

Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forests Meeting Summary

**9:00 to 3:30p.m. September 30, 2010
Gregory Forum, Clackamas Community College
Oregon City, 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 and were made and the agenda for the day was reviewed. Attachment A provides the participant list.

Review of Reports on Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management E.a. and G.a.

Based on the discussion of these indicators at the July 21 Roundtable meeting and after the results of the online surveys were compiled, staff prepared draft reports describing the key findings for Indicators E.a.: *Composition, Diversity, and Structure of Forest Vegetation* and G.a.: *Carbon stocks on forestlands and in forest products*. 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 September 30 meeting.

The following concerns and suggestions for improving the reports were expressed by Roundtable participants.

Indicator E.a.:

- The evaluation really focuses on two factors—do we have a good indicator? – do we have agreement on a policy goal and desired trend? The answer is yes on the first question and probably no on the second. Our technology is really ahead of our policies for this indicator.
- What process could be used to establish the policy goal for this indicator? Without such a goal it is difficult to evaluate the reported data. The Roundtable has no authority to do so but could offer a proposal. The Department of Fish and Wildlife or the next Governor could lead a statewide policy discussion. This topic should be added to the Roundtable “parking lot” for possible future discussion.
- The Board of Forestry is repeating its call for a policy discussion in the draft 2011 *Forestry Program for Oregon*

Indicator G.a.:

- Mark Harmon has provided a response to the Roundtable's initial evaluation of the Indicator G.a. report. It will be shared with the Roundtable Leadership Group as it plans the next steps for work on this indicator.
- It is apparent there is not consensus within the scientific community on the best methods for measuring carbon stocks on forestlands and in forest products. It may be useful to hear from diverse voices of technical experts in this field.
- It is also apparent that further technical work will be continuing to refine and expand the methodologies that have produced data for Indicator G.a. to date.

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

Presentations and Discussions on Indicators E.c., E.b., and A.c.

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 three indicators reviewed during September 30 meeting are assigned to the nine questions. Listed below is the staff's and Leadership Group's summary of the comments from the September 30 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 E.c.: Forest plant and animal species at risk

Jimmy Kagen (Institute of Natural Resources), assisted by Andrew Yost (ODF), presented the indicator report, referencing information posted online at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/indicatorEc.shtml>

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

- **Yes, the purpose and intent of this indicator are clear.**
- **The Board should revise the statement in the 2007 technical write-up for this indicator that states reporting is limited to species at risk as “recognized by federal and state resource management agencies.” That is not the methodology being used. Reword to read, “This indicator will provide statewide tabular and map information on the status of plant and animal species recognized as at risk by the NatureServe/Natural Heritage rankings because of rarity or because other factors demonstrably make them very vulnerable to extinction.”**

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

- **Generally, the protocol for indicator data collection is clear and technically sound.**
- **A more systematic data collection system would be desirable.**
- There are questions about how diligent efforts are to detect new species and to report data on at risk species. New species are monitored for three years before added to species at risk reports so their status can be assessed.
- We know where the reported species are but lack information on the extent to which species are unreported or underreported.
- Federal “survey and manage” species monitoring protocols may show that some species initially perceived as rare are actually more prevalent than first thought. Survey and manage species tend to be fairly common and therefore not at risk.
- The Oregon Biodiversity Information Center (OBIC) maintains a list of five species risk categories (see <http://orbic.pdx.edu/index.html>). For this indicator, species assigned to OBIC List 1 or List 2 are considered “at risk.” List 1 contains taxa that are threatened with extinction or presumed to be extinct throughout their entire range. List 2 contains taxa that are threatened with extirpation or presumed to be extirpated from the state of Oregon. These are often peripheral species which are of concern when considering species diversity within Oregon's borders. They can be very significant when protecting the genetic diversity of a taxon. OBIC regards extreme rarity as a significant threat and has included species which are very rare in Oregon on this list.
- The five risk categories seem arbitrary to some Roundtable participants.
- We have good confidence in the information of where species have been found, but less knowledge about where they could be. We need to better

understand how species ranges might change with management, disturbance, and climate change.

- Developing potential habitat range maps is possible but expensive. Such maps exist for some species in the Coast Range.

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

- **Currently, data are only reported at the statewide scale and aspatial, but at risk species presence could be reported at the ecoregion scale or down to the 6th field hydrologic unit. More work is needed but maps for every at risk species are already online. Risk rankings would remain a statewide determination.**
- **The report should more clearly state that the data is reported at a statewide scale.**
- Species at risk status is updated every three years.
- Clarify that the data series for this indicator begins in 2001, not 2004.

d. Has the Department appropriately assessed the quality of the indicator information?

- **Yes, the Department has appropriately assessed the quality of the indicator information. However, monitoring is irregular. Systematic and periodic review of the information would add strength to the indicator**
- Consistent state funding is needed for regular comprehensive surveys. Current reporting is highly dependent on federal funds.
- We are not systematically looking everywhere. Species could be present where we are not looking. On the other hand, perfect knowledge would likely not significantly change reports on general statewide results.

e. Has the Department appropriately assessed the conditions measured by the indicator?

- **It is unclear what would be trigger changing a “mixed” condition rating to “good” or “poor.” It appears the condition could always be mixed. Need to reassess and define thresholds.**
- **Currently two of the six taxonomic groups will have 25 percent of the species at risk. It is hard to argue that conditions are not poor.**
- What if a very high proportion of one species class is good and another is very poor?
- In a natural system, what percentage of species might be “at risk?”

f. Has the Department appropriately assessed the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?

- **More clearly describe the timeframe that the data gathering occurred.**

- We need to update reports to include entire 2001 through 2010 data series.
- Clarify in indicator title or trend statement that species at risk determinations are being made at a statewide scale. Perhaps revise the desired trends statement to read: “Decreasing number of Oregon native forest plant and animal species at risk at the statewide scale.”
- Consider assessing trends separately by species groups.

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?

- See comments above about the need for more systematic spatial and temporal data gathering.
- Question: are DEQ aquatic macro-invertebrate data being incorporated?
Answer: If data are not at the species level it may not be useful. Need to follow-up.

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?

- **Generally, yes there is an adequate level of institutional commitment and resources allocated for continued full implementation and reporting of this indicator into the future.**
- **It appears existing data sources are expected to continue under current policies and funding.**
- **Continued and increased state support is needed for this work and to encourage more systematic monitoring.**

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

- **Consider reporting the information at an ecoregional scale.**
- **Indicators E.a., E.b., and E.c. need to be examined together as an integrated set addressing native plant and animal population and habitat conservation.**
- Could spatial information generated through this indicator possibly lead to forest practice requirements that are more site-specific to areas where species are actually present rather than more broad-brushed regulatory approaches? Consider future Oregon Conservation Strategy goals expressed by ecoregion. Look at what the Oregon Natural Heritage Program is already doing.
- Similar work is not yet being done on non-forest species.
- Added capacity will be needed if there is interest in reporting at sub-state scales.

Indicator E.b.: Extent of area by forest cover type in protected area categories

Andy Herstrom (ODF) presented the indicator report, referencing information that is an update to previously posted online at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/indicatorEb.shtml>

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

- **The indicator is really a zoning map for forest uses in Oregon. The zones are clear but more discussion is needed on what land allocations go into each zone category.**
- Further clarity is needed on indicator purpose and intent. Look at Indicator E.c. report for a better example of a purpose and intent statement.

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

- **There are problems with confusing terminology used by the indicator need to be corrected.**
- **The emphasis for this indicator should be biological diversity zoning, not wood production zoning.**
- Nature Conservancy and state parks lands do not fit the definition given for “reserves.”
- It is confusing that late successional “reserves” and riparian “reserves” are not in the “Reserves” category.
- Consider separating forest cover data for recent burns and harvested areas.
- It is appropriate that no federal forest lands be designated as “wood production forests.” That would be inconsistent with the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act.
- Change riparian buffers to “administratively withdrawn” on federal lands.
- Consider a stand alone category for riparian buffers.
- Clarify the difference between “wood production” and timber harvest. Trees may still be harvested under some “administratively withdrawn” land allocations.
- Look at earlier similar land allocation work done in the Blue Mountains by the PNW Research Station.
- Based on the definitions used, more “protection” does not necessarily equal more biological diversity.
- Maybe remove references to “protection” in this indicator and focus instead on management emphases.
- It seems like in the context of this indicator “protection” means protection from ground disturbing activities.
- Change the indicator title to “percent of area by management classes by forest cover type.”

- The protocol may be oversimplifying riparian buffer impacts on family forest landowners. The land allocation to riparian buffers may be more significant for landowners who tend to be lower down in watersheds.
 - Many family forest landowners do not manage primarily for wood production. The percentage of private forest lands designated as “multi-resource” emphasis should be increased.
 - Clarification is needed on federal riparian buffers—both their extent and what management activities can, and cannot take place.
 - Describing private lands as 99 percent “wood production” emphasis timber is misleading. More than that is subject to regulation and activity restrictions.
 - Correlate this analysis with the Indicator A.c. analysis of Forest Practices Act encumbrances.
- c. *Are indicator data being reported at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales?*
- Time frame for the reported data is not clear.
- d. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the quality of the indicator information?*
- Not specifically discussed by the Roundtable.
- e. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the conditions measured by the indicator?*
- Not specifically discussed by the Roundtable.
 - Clarify whether the data graphs for the report include or do not include riparian buffer areas.
- f. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?*
- Not specifically discussed by the Roundtable.
- 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?*
- Not specifically discussed by the Roundtable.
- 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?*

- Not specifically discussed by the Roundtable.
- i. What improvements would you like to see in future reporting for the indicator?*
- **A dilemma with this indicator is that finer delineations are needed to truly understand management allocations, but coarser scaled delineations are needed to aggregate and simplify information for public understanding.**
 - Clarify how riparian acres are included in the statistics.
 - Riparian buffers should be considered as “administratively withdrawn” on federal and as “multi-resource” on private.
 - Some “late successional” forestlands should be considered as “administratively withdrawn” and some as “multi-resource.”
 - The nomenclature is confusing. Federal, state, and private terminology differs. Terms do not mean the same thing across ownerships.
 - Can forest cover data and protected areas designations be cross-walked with species at risk locations? What if 20 species are declining--where are they declining in relation to management allocations?

Indicator A.c.: Compliance with forestry regulations

Gary Lettman (ODF) presented the indicator report, referencing information that is an update to previously posted online at:

<http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/indicatorAc.shtml>

- a. Is the purpose and intent for the indicator clear?*
- **The clarity of the indicators purpose and intent is adequate.**
 - The purpose and intent is less clear on federal lands than non-federal lands.
 - It was expected that the indicator would measure the whole state based one set of requirements.
 - Not all forestry regulations were considered in the analysis.
- b. Is the protocol for indicator data collection clear and technically sound?*
- **The protocol regarding Forest Practices Act administration is clear for non-federal lands but the federal lands analysis needs improvement. It is only partial data and geographically-biased. The omission of federal forestlands outside the Northwest Forest Plan area needs to be corrected.**
 - The omission of reporting on meeting federal timber harvest objectives needs to be addressed.
 - A readily available data set is difficult for federal lands. Federal monitoring does not go down to actual active operation performance, but does look at post-operation outcomes like soil compaction.

- The differences in federal and non-federal monitoring may be confusing to the public—compliance with the Forest Practices Act versus compliance with federal land management plan standards and guidelines.
- The public does want to know if federal management plans are being carried out.

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

- **No. The indicator data are not being reported at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales.**
- Non-federal data is a one-time snapshot with no trend data.
- Federal data has an appropriate, but becoming dated, temporal dimension and a limited spatial side.

d. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the quality of the indicator information?*

- Federal data limitations may be more significant than described. We may need to rate as “inadequate.”
- There is increasingly dated information and there are concerns about the availability of future data. Consider information quality for this indicator to be inadequate on federal lands.

e. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the conditions measured by the indicator?*

- The interpretation is appropriate given what was measured, which is outdated and limited information.

f. *Has the Department appropriately assessed the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?*

- **There is a lack of data and a lack of resources to assess trends on non-federal lands.**

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?*

- Look at additional information for federal lands.
- Look at third-party forest certification audit results as a compliance metric for private lands.

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?*

- With budget cuts to the ODF Private Forests Program there is concern about a lack of capacity to continue compliance monitoring.
- i. *What improvements would you like to see in future reporting for the indicator?*
 - Reconcile encumbrance data for this indicator with private lands management allocations under Indicator E.b.
 - On the indicator website, allow the public to drill down to more detailed information on compliance and non-compliance areas.

Lunch - Information Sharing on Sustainable Forests Topics

Oregon Forest Resources Council/Oregon Department of Forestry Values and Beliefs Survey Results

David Morman presented excerpts from two focus groups conducted in the spring of 2010. Full values and beliefs report results are available online at:
<http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/ofri2010study.shtml>.

2011 Forestry Program for Oregon public comment process

David Morman described Board of Forestry activities regarding development of the public review draft of the 2011 *Forestry Program for Oregon*. The public comment period will be open through December 31, 2010. The Roundtable may wish to consider if and how it may want to engage in this review process. More information is available at: <http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/fpfo2011.shtml>

Roundtable Declaration of Cooperation

Current organizations participating in the Declaration of Cooperation include:

- The Board of Forestry
- Oregon Department of Forestry
- OSU College of Forestry
- Bureau of Land Management
- Department of Environmental Quality
- USFS, Region 6
- USFS, Pacific Northwest Research Station

More statements of support and participation in the Roundtable are encouraged. The current Declaration is available online at:
http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/docs/ORSF_Declaration_of_Cooperation.pdf

The Board of Forestry will receive a status report on the Declaration of Cooperation

at its November 5 meeting.

Completed Roundtable Evaluations of Indicators

Initial Roundtable evaluations reports for Indicators C.a.: *Area of non-federal forestland and development trends* and D.a.: *Water quality in forest streams* have been posted on the Roundtable and respective indicator websites. They were also provided to the Board of Forestry at its September 8 meeting.

Next Steps

- The Leadership Group will have a conference call to debrief on the October 8.
- Initial Roundtable evaluations for Indicators E.a.: *Composition, Diversity, and Structure of Forest Vegetation* and G.a.: *Carbon stocks on forestlands and in forest products* 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 Indicators A.c., E.b., and E.c. Survey responses must be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, October 8.
- Staff will draft preliminary Indicator A.c, E.b. and E.c., Roundtable evaluation reports based on the input from today's meeting and the survey results. The draft reports will be reviewed by the Leadership Group and then with the rest of the Roundtable at the next meeting.
- The issue of identifying a process to establish the policy goal for this indicator will be assigned to the Roundtable "parking lot" for continued future discussion.
- The next meeting of the Roundtable will be on Monday, October 25, at Oregon Department of Forestry headquarters in Salem. Current plans are to focus on evaluations of the following Indicators:
 - B.a. *Forest-related revenues supporting state and local government public services*
 - B.b. *Forest-related employment and wages*
 - B.d. *Forest products sector vitality*

Attachment A - Participants

Jamie Barbour, USFS Pacific Northwest Research Station
Paul Barnum, Oregon Forest Resources Institute
Doug Daoust, USDA Forest Service, Region 6
Steve Calish, USDI Bureau of Land Management
Shannon Hubler, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Jimmy Kagen, Institute for Natural Resources
Rick Loew, Affiliated Timber Investment Conversion Advisors, Inc.
Janet McLennan
Don Nearhood
John Poppino
Keith Reynolds, PNW Research Station
Dillon Sanders, Inbound, LLC
Rex Storm, Associated Oregon Loggers

Oregon Department of Forestry Staff: David Morman, Andrew Yost, Andy Herstrom,
Gary Lettman, Cathy Clem

Mediator: Mike Schnee