

## Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forests Meeting Summary

9:00 to 2:30p.m. November 22, 2010

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, Roundtable progress to date was summarized, and the agenda for the day was reviewed. Attachment A provides the participant list.

David Morman proposed that the technical specialists who prepared and presented the indicator reports develop written responses on how they have utilized the initial Roundtable evaluations to improve the indicator reports. This will allow the Roundtable to see how its feedback has been incorporated. After reviewing the information the Roundtable may choose to follow-up on any indicators that they would like to further discuss.

Roundtable participants supported the proposal.

### Briefing and Roundtable Discussion on the draft 2011 *Forestry Program for Oregon*

David Morman highlighted the timeline for review and adoption of the draft and described the organization and key sections of the document. Comments from the Roundtable discussion are listed below.

*Statements in **Bold** type are points of emphasis and possible points of agreement that appeared to emerge during the meeting.*

### Overall Comments

- **It is a comprehensive set of goals.**
- The goals should include measurable deliverables or outcomes. If there are existing Board Work Plans that support the objectives they should be referenced.
- The quote on page 20 is not very inspiring with respect to sustainable forestry.
- Appendix 1 on page 66 is a strong endorsement for the Roundtable.
- There is a lack of expressed commitment to monitoring and adaptive management. There should be a strong statement of commitment to follow-through with the data gathering and analysis necessary to implement the indicators described in Appendix 4 (page 72).
- Better align the language in the goal statements with the corresponding goals in

- the Montreal Process.
- Even though the goals are not listed in any priority order, the current Goal A should not be the first one presented.
  - Each goal discussion closes with a “How are we doing?” section. Use footnotes to reference how to get more information, specifically for condition and trend descriptions. This is particularly important for currently undefined descriptions such as, “No change, but...” for Indicator C.a.
  - The goals are written in a manner that does not infuse much energy to solutions. A large percentage of Oregonians will simply want to know if things are getting better or worse. If the analysis only addresses the issues in complex and technical ways it will be hard to generate much excitement among Oregonians. In addition, people want less government but still want government to preserve positive directions for the things they value.
  - The draft *Forestry Program for Oregon* presents a broad vision on Oregon’s Forests. It is not clear how that vision will serve to meet the specific statutory and administrative rule mandates that the Board and the Department of Forestry are charged to meet. A description of how that vision is consistent with and provides for meeting statute and rule responsibilities should be added. For example, it is not clear how the Forest Practices Act requirement to “... inventory special resource sites...” will be achieved and how that ties into the described need for a “statewide plant and animal conservation policy.”
  - The Board should include their views on sustainability in a “value” statement.
  - The trend statements from the 19 indicators (pages 18-19) are important, strong statements. Provide additional specifics on each of them to add clarity on the desired outcomes. Make each of these outcomes as measurable as possible.
  - Page 18. Support was expressed for the first bullet under the trend statements that addresses “no net loss...wildland forest.” However, in the past there has been some inconsistency between this language and the Oregon Department of Forestry’s actions regarding the conversion of forestland to development.

### **Goal A**

- This goal should address public safety conflicts for landslides and for wildfire. Landslides are currently addressed in Goal B – this is not a good fit. The aspects of wildfire addressed in Goal F, Objective 5 should be addressed in Goal A.
- The document should address recreational use, particularly on private forests. The document generally fails to adequately address recreation.
- Objective 2: Need a stronger emphasis on the importance of maintaining the forestland base and a strong land use planning program. The phrase “but flexible” weakens the emphasis and should be deleted.
- Objective 3: This is a critical step. An explicit commitment and a very deliberate process should be described. How will the 19 indicators be analyzed and integrated into a meaningful evaluation of sustainability that can be understood and implemented into policy? What does the “integrate” mean in this context? How can it be communicated to a range of audiences?
- Objective 4. The current language is “too shallow.” It relies too heavily on the “politically driven” 2009 report, “*Achieving Oregon’s Vision for Federal*

*Forestlands*”. The recommendations in that report are not strong enough.

### **Goal B**

- The losses of forest management capacity and manufacturing infrastructure warrant an objective to address these problems.
- Recreation is not adequately addressed.

### **Goal C**

- Recreation is not adequately addressed.
- Indicator C.a. should also track wildland forest dwelling trends. It should report on increasing densities – don’t wait until the threshold of five dwellings per square mile is reached.
- The stated trend for Indicator C.a is “improving but...” Provide more information or a definition of what the phrase means.
- Be consistent in reporting the new Indicator C.a. target. Is the baseline year 2009 or 2010?

### **Goal E**

- Objective 2: The first two sentences do not appear to be consistent. It is unclear if it means using the existing forest practices framework or the set of existing specific standards. If it means the latter, then those standards may not be adequate to meet the goal. Some aspects of the current standards are not being implemented, e.g. inventorying sensitive resource sites. Reconcile this objective text with Objective A.2.
- Page 19. Bullets 9 and 10 refer to a “...coordinated statewide plant and animal conservation policy.” The issue also is raised in objectives for Goal E. The *Forestry Program for Oregon* document should further describe what such a policy would address, how it would be generated, and by whom.
  - To what extent does the “Oregon Conservation Strategy” (adopted by the Oregon Fish and Wildlife Commission) already suffice? Does the Conservation Strategy tie into the described in need is Objective 4 need for “...a coordinated, statewide Oregon native plant and animal conservation policy...”? It addresses already environmental, economic, and social needs. How will the Board help implement the Oregon Conservation Strategy?
  - All land use sectors need to come together to discuss native plant and animal habitat and population objectives. There has been no progress on this topic since 2003. The Board has stated that it is ready to come to the table if other land uses will also participate and has stated in draft Objective E.4. that all private landowners should be treated equally, regardless of land use.
  - The *Forestry Program for Oregon* should describe how to move the issue forward, who should collaborate on the issue, and where the leadership would come from. The governor’s natural resource staff and state agency directors would likely be key to moving this forward.
- Objective 4: If collaborative development of a strategy (policy) is unattainable,

- the Board could utilize existing technical information to develop targets.
- Objective 5: The objective is predicated on the existence of a "...state native plant and animal conservation policy..." Until such a policy is determined the objective is meaningless.
  - Objective 6. How does this statement reconcile with federal law? The text should clearly reference that this statement came from the Federal Forests Advisory Committee report.
  - The Roundtable has previously identified that further discussion is necessary to develop desired trends/targets for Indicators E.a. and E.b. This links to Objectives 4 and 5.
  - Indicator E.a. data requires a more meaningful analysis in order to develop a desired trend statement.
  - Decouple the desired trend statements for Indicators E.a and E.b from the "call" for a conservation policy.

### **Goal G**

- The goal statement and the discussion should more broadly describe the array of ways that forests and forest management can affect the carbon cycle. Include carbon sequestration, storage, and substitution.

Scientists from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are calling for longer timber rotations, active forest management, forest product use, and biomass energy to address forest carbon. Look at the Consortium for Research on Renewable Industrial Materials (CORRIM) research. Look more closely at the carbon reduction benefits of using wood versus other building materials. Proposed wording changes will be submitted to ODF staff.

### **Review of Reports on Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management B.a., B.b., and B.d.**

Based on the discussion of these indicators at the October 25 Roundtable meeting and after the results of the online surveys were compiled, staff prepared draft reports describing the key findings for Indicators B.a.: *Forest-related revenues supporting state and local government public services*, B.b.: *Forest-related employment and wages*, and B.d.: *Forest products sector vitality*. The Leadership Group reviewed and commented on the initial draft and staff redrafted the reports based on those comments. These draft reports were then distributed to Roundtable participants prior to the November 22 meeting.

The Roundtable participants expressed support for the format and content of the reports. No substantive changes were identified - however there are spelling errors that should be corrected in the report for B.d.

Department of Forestry staff will finalize the initial Roundtable reports for these three indicators and post them on the Roundtable webpage and the respective indicator web pages.

## **Presentation and Discussion on Indicator C.b.**

*The Leadership Group has developed nine indicator evaluation questions to guide Roundtable discussions on the Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management. Listed below is the staff's and Leadership Group's summary of the comments from the November 22 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 each 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.*

*Statements in **Bold** type are points of emphasis and possible points of agreement that appeared to emerge during the meeting.*

### **Indicator C.b.: Timber harvest trends compared to planned and projected harvest levels and the potential to grow timber.**

Gary Lettman (ODF) presented the indicator report, referencing information posted online at: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/Indicators/IndicatorCb.shtml>

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

- **The purpose and intent are adequately clear.**
- This information generated for this indicator is an important part of the sustainable forestry story. It supports Goal C and Objectives C.2. and C.7.
- It is important to understand that there may be environmental, economic, and social consequences of both overharvesting and underharvesting compared to planned/projected harvest levels. This indicator is also pertinent to overharvesting or underharvesting relative to biological wood growth potential.

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

- **Yes.**

c. *Are indicator data being reported at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales?*

- **A statewide reporting scale is appropriate but regional breakdowns of the data are also desirable. Consider eastside/northwest/southwest.**
- d. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the quality of the indicator information?*
- **Yes.**
- e. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the conditions measured by the indicator?*
- **No. The participants agree that the condition rating should be changed to “Poor”. Use Gary Lettman’s alternative rating rationale that was presented at the meeting.**
- f. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?*
- **No. The participants agree that the trend rating should be changed to “Deteriorating.” Use Gary Lettman’s alternative rating rationale that was presented at the meeting.**
- 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?*
- **Separately and distinctly address the planned/projected levels of harvest and the amount of total wood growth potential that is being harvested. Consider a separate indicator addressing how much of wood growth potential is being harvested or at least add a separate set of ratings for this aspect. It is important to clearly describe how much wood volume the forest produces and how much is actually harvested. Should mortality also be described?**
  - **Avoid jargon and unclear terms. This information must be communicated in a manner that the average Oregonian can understand. For example, “biological potential” can mean different things to different people. Be clear that “wood growth potential” or the “biological potential/capability of forests to produce wood” is what is being referenced.**
- 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?*
- **Yes there is an adequate level of institutional commitment and resources allocated for continued full implementation and reporting of this indicator with current ODF funding.**

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

- **Display harvest levels by landowner categories (public/private) statewide and breakout the various public ownerships and their respective contributions to timber harvest. Stacked bar graphs showing the harvest by ownership for at least three periods of time would be helpful. Furthermore, display public and private harvest levels by region. Finally, cross reference land ownership proportions with harvest proportions.**
- **Clearly describe the implications of the information.**

### **Update on other sustainable forestry developments**

- Oregon's strategic sustainable forest management framework was presented at the national Society of American Foresters Convention and at a public meeting in Bend. Additional public meetings are planned for November 22 at PSU in Portland and December 8 in Medford.
- Jefferson Public Radio interviewed David Morman about the *Forestry Program for Oregon* and the sustainable forest management framework.
- The current Roundtable Declaration of Cooperation was shared with the Board of Forestry at its November meeting.

### **Next steps**

- In December, the Leadership Group will have a conference call to debrief on the November 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting.
- Initial Roundtable evaluations for Indicators B.a.: *Forest-related revenues supporting state and local government public services*, B.b.: *Forest-related employment and wages*, and B.d.: *Forest products sector vitality* 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 C.b.
- Staff will draft a meeting summary for today's meeting and a preliminary Indicator C.b. Roundtable evaluation report based on the input from today's meeting and the survey results. The Leadership Group will review the summary and the draft report will be reviewed with the rest of the Roundtable at the next Roundtable meeting.
- The Leadership Group will set dates/agendas for future Roundtable meetings to complete the initial evaluations of the indicators, pursue follow-up discussions on some indicators, take on issues from the "parking lot", and have a synthesis discussion on the entire set of indicators. Meetings will likely be scheduled for January, February, and April of 2011.
- January – Likely indicators for discussion:
  - D.c. *Biological integrity of forest streams*,
  - F.a. *Tree mortality from insects, diseases, and other damaging agents*, and
  - F.b. *Invasive species trends on forestlands*
- February, likely indicators for discussion:
  - A.b. *Sustainable forest management knowledge*

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

*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 requested at several previous meetings.

- Another possibility for the February meeting is to begin indicator follow-up discussions. Such discussions could consider responses from the technical experts to the Roundtable's indicator report evaluations or revisit indicators that warrant more in-depth discussion.
- It remains uncertain if there will be anything to report on the following two indicators in the short term:

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

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

- April - the Roundtable may choose to begin a discussion on how the indicator information can be aggregated and synthesized to assess the degree to which economic, environmental, and social aspects of sustainability are being met.
- What about potential future Roundtable Projects? Possibly a role in revising the Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management in the summer/fall of 2011? Other ideas?

## **Attachment A - Participants**

Linc Cannon, Oregon Forest Industries Council

Jim Just, 1000 Friends of Oregon

Rod Krahmer, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife

Richard Loew, Affiliated Timber Investment Conversion Advisors, Inc. (Via Phone)

Robert Lundblad

Keith Reynolds, PNW Research Station

Dillon Sanders, Inbound, LLC

Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers

Oregon Department of Forestry Staff: David Morman, Gary Lettman, Cathy Clem

Mediator: Mike Schnee