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.

I. Introductions and Agenda
Brief introductions and were made and the agenda for the day was reviewed. Attachment A provides the participant list.

II. Review of Reports on Indicators C.a. and D.a.
Based on the discussion of these indicators at the May 12th Roundtable meeting and after the results of the online surveys were compiled, staff prepared draft reports describing the key findings for Indicators C.a.: Area of non-federal forestland and development trends and D.a.: Water quality in forest streams. 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 and were the focus of the initial Roundtable discussion at the July 21st meeting.

The following concerns and suggestions for improving the reports were topics of discussion:

- Concern was expressed about “endangered indicators”, i.e. that the indicators themselves may not be sustainable due to a lack of funding or resources. It was suggested that the reports be used to identify the resources/funding needed to properly support the indicator.
- It was suggested that the following question be added to the evaluations: “Is there an adequate level of institutional commitment and resources allocated for continued full implementation and reporting of this indicator into the future?”
- Move the key points from each report to a summary section at the beginning of the report. Then a separate, more detailed discussion of the (now) nine questions can follow in the body of the report.
- Use bold type and a larger font for the indicator name and add the desired trend statement for the indicator.
- For indicator D.a: Add a reference to commitments already made through the Oregon Plan. Funding is a key concern for continued monitoring for this indicator.
• For indicator D.a.: Integrate data gathering that is going from all sources. Identify existing sources of data and funding, sources that would add robustness to the indicator, and opportunities to make data gathering more efficient and avoid redundancy. Be clear about who will be using the data and for what purpose. More data is available from USFS higher elevation sources that could be incorporated into the most recent indicator analyses.

• For indicator C.a.: There is concern that the indicator looks at all forests but the desired trend looks only at wildland forests. This could lead to confusion or misinterpretation. Ownership class may be another leading metric in addition to parcelization.

David Morman stated that the reports would be revised to incorporate the discussion points. The revised draft reports will be distributed to the Leadership Group for their approval and when approved, will be posted on the Roundtable webpage.

III. Presentations and Discussions on Indicators E.a and G.a.
After the July 21 meeting, staff and the Leadership Group reviewed the discussion points raised during the meeting and staff later assigned them to the nine questions that the group has been asked to respond to for the Board of Forestry. This was done to assist the Roundtable members in formulating draft responses to the nine questions. 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.

Listed below is the staff’s and Leadership Group’s best determination as to how to assign the comments from the July 21 meeting to the nine questions for the two indicators that were discussed. Statements in Bold type are points of emphasis and possible points of agreement that appeared to emerge during the meeting.
Indicator E.a.: Composition, Diversity, and Structure of Forest Vegetation

Andrew Yost (ODF) presented the indicator report, referencing information posted online at: [http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/indicatorEa.shtml](http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/indicators/indicatorEa.shtml)

Roundtable participants asked clarifying questions, discussed its strengths and weaknesses, and generated ideas for improvements. There was insufficient time available to discuss all nine specific questions for evaluating the reports. It was agreed that the Leadership Group would take the information from the meeting and develop a draft report on the indicators. The draft report will be available prior to the next Roundtable meeting.

Discussion points raised at the meeting have been placed under the evaluation question deemed to most appropriately fit and are listed below:

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

   **The purpose and importance of this indicator is not clear.**
   - Describe how the information can lead to better decisions.
   - How will the indicator serve as a measure of change over time and space?
   - It is not clear how the data will be useful to evaluate invasive species and climate change effects.
   - Better explain the use and validity of the indicator.
   - Recommend having a non-technical editor for the report.
   - Relate the indicator to other indicators.
   - Given the indicator information presented, are outcomes being met?

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

   **The protocol is state-of-the-art for the purpose for which it was designed - but it doesn’t seem to answer all the questions posed by the indicator.**
   - Indicator does not go far enough. Other data should be considered. FIA Data may not be adequate for answering diversity questions.
   - Information on the dead wood components (snags and down wood) is needed but missing.
   - Use several data sources instead of just one. The Nature Conservancy and the Oregon Wildlife Conservation Strategy may be possible additional sources.
   - Need to combine data to analyze habitat conditions/effectiveness and correlate with species populations.
Better outputs measuring diversity indices are needed.
- Consider “overstory species richness” mapping as a measure of diversity.
- Need to also capture the distribution and extent of other “non-tree” forest features like meadows and wetlands.
- We need access to understory and non-tree species information in the database, recognizing the spatial resolution may not match that available for overstory vegetation.
- Consider developing a diversity metric based on frequency and distribution information.
- The data and data-gathering methodology may not go far enough to adequately quantify this indicator.
- True biological diversity sampling is not possible with the current level of sampling. Examples of possible strata to subsample include but are not limited to: aspect, elevation, and any identified topics of social concern.
- If technically possible, we need more details than just reporting species dominance. It makes a difference if the dominant species is 100% or 51% of the stand.
- Link to the new Oregon statewide assessment biological diversity analysis.

3. Are indicator data being reported at the appropriate spatial and temporal scales?
- It is important to note the indicator data cannot be used at very small, site-specific scales. Be clear on appropriate uses for indicator data. The data are strongest at the ecoregion scale.
- There is interest in having the data answer questions in at many scales (from macro to micro), such as stratifying the data by ownership and gathering additional data at smaller scales.

4. From the indicator report can you draw a conclusion regarding the quality of the indicator information?
- Partial – Current condition information is good but trend information is missing.

5. From the indicator report can you draw a conclusion regarding the conditions measured by the indicator?
- Provide clearer conclusions on what stands out from the data.
- Are (desired) outcomes being met?

6. From the indicator report can you draw a conclusion regarding the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?
- The lack of a policy goal is a problem.
- A range of desired future conditions could be based on the management objectives and protection strategies of various landowners and evaluating whether the combination of those objectives and strategies are moving forest vegetation conditions in the right direction.
- There doesn't seem to be either a historic benchmark or a desired future condition, so it would be impossible to state whether there is a trend.
7. **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?**
   - It would have been helpful to examine all three Strategy E indicators at once and synthesize evaluations. Show they influence each other. Indicator E.b. assumes “protected lands” are treated differently.
   - Important to link to species of concern or species at risk.
   - How information will be used as an indicator is unclear.

8. **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 at the meeting)

9. **What improvements would you like to see in future reporting for the indicator?**
   - Add a link to the PNW Research Station website.
   - Correct or supplement the three dimensional size class chart for normal size class distribution by species. For example, red alder will never have “giant” trees. Size class distributions may vary by ecoregion.
   - Try to establish trends from historical data, recognizing that the current and historical information would be based on different data gathering methods.
   - Since the data was generated over several years, better explain why the current information represents the “window of time” versus the current indication of a “point in time”.
   - Need to clarify how data are correlated with elevation and aspect.
   - Consider plant association groups as a tool to define desired conditions and trends. If plant associations are too fine a scale for the indicator, look at some higher level of plant community classification.
   - We need a risk analysis for vegetation structure components. Under current management, are there vegetation types or structural components that are likely to decrease?

**For all indicators… Be clear about the purpose and importance of each indicator, interdependencies among indicators, and what we know and don’t know.**

**Some summary ideas from the discussion on Indicator E.a.**
   - Be clear about the goal for the indicator.
   - The data and the protocols are good - given the original purpose for the FIA data. Additional data and protocols may be necessary to answer the questions of interest. Broaden the approaches to measuring and describing diversity indices.
   - Consider discussing trends as a description of our ability to meet management goals over time.
Research needs include – clarifying the data required, habitat effectiveness in meeting goals, and risk analysis.

Indicator G.a.: Carbon stocks on forestlands and in forest products.
Andrew Yost (ODF) presented an overview of the indicator and Frank Schnekenburger (OSU) presented the carbon model and modeling results. Both responded to questions from the Roundtable. Frank’s PowerPoint presentation will be posted on the Roundtable website.

Roundtable participants asked clarifying questions, discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the report and the modeling approach, and generated ideas for improvements. There was insufficient time available to discuss all nine specific questions for evaluating the reports. It was agreed that the Leadership Group would take the information from the meeting and develop a draft report on the indicators. The draft report will be available prior to the next Roundtable meeting.

Discussion points raised at the meeting have been placed under the evaluation question deemed to most appropriately fit and are listed below:

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

   **The purpose and intent are not clear.**
   - The fourth paragraph in this section of the report is the most useful.
   - The report should speak to participation in the carbon economy and climate change adaptation and mitigation.
   - Could be written more positively, e.g. the indicator analyzes the role forests can play to mitigate climate change by enhancing carbon storage.
   - Recommend a non-technical editor for the report.
   - Forest management has a very small (negligible) impact on carbon. Emphasize forest management as carbon neutral. Let’s say this!
   - Does the indicator make sense given the impact of forests on carbon?
   - The report doesn’t describe the tradeoffs of increased/decreased carbon on other indicators/resources.
   - Consider a trend statement that focuses on a “positive” achievement of management activities designed to meet goals.

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

   **The modeling approach raised many concerns and ideas for improvement.**
   - The model uses fire and timber harvest as the only drivers. What about the effects from fire suppression and other management activities?
   - Given the major impacts of insects and diseases, their omission from the model is a major gap, especially in Eastern Oregon.
   - If fire or insect and disease mortality is mistaken for harvest, does that then overstate resulting forest products storage?
Subjective decisions have been made on what to include and not include in the model. Fossil fuels expended for wood product extraction and fossil fuels offset from wood product use are both outside the analysis.

There is currently low validity in the model to use it as the sole source for a statewide indicator.

There seems to be confusion between sequestration and storage. Do we want high levels of sequestration, storage, or both?

The protocol is still under development and not mature enough for use by decision-makers.

The protocol lacks precision to track small and incremental changes.

The model is still rudimentary. It may be useful for historical/future projections, but not for quantifying current conditions.

Look at other methods that can be interrelated with other indicators.

The model currently is just a starting point and may take years to mature.

Be clearer on what we know and don’t know.

The ecosystem is very complex. Forests must be described as more than just a source or sink at a given point in time.

Fire history in the model needs to be updated.

The model output for “Product Flux” doesn’t seem to appropriately reflect the harvest rates since 1990.

Does the model reflect the high sequestration rates of new plantations?

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

- To be used as an indicator we need statewide data and not an extrapolation from four areas. The statewide picture could be completely different.
- Consider using ecoregions as the building blocks. Reporting only at a statewide scale may not be that meaningful.

4. *From the indicator report can you draw a conclusion regarding the quality of the indicator information?*

**No. The indicator is not yet ready to assign ratings.**

5. *From the indicator report can you draw a conclusion regarding the conditions measured by the indicator?*

- The data may already be adequate to show management is not having much effect on total forest carbon storage.
- No. Indicator is not yet ready to assign ratings.

6. *From the indicator report can you draw a conclusion regarding the current trend measured by the indicator, when compared to the Desired Trend Statement?*

**No. The indicator is not yet ready to assign ratings.**
• The existing desired trend statement is flawed. In some forest types we may not want stable or increasing levels of carbon storage.
• The desired trend should be determined by the time scale looked at. Restoration work could reduce carbon storage in the short term but increase storage potential in the long term.
• The existing trend statement is not necessarily an indication of a healthy forest.
• The desired trend should probably vary by ecoregion.
• Making forest management decisions solely on carbon does not make sense. Such decisions could have unintended consequences for biological diversity and fuels.

7. 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)

8. 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)

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

Consider this indicator as an ongoing long-term effort. Other indicators are more ready for evaluation.
• Tie to development indicator. How much potential storage and sequestration is lost through conversion?
• Analyze what mix of management is most beneficial for carbon policy.
• Emphasize storage AND sequestration.
• Describe how ownership and other overlays interact and how different management approaches affect carbon.
• Identify the impacts of management activities on carbon. Rather than a trend statement consider identifying possible objectives for management activities to help meet the goal for the indicator. Encourage activities that enhance carbon storage and sequestration.
• Analyze the carbon storage and sequestration interactions with other indicators, harvests, jobs, fuel conditions, ecosystem function, and economic values. Connected data sets are needed.

Model validation and enhancements are necessary if the model is to be credible.
• The modeling is helpful however improvements and validation testing are necessary before attempting to use it in decision-making. The historic perspectives are the strongest point. The projections are also helpful but shouldn’t be used to present carbon storage as absolute values today.
• The 2009 and 2010 data points should be deleted from the graphs.
Check the name of the southwestern block of the Oregon forests that was modeled. In the report it is called the Klamath Region, however it appears as though it might be more appropriately called the Siskiyou Mountains. Given its location, the name Klamath seems misleading.

Compare model predictions to inventories and other field data to improve model parameterization.

Improve disturbance (fire history and others) & products use history.

Improve the depiction of climate and the processes it controls.

Examine how biofuels influence carbon stores in forest ecosystems & forest products.

Project future possible changes in carbon stores due to natural disturbance and management.

Continue development of the Carbon Calculator.

Expand the modeling to other areas in Oregon.

Why don’t the Biscuit Fire in 2002 and the multitude of 1987 fires and other major disturbances show up in the modeled results?

Clarify that data is spread out over five-year intervals.

Validate the model against historical data and other growth, harvest, and mortality estimates. Broadly, the model should undergo adequate validation testing.

Do comparative runs with different models, not just one.

Could the model be used to estimate pre-European settlement conditions?

Correct typo in caption for Oregon-wide carbon stores chart. “(1012)” should be “(10^{12} grams).”

IV. Lunch - Information Sharing on Sustainable Forests Topics

Western Governors’ Association policy Resolution 10-08 (See http://www.westgov.org/index.php?option=com_wga&view=resolutions&Itemid=53)

David Morman spoke briefly on this resolution that focuses attention on the importance of all American forests and the need for developing a clear vision and policies to promote sustainability that delivers a full and integrated set of economic, environmental, and social values. The policy resolution recognizes the valuable contribution of efforts such as the national Roundtable on Sustainable Forests and declares the intention to propose recommendations for a common set of western states indicators and supports participation in efforts such as the national Roundtable.

Progress Report - Declarations of Cooperation for the Oregon Roundtable

Current signers: Board of Forestry, ODF, and OSU College of Forestry.

Pending: PSU, PNW Research Station, USFS Region 6, BLM, and DEQ, others?

OFRI/ODF Values and Beliefs Survey Results

The reports and supporting documentation from the telephone surveys and focus groups conducted in the Spring of 2010 are now available online at: http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/ofri2010study.shtml. This information was presented to the Oregon Forest Resources Institute Board in June and will be presented to the Board of Forestry on September 8.
2011 Forestry Program for Oregon public comment process
The Board of Forestry will consider approval of a public review draft of the 2011 Forestry Program for Oregon at its September 8 meeting. A 90-day public comment is planned followed by final adoption of the new Forestry Program for Oregon in the Spring of 2011. The proposed public review draft will be posted along with other September meeting materials on the Board’s website in late August (See http://www.oregon.gov/ODF/BOARD/BOARD_INFO/2010_meeting_schedule.shtml).

Masters of Natural Resources Program at OSU
Dr. Badge Bishaw informed the Roundtable that final approval is pending on this new online degree program at OSU.

OFRI August 27th federal forestlands field tour
Paul Barnum stated that all Roundtable participants are welcome and encouraged to attend. The tour, based in Bend, will focus on “Federal Forestland Health and Restoration.”

V. Next Steps
- The Leadership Group will have a conference call to debrief on the July 21st Roundtable meeting.
- Staff will draft a meeting summary for Leadership Group review and approval. The summary will then be distributed to all participants.
- Staff will take the comments from today’s meeting and revise the Indicator C.a. and D.a. draft reports for Leadership Group approval. The reports will then be posted online.
- All the participants at today’s meeting are encouraged to complete the online survey with the nine questions for Indicators E.a. and G.a. Survey responses must be submitted by 5:00 p.m. on Wednesday, July 28th.
- Staff will draft preliminary E.a. and G.a. 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.
- Staff will complete the staff report (including assignment of the ratings) for Indicator A.c.: Compliance with forestry regulations. This indicator will be evaluated by the Roundtable at a future meeting.
- Staff will provide an Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management status report at the September 8 Board of Forestry meeting. In addition to a summary of the overall status of indicator implementation and reporting, the presentation will provide a first report on Indicator A.c.: Compliance with forestry regulations, with staff evaluations, and also provide the Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forests initial evaluations of Indicator C.a.: Area of non-federal forestland and development trends and D.a.: Water quality in forest streams. No specific Board actions or decisions will be requested on this topic at the September meeting. This agenda item will be posted along with other September meeting materials on the Board’s website in late August (See

- A list or graphic depicting all the indicators will be posted at future meetings. The purpose of this will be to help keep Roundtable discussions more focused on the indicator(s) being discussed at each meeting and to help relate each indicator to the other indicators.
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