

**Oregon Board of Forestry – Federal Forestland Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Oregon Department of Forestry**  
**Salem, Oregon**  
**June 3, 2008**

## **Key Discussion Questions**

The following questions pertain to the expanded outline that will form the basis for the Board of Forestry's Federal Forestland Advisory Committee (FFAC) report to the Board. These questions are intended to help guide the Board – FFAC discussion of the expanded outline during their June 3 meeting.

### Direction of the Expanded Outline

In general, do Board members feel the expanded outline is headed in the right direction to contribute to achieving the vision for federal forestlands?

### Vision and Goals

Is the Board still comfortable with the draft vision state and goals to achieve the vision?

### A Sense of Urgency

Is the sense of urgency adequately and accurately described? If not, what is missing?

### Problems

1. Have the most important problems been identified in the outline? If not, what is missing?
2. Does the Board agree with how the interrelationships among problems have been described?

### Recommended Solutions: State and Local

1. Is a two-pronged strategy at different levels of government (state/local, national) the most effective approach?
2. Does the Board agree that focusing on the forest health problem is appropriate and that by necessity, will require addressing the other problems identified in the outline to varying degrees?

3. State facilitation and support of local partnerships/advisory committees
  - a. Does the Board agree with the concept of State facilitation and support of local partnerships or advisory committees (i.e., unit of state employees with clear direction and budget sufficient to carry out the mission)?
  - b. Should the State try to make use of existing committees (e.g., watershed councils, federal resource advisory committees)?
  - c. Should the State provide scientific support for these partnerships/committees?
  - d. How should funds to support the State-level organization and local partnerships/committees be secured?
4. Should the State become directly involved in the NEPA process as originally envisioned by the FFAC Synthesis Subcommittee or should it focus its energy on supporting increased funding dedicated to increased federal training and personnel for NEPA work?
5. Should local partnerships/committees work to simultaneously identify areas where a timber sale program is possible with careful attention to ecological and cultural values?
6. Is it practical for local partnerships/committees to define "older forests" for their areas and to define goals for those older forests?
7. Does the Board agree that local partnerships/committees should work with federal agencies to save existing older forests and identify opportunities for additional older forests?
8. What actions should be taken to increase trust among stakeholders?
9. How should policies be coordinated/integrated across different levels of government including local partnerships/committees? For example: How would federal plans for the Northern Spotted Owl be integrated with local partnership/committee plans?

Recommended Solutions: National

1. Does the Board support a "National Sustainable Forest Act" as described in the FFAC expanded outline?
2. Does the Board agree with the funding-related action items identified in the expanded outline? What other action items should we consider?

## Implementation

1. What strategy or actions (short or long-term) should be used to implement state and local solution recommendations?
2. What strategy or actions (short and long-term) should be used to implement national solution recommendations?