

*Notes from Public Meetings and the State Forest Advisory
Committee Meeting That Addressed the Performance
Measure Work on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests*

Meeting Dates:

- **Public Meeting - Wednesday, August 27, 2008, Forest Grove**
- **Public Meeting - Wednesday, October 15, 2008, Forest Grove**
- **State Forest Advisory Committee Meeting – Friday, October 24, 2008**

Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests Performance Measures Work Group Open House

Wednesday, August 27, 2008, Forest Grove

Public attendance:

David Ivanoff - Hampton Affiliates, Patricia Roberts - Clatsop County Commissioner, Chris Jarmer - OFIC, Rex Storm - AOL, Peter Hayes - Small Woodland Owner, Board of Forestry member (left at 1000), Ned Hayes - Nephew of Peter Hayes (left with Peter), April Olbrich - Former SFAC member - arrived approx. 1030 at break.

Staff attendance:

Mike Cafferata, Ron Zilli, Mike Bordelon, Liz Dent, Marcia Humes, Rod Krahmer, Erik Marcy, Roger Welty, Colleen Kiser, Dan Goody, Jeff Foreman, Wayne Auble

Goals: Explain the project goals and key assumptions so that participants can develop informed opinions. Discuss the methods being utilized to develop and analyze strategies to meet the performance measure targets for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests established in November 2007. Hear suggestions and comments from the group.

To meet these goals the department explained key areas of the project and took comments and questions from the group. Below are questions and comments received by the Department for consideration.

Introduction: Mike Cafferata and staff provided background and context for the project. As a result of that discussion, the first questions and comments were about project scope:

Question: Why was the aquatic and riparian management strategies contained in the FMP Appendix J not in the scope of the workgroup, yet the Salmon Anchor Habitats were?

Comment: In general, it has been difficult to understand what was in scope and what was not. The Department has chosen a narrow path to look at for achieving performance measures, a broader view may be necessary than what the Department has chosen.

Comments: The 'greatest permanent value rule' could change as well as the present definition of 'greatest permanent value.' The scope could be broad enough to include these as options and it might yield higher overall values of the performance measures.

Question: Is the department considering the natural range of variability in aquatic and riparian environments in their planning?

Question: Has the department adequately involved experienced field foresters and biologists so the project outcomes are rational and applicable on the ground?

Comment: The aquatic and riparian rules from the FMP are more restrictive than the FPA... and lower the timber outputs. This contributes to lower timber harvests than were originally forecast.

Model Construction and Data Development Status Ron Zilli described the model being used by the workgroup, its construction, and data development. This resulted in the following questions and comments:

Question: How is the Department accounting of acres that make up complex structure goals and is the Department accounting for all structure created and existing on the landscape?

Question: When an upland complex stand is modeled as harvested and an RMA is left, is that RMA considered complex structure? If it was not complex, but meets the definition in a few years, is it complex then?

Comment: For the purposes of meeting performance measure targets and calculating the costs of these strategies, the Department needs to do a complete accounting of these areas.

Stand Structure Classification Revisions and Current Condition Update Dan Goody explained the stand structure classification revisions and current condition update. He referred to the handout available for the group, with additional information and received the following questions and comments:

Comment: It was recommended that the Department seek an outside peer review of the process used to adjust the stand structure algorithm and the results of the changes that were made. This could improve the process and/or gain credibility for the Department.

Question: What is the difference between "old growth" and old forest structure?

Species of Concern (SOC)

Marcia Humes explained the process used to develop the species of concern framework. Marcia referred to the handout available about SOC, and discussed portions of it.

Question: How are SOC strategies going to be modeled?

Comment: It was recommended that the Department do a good job of describing the SOC strategies and the associated costs. This should apply to strategies that are being modeled and also for other strategies and costs that can not be modeled.

Question: Does using the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife conservation strategy species list lead us to focus on the right species?

Question: Are the underlying decisions made in the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife conservation strategies the right ones to transfer into ODF land management, especially differences between eco-region vs. ecologically significant unit used by Endangered Species Act? Are we developing another measurement that may cause confusion?

Landscape Design Overview

Colleen Kiser gave an overview of the landscape design process using the draft Tillamook District landscape design as an example. She received the following questions and comments:

Question: What existing watershed research and whether the results of these would be considered in state forest management?

Question: Did you give consideration between local taxing districts when creating the landscape design?

**Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests Performance Measures Work
Group
Public Meeting
October 15, 2008**

Forest Grove Power and Light Conference Room

Public attendance:

David Ivanoff – Hampton Affiliates
Patricia Roberts – Clatsop County Commissioner
Chris Jarmer - OFIC
Rex Storm - AOL
Jon Germond, ODFW
Rick Brown, Defenders of Wildlife
Bob Van Dyke, Wild Salmon Center
April Olbrach – former SFAC member

Staff attendance:

Mike Cafferata, Ron Zilli, Rob Nall, Mike Bordelon, Erik Marcy, Clint Smith, Roger Welty, Colleen Kiser, Kate Skinner, Dan Goody, Jeff Foreman, Wayne Auble, Todd Haren, Janine Rice, Henk Stender, Andy White

Introduction: Ron Zilli gave an introduction with background information. He then introduced the Staff Report that will be presented to the Board of Forestry and some supplemental documents that better describe categories of acres in the forests. Ron then reviewed highlights of the report and supporting documents. Staff further described Attachment 6 on effects on fish and wildlife.

Discussion with the group reflected questions about the report and the underlying data analysis. Areas needing further clarifications:

- The supporting documents described acreage categories and how they contribute to the performance measure targets. A key concern is that many acres provide structure and habitat, but are not considered as part of the 20% complex structure to be developed in 20 years.
- Model results in Tillamook overestimate per acre harvest yields. ODF staff described the model results for the Tillamook District and gave background on the analysis of the model vs. the past 6 years of harvest data. This compared cruise to harvest volumes and compared those to model outcomes. From these comparisons they developed the percent variance from the model outputs of a 33 percent reduction in harvest volumes. Staff further described that they are working on improving the model's results and reducing this variance.

- There were questions about how to define operable. The inoperable acres look high for coast range forest management. The explanatory chart handed out needs further refinement.
- There was discussion of the ability to parse out the difference between LYR and OFS from the model results.

Discussion and questions for individual staff members followed the presentation of information.



State Forest Advisory Committee

10/24/08 Meeting

Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue on Strategies to Achieve the BOF Performance
Measure Targets for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests

Committee Feedback and Input

1. What information in the report was the most significant to you?
 - No direct monitoring of SOC, making adaptive mgmt difficult - academia
 - Too many assumptions relative to PM #6 (F&W) - industry
 - Too many data gaps or unknowns - enviro
 - We need to verify assumptions (ex. structure provides habitat).
 - Not enough data regarding impacts to SOC - enviro
 - Need more measurement tools – non aff
 - There may be perils to policy from an inability to convey the shortcoming of the performance measures and the model runs, currently there is too much confidence that the performance measures and model results provide the definitive decision tool – motor rec
 - The dependence of recreation on timber revenue is weakly acknowledged – indust
 - Report doesn't reflect the sense of urgency related to needed improvements in recreation management – motor rec
 - No feedback mechanism to test assumptions that structure = populations (not ideal for decision making) – academ
 - Broad general public (voters) opinion not factored into BOF decision space
 - Need future review and adjust in the future - envoiro
 - High degree of implied accuracy/precision in the model results but no measurement of error (e.g., inventory, yield, etc.) – academ
 - Focus of presentation only on timber revenue. Would like more info regarding non-timber revenue sources – enviro

-
- **Missing analysis of: 5 & 10 year effects to rec. program, long term effects to recreation, water quality, wildlife, & environmental goals – non-motor rec.**
 - **Why would increasing harvest now be a consideration when log prices are so low? – non-motor rec.**
 - **In-stream habitat improvement is not factored in as a mitigating effect to increasing timber harvest - WS**
 - **Surprised that the base model will achieve 144 MMBF and 28% complex structure in 20 years - Rec**
 - **Surprised that there is such a large disparity in county by county benefit from performance measure model run – non-affil**
 - **Surprised that Tillamook will only reach 16% complex structure in 20 years (and difference between districts) – enviro**
 - **Concerned that revenue targets are the favored metric in the performance measures, the state cannot control revenue but it can control volume, ODF does not have authority to control revenue, particularly with a fluctuating market – trib**
 - **The performance measure model run is a misnomer, actually it's a structure run because it does not achieve the 30-35% revenue goal – indust**
 - **The performance measure model run does not analyze attaining the revenue goal as the primary objective – indust**
 - **The performance measure model run does not consider effects to all of the performance measures, it assumes that all of the other performance measure goals would be achieved**
 - **Non-motorized recreationists view the economic goals being over emphasized, water and other resource values will soon be just as valuable**
 - **Performance measure model run puts fish and wildlife goals at greater risk - rec**
 - **The new information in the model makes decision implications more clear – non affil.**
2. What does this information tell you about the need for balancing or re-balancing economic, environmental, and social goals to achieve the GPV on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests?
- **Not enough emphasis on local stakeholders and beneficiaries - indust**
 - **Balance of effects to stakeholders and beneficiaries is not adequately addressed in performance measures - indust**
 - **Economic and social interactions are more intricately linked than the performance measures represent, for example if local economies suffer than recreational users will decline - indust**

-
- **There is a cost for everything, the reality of balance is that there is always give and take - enviro**
 - **The performance measure model run is too biased to gaining economic goals – rec**
 - **Too much emphasis on structure and not enough on recreation & education, statewide user information suggests there are at least 1 million Oregonians that enjoy hiking and outdoor recreation**
 - **Non-motorized constituents favor the current plan and the 50% structure goal**
 - **Difficult to put a value on water because its not being sold, performance measures weakly address the value of water – WS**
 - **Performance measure #1, the rate of return on asset value under the base model run is abysmally low (2%), indicating that the asset is being under-utilized, thus the taxpayers will not be able to derive the full potential of their benefits from state forests, instead they will have to keep paying for it...could be they'd be better off selling it - indust**
3. What information is missing that would have been useful in determining how to move forward with recommendations and a decision?
- **Too much information, needs condensed and better summarized – non-affil**
 - **Report too complex, it weakly articulates results, trends, and consequences**
 - **Other than revenue goals, can management under the current plan achieve the other performance measure goals?**
 - **Difficult to make decisions in the face of incomplete analysis an data (i.e., wildlife/aquatics), qualitative analysis, and quantitative analysis (vol/structure/revenue), creates a challenging decision space - academ**
 - **Lacking data of recreation users on SF lands and the economic impact they have – rec.**
4. Other comments
- **State Forests started as a deal with the counties, the deal has come a long way; commend ODF for sharing the analysis and seeking stakeholder feedback – non-affil**
 - **Need to step back and look at the big picture, consider the intangible contributions of state forests at the macro-level and their contributions to regional ecosystems, the global climate, and the carbon cycle. State forests have value other than what the performance measures attempt to address – rec.**
 - **The BOF needs this information boiled down and summarized in a more compressed manner so they don't focus on details - enviro**

Oregon Dept. of Forestry

- The SF program shouldn't put an inordinate amount of energy into refining the performance measures, but rather focus on improving data, conducting R&M, reducing data gaps, and improving analysis confidence limits, ODF should keep these items as priorities...decisions made without qualifying the limitations of the info and the analysis risk being misplaced – motor rec.
- Modeling and analysis of options to increase revenue while maintaining environmental and social goals should remain high priority