

**Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forests  
Meeting Summary  
9:00 to 3:00p.m. March 4, 2011  
Tillamook Conference Room, Oregon Department of Forestry  
Salem, OR**

Meeting summaries for the Roundtable characterize the meeting discussion but do not document every comment made. Presentation materials and web links to important documents are usually posted on the Oregon Roundtable webpage on the Oregon Department of Forestry website, <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/roundtable.shtml>.

### **Introductions and Agenda**

Brief introductions were made and Roundtable processes and progress to date were summarized. Meeting handouts and the day's agenda were reviewed. Attachment A provides the participant list.

### **Roundtable Evaluations of Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management**

***D.b.: Biological integrity of forest streams***

***F.a.: Tree mortality from insects, diseases, and other damaging agents, and***

***F.b.: Invasive species trends on forestlands***

Based on the discussion of these indicators at the January 10 Roundtable meeting and after the results of the online surveys were compiled, staff prepared draft reports describing the key Roundtable findings for these three indicators. These draft reports were then distributed to Roundtable participants prior to the March 4 meeting.

The following concerns and suggestions for improving these indicator report evaluations were expressed by the March 4 Roundtable participants:

Indicator D.b.:

- Add text that states the Roundtable concluded the trend rating should be changed from “uncertain” to “not available.”
- The evaluation is not a stand alone document. Add text and or visual graphic to the introduction of this and all future indicator evaluations that more clearly refers readers to the indicator website for a fuller understanding of context and process. It is currently hard to keep track of all the documents.
- On the website, provide a “roadmap” with visuals that lead the reader through each indicator and supporting documents in a clear and logical manner. Consider an “abstract” for each indicator, supported by the roadmap.

- The evaluation will be useful to DEQ as it works with ODF to improve the indicator report.

#### Indicator F.a:

- The evaluation states that the protocol is limited to 30 years of data but USFS has 60 years of data. This topic needs to be further clarified. The 60-year data would provide better perspective on the situation.
- Clarify that there was not consensus with the statement, “Trend appears to be that bugs are currently in balance.” Have natural processes been perturbed by human actions? Insect populations may be within ecological range but still can cause economic and social problems. Some see western Oregon in balance but eastern Oregon on the verge of increasing tree mortality. Providing regional perspectives would clarify that some areas may not be “in balance” while other areas are. This would be more credible than the broad statement that things are in balance. Also, consider using the phrase “in relative balance” rather than ‘in balance’.
- Management can affect the perspective on “balance”. Without management some forest stands will either burn or be killed by insects. The indicator needs to reflect that.
- Different conclusions could be drawn at sub-regional scales.
- Statement that “four percent mortality per year is normal” needs to be clarified by staff in its response. Seems illogical as it could be interpreted that there would be 100 percent mortality is 25 years.
- In ecological terms, forest disturbance cycles can span multiple human generations. Environmental, economic, and social perspectives on balance might be quite different. But there are obvious economic and social downsides when a forest experiences significant natural mortality followed by slow recovery that could take decades.

#### Indicator F.b.:

- Doug Doust serves with Rob Flowers on the Oregon Invasive Species Council and offered to assist Rob in narrowing the “100 most dangerous” species list to just those species affecting forests.

Department of Forestry staff will incorporate these additional comments and finalize the initial Roundtable evaluations for these indicators and post them on the Roundtable webpage and individual indicator web pages.

### **Presentation and Discussion on Indicator A.b.: Development and maintenance of sustainable forest management knowledge**

*The Leadership Group has developed nine indicator evaluation questions to guide Roundtable discussions on the Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management. Discussion points raised on the indicator reviewed during the March 4 meeting are assigned to the nine questions. Listed below is the staff's and Leadership Group's summary of the comments from the March 4 meeting. Roundtable participants asked clarifying*

*questions, discussed its strengths and weaknesses, and generated ideas for improvements.*

*Everyone may not agree with the assignments and the Roundtable participants are encouraged to make alternative assignments or use the comments as makes sense to them as they consider the nine questions.*

*A short summary report for the indicator will be generated to summarize the draft Roundtable responses to the nine questions and list any additional observations, recommendations, or conclusions that the Roundtable chooses to offer. This report will be available for Roundtable participant review and comment prior to and at the next Roundtable meeting.*

*It is anticipated that the Roundtable will proceed with discussions on each of the indicators and will then discuss the body of indicators as a whole – looking for common themes and synthesizing conclusions about the indicators project.*

David Morman (ODF) presented the indicator report, referencing information posted online at: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/indicatorAb.shtml>. Some recent updates to the online report data were also presented.

*a. Is the purpose and intent for the indicator clear?*

- The text describing why the indicator is important is good. Purpose and intent is clear to some, not to others.
- The metrics measure actions but not the sufficiency of knowledge. The indicator is not measuring the knowledge base but measuring what is getting done. Loose correlation at best.
- Indicator title is not very descriptive. Indicator is really about an informed citizenry and application of human skill and ingenuity. Reword indicator in that way. The title is not worded the same as it is on the website.
- Perhaps have separate indicators for the general public and technical experts knowledge.
- Indicator is subjective and incomplete, but understandable.
- We don't have agreement on what sustainable forest management knowledge is.

*b. Is the protocol for indicator data collection clear and technically sound?*

- Concern that the data is outdated.
- Be clearer on what years are being reported for each metric.
- Don't limit K-12 forestry education program reporting to only those with a field component.
- K-12 metric should be expressed as a percent of total student population rather than just a number of participating students
- K-12 data needs to be updated. Data from different years are mixed together. Better capture unreported programs.
- Clarify that the forestry higher education legend is referring to faculty FTE and

- not the number of colleges.
  - Other research beyond OSU and the PNW Research Station is not being collected.
  - Data on family forest landowners with advanced training should be expressed as a percentage of the total family forest landowner population.
  - There is a math error in the presented family forest landowner data.
  - A better metric might be the number of family forest landowners with management plans.
  - Be clear that the metrics are not comprehensive and only provide a “quick glance”.
  - When considering changes in the protocol, the challenge is weighing the costs and benefits of focusing on easily-gathered data, which might comprise 90 percent or more of the activity within a metric vs. increasing capacity to capture and report all possible data source. Conclusions on conditions and trends might be the same.
  - Some participants believe professional society membership not a good measure of sustainable forest management knowledge. Others pointed out professional membership is relevant as a measure of how active natural resource workers are in improving their profession.
  - Indicator does not measure general public knowledge.
  - The indicator and protocol might not be measuring the right things, i.e. should focus on knowledge.
  - Need to track the extent private cooperators pick up research dropped by public agencies. Clarify whether OSU research budgets include private funds contributed to research cooperatives.
  - How does Master Woodland Manager data address landowner transfers or deaths? To be more useful the metrics should track the number of active Master Woodland Managers and not the cumulative total. Also look at the percentage of total landowners who meet the standard.
  - The family forest landowner metrics references other programs in addition to Master Woodland Managers, but none are identified or tracked.
- c. *Are indicator data being reported at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales?*
- OK to summarize metrics at a statewide scale. Five-year reporting intervals is adequate but the current numbers are getting old
  - Timing of updates is important. K-12 information is spotty. Get data from a broader range of schools.
  - Divide citizenry (public) and professional or technical management education metrics.
  - Reporting rural-urban might be useful.
  - Regional reporting would add value.
  - Measure and report all metrics for the same year and at regular intervals.
- d. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the quality of the indicator information?*
- Generally, the participants said yes, the Department has appropriately assessed the

- quality of the indicator information.
- K-12 data is shaky. Updated information is not necessarily all 2009-10 data. The table just shows some updates to older numbers.
  - Evaluate the benefits and costs of obtaining more comprehensive data for these metrics.
- e. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the conditions measured by the indicator?*
- Given the metrics as described, the Roundtable participants provided many reasons why they agree with the staff's conclusion.
  - Change from "uncertain" to "unknown." We may be measuring the wrong things.
  - A data time series is needed to assess current condition.
  - If general public knowledge was tracked separately, the participants' perception is the condition could be rated "poor."
- f. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?*
- Indicator metrics need a longer trend time series.
  - Important data is missing for the recession years. More current data might indicate deteriorating trends.
  - Portland outdoor school numbers alone could drive trend ratings for the K-12 metric.
  - Trying to assess trends provides another argument for separating the general public metrics and technical expert metrics. Perception is that there is a positive trend for higher education and professional organization memberships and negative for general public knowledge.
  - Knowledge about sustainable forests in Oregon is actually pretty good in professional and academic circles – compared to other places. This trend has been positive.
- g. *Can a case be made that other technical information should be considered as a supplement or an alternative to the information already provided for the indicator?*
- Consider expenditures on outreach and education as another metric.
  - Roundtable participants are very interested in the Oregon Forest Resources Institute's new forestry literacy program. Testing a sample of Oregonians against predetermined literacy standards might be a much cleaner and informative metric for this indicator.
  - Another better metric might be the number of family forest landowners with management plans.
  - Clarify whether research budgets include infrastructure and administration. Consider using researcher FTE or funding per researcher FTE instead.
  - Track family forest landowners' acres under an acknowledged management plan if data are available.

- Track the number of FTE disseminating forestry outreach and education. The downside would be the numbers will likely not change much year to year.
- Tracking understocked or underproductive land trends could be a surrogate for landowner sustainable forest management knowledge
- The indicator is not tracking private sector, non-profit, and DEQ and ODFW research funding. Including their information might encourage their more active participation in the Roundtable.
- The indicator should also track private forester FTE.

*h. Do you believe there is an adequate level of institutional commitment and resources allocated for continued full implementation and reporting of this indicator into the future?*

- Need to resolve question of whether to just collect existing data or trying to go out and find all the data people are interested in for the metrics.
- The indicator is not very technical. It is just a matter for gaining access to the information.
- Cooperation among organizations to gather and share data will be important and necessary in future years.

*i. What improvements would you like to see in future reporting for the indicator?*

- Add narrative text to the report providing more information about the data sources along with links to more detailed information from those sources. Use this as an opportunity to acknowledge and reward cooperators.

## **Status reports and discussion of implementation of other Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management**

Technical expert panel presentations, followed by Roundtable discussion, were conducted for three indicators where full reporting has been delayed. Feedback from the Roundtable will be helpful to the technical experts as they continue work on these indicator topics.

### ***B.c. Forest ecosystem services contributions to society***

Technical Panel: Randy Rosenberger, OSU; Jeff Kline, PNW Research Station; and Gary Lettman, ODF

Key points:

- Technical experts continue to struggle with quantifying these issues that have been of long-standing interest to managers and policymakers.
- For other than recreation, developing price proxies for ecosystem services is limited by a lack of data.

- The quality of recreation data decreases as you go from federal lands to state lands to private lands.
- Huge data issues exist for looking at any ecosystem service other than recreation. We first need spatial information on quantity and quality. We are probably closest with carbon, but even there we only have international market info - no Oregon market information.
- An alternative is to focus on quantity/quality measures and then have people respond to those metrics to define social preferences. This work has not been done.
- Government can't just create ecosystem services markets. Markets require willing buyers and sellers. We need to better understand how the public weighs different values.

#### Roundtable discussion:

- Can fish and wildlife harvest values be quantified? Consult with ODFW.
- Would tracking permits and license sales be a surrogate to tracking ecosystem services demand?
- Our ability to come up with metric ideas exceeds our capacity to measure
- Look at OFRI's 2006 report by Eric Hovee
- There is some confusion over what we are trying to measure. Jobs and income are not useful in quantifying the monetary value of a forest resource.
- Think more abstractly about how to approach ecosystem services. Trying to monetize things like biological diversity or water quality will likely lead to a dead end. Hard to quantify existence values.
- SB 513 Process – Workgroup on Ecosystem Services, might be another source of information.
- Don't use the term “non-timber forest products.”
- Monetizing is not necessary. Focus on quantity and quality. Quantity and quality of carbon, biological diversity, and water quality are already addressed by other indicators.
- Look at work done by the Willamette Partnership on this topic.
- The Roundtable participants generally preferred a focus on recreation use rather than ecosystem services. Some believe recreation should be used as the measure and as a relative indicator of other uses. When it is listed under ecosystem services – it becomes confusing.
- The values of special uses such as minerals, energy, easements, rights-of-way, are not included in the indicators. Perhaps they should be considered in addition to recreation.
- Use categories of measurables as proxies, e.g. permits of all kinds to express demand for services. The current suggested approach utilizing the economic technique of “Constrained Optimization” is not the best approach.
- Recreation analysis needs to look at both supply and demand.

***D.c. Forest road risks to soil and water resources***

Technical Panel: Andy Herstrom, and David Morman, ODF

Key points:

- A field-based road segment sampling protocol was developed in cooperation with the OSU Statistics Department
- The intent is to sample forest roads in all Oregon georegions and ownership classes
- A Request for Proposals was issued last summer for pilot work in the North Coast georegion. Four quality contractor proposals were received.
- Indicator work was suspended following the Ninth Circuit Court ruling and resulting uncertainties regarding the legal obligations of forest landowners to comply with the federal Clean Water Act. Any data collection is delayed until the winter of 2011-12 at the earliest.

Roundtable discussion:

- USFS is conducting a minimum road density analysis to determine what road network is needed under current management plans.
- Look for ways to make the public data blind to location and landowner. Need an approach that will hold cooperative landowners harmless.
- Alternative indicator might be to look at Forest Practice Act enforcement on new construction. However, most new construction is now limited to spur roads.
- Was GIS analysis considered?

***F.c. Forest fuel conditions and trends related to wildfire risks***

Technical Panel: Jim Wolf, West Wide Wildfire Risk Assessment; Josh Halofsky, Washington Dept. of Natural Resources, and Keith Reynolds, PNW Research Station

Key Points:

- West Wide Wildfire Risk Assessment
  - LANDFIRE refresh now underway for western states - updated from 2001 to 2008 imagery. Comparisons between the two datasets may be useful.
  - Assessment looks at weather influence zones, topography, and vegetation
  - Will model fire type
  - Project scheduled for completion in October 2011. It will provide the information called for in the current metric.
- Integrated Landscape Assessment Project
  - ARRA funded state and transition models
  - WA, OR, NM, AZ focus

- Models management, disturbance, and projects future conditions
- Fuel hazard scores developed
- Looks at future acres in future fire potential categories
- Resolution is 5<sup>th</sup>-field hydrologic units (50,000 to 150,000 acres) but can stratify to smaller scales
- PNW Research Station fuels modeling
  - Model completed last year to generate estimates of wildfire potential
  - Resolution is 6<sup>th</sup>-field hydrologic units (20,000 to 30,000 acres)
  - Probabilistic modeling – this approach might yield the most realistic results
  - Decision model driven by managers who build in timber volumes and values
  - Results can help prioritize the landscape for treatment
  - Routine updates maybe every five years. These can be used for trend assessments
  - Valuable tool for short term planning

#### Roundtable discussion:

- All three tools allow for trend assessments. A combination of modeled outputs might yield the best result
- ILAP is future-oriented. It takes current conditions and projects into the future.
- West Wide Assessment is one snapshot in time, just looking at fuels. It is not probabilistic and only estimates the potential for surface and crown fires. Admittedly not as complex as the other two tools.
- Modeling for extreme fire weather not useful as the models show everything burns
- Big advances have been made in fire science since Indicator F.c. was developed. It may be worthwhile to reevaluate the metric

#### Next Steps

- The Leadership Group will have a conference call to debrief and plan next steps.
- Initial Roundtable evaluations for Indicators D.b.: *Biological integrity of forest streams*, F.a.: *Tree mortality from insects, diseases, and other damaging agents*, and F.b.: *Invasive species trends on forestlands* will be finalized and posted online.
- All the participants at today's meeting are encouraged to complete the online survey with the nine questions for Indicator A.b.
- Staff will draft a preliminary Indicator A.b. Roundtable evaluation report based on the input from today's meeting and the survey results. The draft report will be reviewed by the Leadership Group and then with the rest of the Roundtable at the next meeting.
- Staff responses to Roundtable evaluations on indicators will continue to be provided as they become available.
- Current plans are for the next Roundtable meeting to focus on evaluation of Indicator A.a.: *Ability to measure and report on all other Oregon sustainable forest management*

*indicators*. This indicator could provide the beginning of the indicator integration discussion that has been asked for at several previous meetings.

- The next meeting can also provide an opportunity for the Roundtable to discuss its work to date and plans for the future.
- A status report on the Roundtable may be provided to the Board at its June 8 meeting.
- Following *Forestry Program for Oregon* adoption by the Board of Forestry later in 2011, the Roundtable may be asked to provide recommendation for changes in the list of Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest management heading forward into the next eight-year Board strategic planning cycle.

### ***Reports From Round Participants - Recent Sustainable Forestry Developments***

- “Structure Oregon” will be held at the Oregon Convention Center in June. It will bring together green builders and Oregon wood products manufacturers with a focus using wood, particularly local wood. Contact Paul Barnum at the Oregon Forest Resources Institute for more details.
- The Oregon Forest Biomass Work Group continues to meet with the next gathering scheduled for March 8 in Salem. Contact David Morman for more details.
- The Board of Forestry will receive a report on the public comments received on the draft 2011 *Forestry Program for Oregon* at its April 29 meeting. Final adoption could take place at the Board’s June 8 meeting.

**Attachment A - Participants**

Jamie Barbour, PNW Research Station  
Paul Barnum, Oregon Forest Resources Institute  
Aaron Borisenko, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality (by phone)  
Steve Calish, USDI Bureau of Land Management  
Doug Doust, USDA Forest Service  
Katie Gauthier, Senator Jeff Merkley's Office  
Robert Lundblad  
Janet McLennan  
Tally Patton, Weyerhaeuser Co.  
John Poppino  
Keith Reynolds, PNW Research Station  
Dillon Sanders, Inbound, LLC  
Josh Seeds, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality  
Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers

Guest Panelists: Randy Rosenberger, OSU; Jeff Kline, PNW Research Station; Gary Lettman, ODF; Andy Herstrom, ODF; Jim Wolf, West Wide Wildfire Risk Assessment (by phone); Josh Halofsky, Washington Dept. of Natural Resources (by phone)

Oregon Department of Forestry Staff: David Morman, Cathy Clem

Mediator: Mike Schnee