeline was discussed by the group. Suggestions were made to include the mechanism for committee members to request "Hot Topics" through the chairperson three weeks prior to the meeting. Vergie Ries suggested that the timeline include sending out meeting materials that were distributed at the meeting to absent members. She also suggested pulling out an outline of action items identified during the course of the discussions shortly after the meeting and sending them out to the group. Klaus Puettmann suggested utilizing a calendaring program to schedule meetings.

**State Forest Informational Updates****Research and Monitoring Q&A:**

Jeff Brandt provided a background on the Adaptive Management PowerPoint. Barrett Brown asked for a thumbnail version of the agency's Adaptive Management philosophy. Jeff pointed the group to slide 52 in the PowerPoint which outlines Adaptive Management principles. Phil asked how research findings get to the program for incorporation into the programs planning efforts. Jeff pointed the group to slide 54 which outlines the flow and processing of information. Ginny Van Loo asked how the adaptive management processes are made known to the committee. This is done through reports and updates to SFAC. An example of this was the information provided in June of 2005 on Swiss Needle Cast research findings. Nancy asked how the watershed assessment findings have influenced adaptive management. The agency is still in the information gathering stage of the watershed assessments. To date, there has been little influence on policy planning; however, some findings have been incorporated into the recent AOP's. Nancy asked if the completed assessments are available to be reviewed. Jill will send the link to the group via e-mail. Dave Bowden questioned how the agency incorporates short-term research into a long-term plan without it altering the outcomes of the plan too greatly. Jeff focused on slide 18 that outlined the current research projects that the agency is participating in. These projects aid the agency in determining if the plan is working the way it was perceived to at adoption. Small course changes may occur along the way to make the plan work better to achieve its goals. Interim research reports, monitoring reports, etc are available on the web. Klaus spoke on the timing of research and science transfer. Carolyn asked for the difference between stand based versus strata based inventory. Strata based inventory utilizes averages of characteristics across stands. Stand based inventory incorporates all the data collected on a stand and gives a more precise picture of the actual stand conditions. Stand level inventory protocols do not apply to clear-cuts. Phil asked if the research and monitoring program is finding major differences between the stand based and strata based inventories. There are no major differences. The stand based inventory provides more detail to the modeling that was not available in the past. April questioned the weaknesses noted on slide 37, specifically the last bullet. Jeff answered that this is an internal personnel issue. There is only one person that is intimately knowledgeable about the model and if they were to leave, that knowledge will leave with them. The group thanked Jeff for bringing this information to them.

**Recreation Assessment:**

Barbara Lee provided an update on the recreation assessment to date. No draft report is available at this time and the timeline has been extended for the contract. The agency hopes to have a final report by the end of the month. The findings in this report will be discussed at the June meeting. Preliminary findings recognize the legacy recreational use on the forest, and how well ODF has responded to management challenges this has presented the recreation program. Findings point to a need to update recreation plans using current recreational use and trend data. A suggestion has also been made to keep with the agency theme of DFC and apply this to recreation planning. Assessment findings are also indicating improvements to infrastructure are needed. Barrett asked about the detail of the recommendations from an organizational standpoint. Similar to the 2<sup>nd</sup> party assessment of the FMP, the contractor is providing findings of fact that are likely to fall into broad areas. Barbara explained what we expect to see and the deliverables requested. She does not feel a recommendation regarding the organizational structure needed to manage the recreation program will be a part of the contract outcomes. Phil continues to be concerned that the contractors did not talk to recreational user groups and only utilized ODF staff for their information. The contractors and staff feel that the group was able to see enough of a representation of the recreation infrastructure to make their assessment meaningful. Phil still does not see how the contractors will be able to provide an assessment of how well ODF is doing without talking to the users of the recreation program offerings. Wayne Naillon requested that the report be sent via email once it is available for review.

**Legislative Update and Performance Measures:**

Jim Paul, Assistant State Forester for the Forest Management Division, presented a PowerPoint on Oregon's Challenge. This presentation will be made available via email at the committee's request. This presentation focused on fragmentation and development issues of Oregon's forestland. Many parcels of forestland are worth more for real estate development than for forest management. This is resulting in deforestation of many forestlands. This is a nationwide issue. In Oregon, Ballot Measure 37 plays a big part in increasing the fragmentation of forestlands. Legislation, SB 98, has been proposed to the legislature by ODF at the request of the Governor. This bill would authorize the State Forester to acquire working forests. SB 98 will need a second hearing from the legislature in the next couple of weeks or it will "die". The BOF has also recently adopted 9 State Forests Performance Measures; 3 economic, 3 social, and 3 environmental. These performance measures will be evaluated for the first time in June. Oregon has a strong foundation for natural resource sustainability.

Vergie asked what role the counties may play in SB98. Jim answered that the way the bill is written, funds from the management of these acquired lands would first go to repay the debt used to purchase the land as well as cover management costs, then to Oregon's Higher Education fund, then to the counties. Ginny asked what funds were associated with this bill. Currently there is no funding mechanism associated with SB98; rather, this bill is to establish the authority. The funding stream is still to be figured out. It does identify existing funding mechanisms such as OWEB funds and parks and recreation dollars.

Carolyn asked if HB2975, the bill that proposed to clarify GPV, has had any movement. It, like SB98 needs a second hearing or it will die on the floor. The department is neutral on this bill.

Rex Storm suggested that as government forest regulation increases, the land base is pushed more toward non-forest use. He also suggested that there is an imbalance between Oregon's forest manufacturing infrastructure and its wood production capacity.

Gregg Cline shared that the BOF tour on Tuesday, July 24<sup>th</sup> is open to SFAC members. More information will be sent via email once it is available. It will be focusing on the issue of working forests.

In conclusion, the department has just finished presenting its budget to the ways and means subcommittee, has completed a day of public hearings, and is scheduled for a work session in a couple of weeks.

#### **FY08 AOP Review**

Vergie provided an overview of the process to be utilized for the review. Gregg Cline reviewed the questions that the small groups would be asked to answer. The committee discussions will be compiled and then posted on the web along with ODF's responses. Small group moderators included Gregg Cline, Ross Holloway and Barbara Lee. Field representatives were made available to clarify questions regarding the specific district AOP's. The committee then broke into three small groups to discuss the FY08 AOP's.

The small groups addressed the following questions:

1. Within the context of implementing the FMP over time, do the proposed operations in the FY 08 Annual Operations Plans (AOPs) achieve sufficient contribution towards social, economic, and environmental values as described in the GPV rule and the FMP? If not what are areas of specific concern?
2. Based upon what we have provided you, such as the summary document and overview presentation at the February SFAC meeting, how well do the AOPs achieve:
  - A. Progress toward Desired Future Condition
  - B. Timber Harvesting objectives
  - C. Recreation objectives
  - D. Silvicultural Investments (i.e., fertilization, reforestation, herbicide use, etc.)
3. Are there specific operations (timber sales or other) that potentially raise issues or concerns? If so, please describe the basis for the concern in the context of conflicts with the NW FMP, District IPs or the GPV rule.

## **Small Group Reports:**

### Group 1

This group consisted of Nancy Spieler, Carolyn Eady, Mark McCollister, and Wayne Naillon. Larry Dorland, a member of the general public also sat in on this group. Nancy Spieler was the group's note-taker. Moderator Ross Holloway.

#### Question 1 –

First, the group thanked the staff for the summary documents provided. It made the review less cumbersome. There was a general sense in this group that the AOP's are at appropriate harvest levels. There was satisfaction expressed that the levels are lower than they have been in the last couple of years and that the volume is higher on fewer acres with an increase in revenue. There was some concern that the charts showed the Tillamook district exceeding the high end of the IP range but the field staff showed that the table was incorrect. There was initial apprehension regarding the Astoria district's increase in clear-cut acres and decrease in partial-cut acres. Once the district staff clarified the issues surrounding owl-circles and previous thinning areas, the group understood this change. There was positive feedback regarding Marbled Murrelette Management Areas and that this AOP was making progress in this regard. There were a lot of positive comments on stream surveys and fish assessments, especially in Astoria. There were positive comments regarding the plan for construction of motorized and non-motorized trails but there was some dissatisfaction with the speed at which they are being developed. This group reiterated the need for additional staff to manage the recreation facilities and planning. Positive comments were received regarding SAH strategies. There was a comment that it was difficult to determine from the AOP's whether the department was meeting the goals of the different values based on the proposed operations. It was also suggested that more consistency be outlined between the FMP, IP's and AOP's. Regarding the Round Top Sale, there was a request for better information regarding trail closures in the proximity of this sale. There was positive feedback regarding stream restoration projects. There was also positive response to the speed at which Astoria district is moving from understory to layered conditions. A request was made to better research the impacts of increased acres of clear-cuts in Astoria on water quality and landslide hazards. A mention was made to strive toward the goal of maintaining hardwoods in the Astoria district at 10% or less. This member felt that there was too little. There was a general feeling that there was a better attempt to diversify vegetation in the West Oregon district. There were also positive comments regarding proposed road construction, keeping as much as possible to small spur roads and maintaining the current road system. There was concern about maintaining stream buffers when doing spraying projects. There was some discussion about culvert replacement, and some members commended the department on striving to replace those which needed replaced.

#### Question 2 –

A question came up related to the H& H model and if there was a determination from the findings on when the department would reach DFC. It was recognized that the model is

not operational. The group reiterated that they felt the harvest levels were appropriate. There was positive feedback regarding the connection of the Wilson River Trail and that the Forest Grove district plans to complete three and a half miles of non-motorized trail. Some disappointment was expressed that there was not enough planned for the Tillamook district in regards to recreation. Regarding silvicultural investments, Larry Dorland from the Oregon Hunter's Association, expressed concern that the spraying levels are too high in the Tillamook District and felt this would have a negative impact on large game and its habitat. Some felt there were opportunities in Alder stands to plant shade resistant species such as Western Red Cedar.

Question 3 –

Carolyn Eady expressed that a 300 foot buffer between clear-cuts in the Foster Home operation on the Astoria District was not adequate even if it meets the regulatory requirements.

Group 2

This group consisted of Phil Cogswell, Rex Storm, Dave Bowden, and Klaus Puettmann. Phil Cogswell was the group's note-taker. Moderator Barbara Lee.

Question 1 –

There was some concern that the department is not moving toward DFC quickly enough since both partial cut and clear-cut harvests are below the mid-point of the IP ranges. Another concern was expressed that the harvest reduction comes at a time when the counties desire more revenue and timber flow. There was some concern that there are stands that are underperforming in terms of growth and a greater pace would move toward DFC more quickly. It was also noted that a slower pace of harvest can negatively impact habitat and socio-economic values in local communities. Another view was presented that the current levels of harvest are within the IP ranges and are not in violation of the plan.

Question 2 –

There was a feeling that the department is moving toward DFC but slowly. It was recognized that there are time and research needs as there is movement toward DFC. It was also recognized that each district will move toward DFC at a different pace for various reasons. In regards to timber harvest objectives, it was expressed by some members that Tillamook could be doing more with underproductive stands to increase the pace toward DFC. There was some question on whether blow-down should be added to the AOP's or whether it should be treated separately. There was some concern over the more restrictive take avoidance strategies of the department compared with that of the timber industry. It was reiterated that recreation progress is moving too slowly. There was positive feedback on the investment in the road system. It was also suggested that investing in low quality stands can benefit a range of interests. This group commends the department on its active silvicultural investments. There was some concern that the department may not be paying enough attention to invasive species. The group was informed that a new taskforce has been formed to address this issue. Barbara Lee suggested that a briefing from this taskforce could be timely for a fall SFAC meeting.

Question 3 –

This group did not have any specific operations of concern.

### Group 3

This group consisted of Ginny Van Loo, Vergie Ries, Barrett Brown, and April Olbrich. Ginny Van Loo was the appointed note-taker. Moderator Gregg Cline.

Question 1 –

There was a request that the summary documents contain more information on the current conditions and the connection of proposed operations to achievement of DFC. There was also a request that the plans better outline how the operations are helping to achieve social, economic and environmental values. There was a comment that ODF are good stewards and that they should outline in the plans, what they are doing environmentally that exceeds the minimum legal requirements. There was a feeling that the emphasis in the plans was leaning more toward economic values and that the plans could better outline how they are addressing social and environmental values as well. It was recognized that Watershed Assessments are good tools and districts should reference when and how they are used in the plans. There was a request that the districts look at adjacency of prior disturbances in sub-basins. The group felt all three elements of GPV are being provided.

Question 2 –

There was a concern that recreation objectives are not being met. There was a request that sustainability be an area of focus when engineering and designing trails. It was also noted by that this group that there is an urgent need for agency resources to be applied to recreation management. There was a comment that poorly designed recreational areas lead to environmental disaster. There was a comment that some members are not sure the department is moving toward DFC and including measures of progress in the plans would be helpful to assist members in evaluating success or failure in this area. The group admits that the timber harvest objectives are low but there is still progress being made toward DFC, albeit slow. Timber harvest objectives are considered to be a tool to move toward DFC. There was acknowledgement by this group that there is a lack of position authority in recreation to meet the needs of public demand. Finally, some members felt that silvicultural objectives should include addressing invasive species challenges.

Question 3 –

There were no specific operations of concern for this group.

### **Individual Comments:**

- Klaus Puettmann would like to see past accomplishments noted in AOP's. The level of detail in the summaries varied by district and he would like to see more consistency.
- Carolyn Eady would like total acres of basin in summary chart re: harvest by basin. There is some progress in recreation, although slow, the department has made good strides. One concern she has in Astoria is the change in proportion of

clear-cut and partial cut acres. She understands why but has a concern about the public relations aspect of this change. Her concern is the effects of the increased clear-cut acres on stream sediment and landslide potential.

- Ginny Van Loo thanked the department for the opportunity to be a part of this committee.
- Dave Bowden suggested that the department look at thinning prescriptions and volume outputs and scrutinize whether it is maximizing growth. He would also like to see less restrictive management of state forestland through re-evaluation of DFC, SBM, and T&E strategies. However, he states that the current process is following the FMP well.
- Nancy Spieler is comfortable with harvest levels, and is pleased to see that monitoring and research is going on. She hopes the department is responsive to research findings and uses new data in reviewing the success of the FMP. She would also like to see past accomplishments noted in the AOP's. She feels layering maps from past AOP's would give her a better understanding of the areas being affected by management activities.
- Barrett Brown feels the ODF recreation program is a spectacular program and envied by other land managers. ODF is doing what it can with available resources. He feels that the motorized trail system could be better engineered and located.
- Phil Cogswell is continuously impressed with the competence and willingness of the staff to present this information. He feels there is a general level of public unawareness of ODF's hard work and ability. He would like to see a mid-term predictive in the 5-20 year range included in the AOP's. These cumulative trends and predictions could be analyzed more frequently and reported in the AOP's.
- Wayne Naillon is impressed with the work ODF does to give an accurate picture of what they are doing. This is appreciated.
- April Olbrich also appreciates the efforts of ODF. She likes the summary document but would also like to see better cumulative evaluation and trend information presented in the AOP's.
- Rex Storm feels that ODF does a great job with the current plans. He feels that there are opportunities to improve the performance of the FMP. He states that the Tillamook district has an opportunity to more aggressively manage the low value stands. He disagrees with the current AOP's being below the mid-point of the acres range. He feels that ODF's TA strategies are too restrictive and need to be revised so they are less limiting. He also feels that the opportunities to address catastrophic blow-down or wildfire should be additional volume and not a replacement of planned operations in the AOP's.
- Vergie Ries thanked the staff for the amazing amount of work they do and their willingness to help members understand the plans. Vergie would also like to see trending information toward DFC included in the AOP's.

The group was asked to address Question 4: Are there ways that ODF can improve the documentation or presentation of AOP materials in order to enhance the understanding about proposed annual operations? The answer to this was covered in much of the above discussion. Members did not have anything to add. Barrett commended ODF on how far



they have come in customer relations over the past 5-6 years. The disclosure of information has definitely improved public trust.

**Website posting:**

The comments will be compiled and posted on the website with the agency's response. This is expected to take place by June 15<sup>th</sup>.

**No afternoon public comment.**

**Future Meeting Planning**

Jill will circulate dates for future meetings via e-mail. The group decided that they would like to visit the West Oregon district for the June field trip. Todd Reinwald will work with the district staff on the tour route. Jill will look at opportunities to meet at OSU the day following the tour.