



# OFIC

1149 Court Street NE, Suite 105

Oregon Forest Industries Council

P.O. Box 12826 Salem, Oregon 97309 / Phone 503/371-2942 / Fax 503/371-6223

February 19, 2007

Kevin Birch  
Senior Policy Analyst  
Forest Resource Planning  
Oregon Department of Forestry

RE: Federal Forests Advisory Committee Input- "Most Pressing Problems"

Kevin,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input to the visions and goals segment for the Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee. Ensuring that all the issues are "on the plate" early in the process will be a great benefit to the Committee.

My comments will be representative of the areas of my responsibility dealing with Forest Protection.

- The vision should include that our forests are a "Dynamic" resource rather than implying by omission that they are "static" for all time. Maintenance, management and protection are all required to keep today's vision...tomorrow's reality.
- "No action" is also a management decision with consequences and impacts to federal lands and adjacent private lands. Responsibility for those no action decisions on adjacent lands is non-existent or a maze of legal maneuvers not for the weak at heart.
- The current DRAFT vision contains the broad "Oregon's forests..." If the focus of the group is Federal Forestlands, let's say so. Then broaden the complementing relationship with private and state forests.
- Suppression preparedness for federal agencies should complement adjacent state protection levels. Standards for performance should also be complementary instead of the current stark difference (ODF 95% @ 10 acres or less, Feds 95% of fires @ 100 acres or less, ten times higher). Suppression costs in recent years would easily fund increased preparedness budgets without the resource loss.
- Vision should include working with diverse groups towards workable solutions. Committee should recognize that concepts with adamant differences could be tested independently given the vast areas of federal holdings. Trial treatments should be promoted to demonstrate treatment/no treatment/variety of treatments options.

Most pressing problems

- Increased fuels adjacent to managed private lands
- Lack of institutional knowledge of active management systems and contractors to perform. (Today's foresters are more versed in legal maneuvering relating to challenges)
- Varying degrees of suppression preparedness (basic budget or draw down to support regional/national assignments).
- Not recognizing the impacts to wildlife in both cover and forage. Populations have declined as well as forced animals to seek forage on managed private lands in higher concentrations resulting in damage conflicts.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Mike Dykzeul