



**SCOPING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF RIPARIAN PROTECTION STANDARDS
IN EASTERN OREGON AND THE SISKIYOU GEOGRAPHIC REGION**

CHARTER WORK PLAN

DECEMBER 30, 2016

REQUESTOR	SPONSOR(S)	PROJECT MANAGER	START DATE	END DATE
Oregon Department of Forestry	Kyle Abraham	Daniel Olson	November 2016	July 2017

BACKGROUND

The Forest Practices Act (FPA) is the primary set of regulations governing forestry-related activities on non-federal in Oregon. The FPA includes standards that are designed to ensure forest operations protect the functions of riparian areas, while also meeting state water quality standards.

The Oregon Board of Forestry (Board) supports a science-based, adaptive FPA as a foundation for resource protection. As a result, the FPA has been revised from time to time when monitoring and research information informed decisions to alter protection standards. For example in 1994, protections for streams, lakes and wetlands were increased by expanding riparian management areas and changing how resources were classified for protection. Conversely, the Board directed the Oregon Department of Forestry (Department) to craft rules lessening protection standards for Bald Eagles in some instances as the result of the review of protection standards and available monitoring and research in July 2016.

More recently, the Riparian Function and Stream Temperature (RipStream) study conducted by the Oregon Department of Forestry (Department) found FPA standards were not adequately protecting water temperature of small and medium fish-bearing streams following timber harvest in Western Oregon. This finding prompted the Board to increase the width and stocking rate of riparian management areas in the Coast Range, South Coast, Interior, and Western Cascade geographic regions. The Board, however, did not increase protections in Eastern Oregon or the Siskiyou geographic region because the areas were considered outside both the scope of inference for the study, and other research and monitoring information collected.

Even though the Board did not to include Eastern Oregon and the Siskiyou geographic region in the most recent rule change, the results of the RipStream study caused the Board to want to initiate a review of the effectiveness of riparian protections in those areas. Key Board conversations with the Private Forests Division on this topic can be found in relation to Board Workplan or Monitoring Strategy topics in the March 2016 and April 2016 meeting notes. Consequently in November of 2016, the Board directed the Department to begin work with stakeholders to develop a list of monitoring questions related to riparian protections in those areas and to scope analyses for answering the questions. The Board also directed the Department to complete this work in preparation for the Board's July 2017 meeting.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

The Board has directed the Department to initiate a review of FPA riparian standards in the Eastern Cascade, Blue Mountains, and Siskiyou geographic regions.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Based on Board direction, the Private Forests monitoring unit will work with stakeholders to refine a list of monitoring questions related to the effectiveness of FPA riparian protection standards in Eastern Oregon and the Siskiyou geographic region. The project will also scope potential analyses that could be used to answer those questions, and inventory the amount of information available to inform the analyses. Finally, a GIS analysis will be conducted to describe the ownership patterns by stream size and type in the different geographic regions, including the salmon, steelhead and bulltrout (SSBT) type that will become part of rule in 2017.

OBJECTIVES & SUCCESS CRITERIA

Objectives	Success Criteria	How Measured
Fulfill Forestry Program for Oregon Objective A.3: Incorporate adaptive forest management, monitoring assessments, systematic evidence reviews, and research into learning, planning and decision making processes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify monitoring question(s) for assessment • Provide a range of options to assess the question (literature or systematic review, conduct field monitoring, etc.) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board decides on monitoring question(s) for the Department to assess • Board directs the Department to use one or more proposed options to answer monitoring question(s)
Fulfill expectations of monitoring riparian protection standards in administrative rule OAR 629-635-0110	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase the confidence of the public, stakeholders, and other state and federal agencies in the rule evaluation process by promoting transparency and active stakeholder engagement. • Conduct work in cooperation with state and federal agencies, landowners, and other interested parties. • Assess monitoring needs and adequate resources to conduct monitoring with cooperators 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder list and outreach efforts include a wide range of public perspectives including state and federal agencies, landowners, conservation community and tribes. • Questions and analysis scoping provided to the Board reflect a diverse range of public perspectives. • The Board is presented with a range of monitoring questions or needs and implementation options and directs the Department to resource and conduct monitoring in partnership with cooperators

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Present monitoring questions and analysis scoping for the Board's consideration. 	
Begin implementing 2016 Monitoring Strategy	Develop effectiveness monitoring question(s) that are clearly linked to 2016 Monitoring Strategy	Board decides on monitoring question(s) for the Department to assess that is linked to questions from the 2016 Monitoring Strategy

PROJECT SCOPE	
In Scope (Will be Included)	Out of Scope (Will not be Included)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectiveness of FPA riparian protection standards (OAR 629, Divisions 635, 642) • The Eastern Cascade, Blue Mountains, and Siskiyou geographic regions • Non-federal and Non-tribal lands (e.g., private, State Forests, county, non-profit) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Implementation of FPA standards • Implementing monitoring of questions • Effectiveness of non-riparian FPA standards (e.g., roads, stream crossings, HLHL, slash) • The Coast Range, South Coast, Interior and Western Cascade geographic regions

ASSUMPTIONS & CONSTRAINTS	
Assumptions (Key Bets)	Constraints (Limiting Factors)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Board will rapidly agree upon one or more monitoring questions regarding riparian protections. • Current staffing and resource levels will be maintained 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Short timeframe to complete work • Work assignments do not exceed current staff capacity and resources

STAKEHOLDERS (DETAILED INFORMATION AVAILABLE UPON REQUEST)

Interested Parties	Why Interested
<p>Landowners</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee for Family Forestlands (CFF) • Oregon Forest Industries Council (OFIC) • Oregon Small Woodlands Association (OSWA) • East Oregon Forest Protective Association • SOA and EOA Regional Forest Practices Committees (RFPC) • Oregon Cattlemen’s Association (OCA) • Companies with significant holdings in the regions • Individual Landowners and Operators • Ritter Land Management Team • Blue Mountain Forest Partners 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have to implement findings • May be affected operationally and financially by findings
<p>Conservation Community</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Stream Protection Coalition (OSPC) • Rogue Riverkeeper • The Nature Conservancy • Oregon Council Trout Unlimited • Friends of Greensprings • Deschutes River Conservancy • Wild Salmon Center • Freshwater Trust • Ecotrust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General environmental concerns • Water quality concerns • Fish and wildlife habitat concerns
<p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Blue Mountains Forest Partners • 	
<p>Oregon Department of Forestry</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field staff • State Forests Division 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Play a role in monitoring design • Recipients of customer comments and concerns • Knowledge of local stakeholders to include • May have to implement findings
<p>Operators</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Associated Oregon Loggers (AOL) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • May have to implement findings • May be affected operationally and financially by findings

<p>Tribes of Oregon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation, Oregon • Klamath Tribes, Oregon • Burns Paiute Tribe of the Burns Paiute Indian Colony of Oregon • Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon • Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon • Confederated Tribes of the Siletz Reservation, Oregon • Cow Creek Band of Umpqua Indians of Oregon • Confederated Tribes of the Coos, Lower Umpqua and Siuslaw Indians of Oregon • Coquille Tribe of Oregon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality concerns • Fish and wildlife habitat concerns • Cultural ties to natural resources
<p>Partner Agencies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife • Oregon Department of Environmental Quality • Environmental Protection Agency • USDA Forest Service • Bureau of Land Management • Oregon State University • City of Bend Water District • City of The Dalles • Hood River County 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource protection goals & regulations • May participate in monitoring
<p>RELATED PROJECTS</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RipStream study • Riparian rule analysis • Department's 2016 monitoring strategy 	

PRIORITY ASSESSMENT					
Level of Importance:	Scope	Time	Cost	Quality	Risk
Highest	X	X		X	
Medium					
Lowest			X		X

PROJECT TEAM		
Resource Name	Role	Responsibilities
Kyle Abraham	Division Sponsor	Project oversight, communications to executive staff
Daniel Olson	Project Manager	Project planning & management, communications & outreach
Marganne Allen, Terry Frueh	Project Oversight	Support Project Manager, communications & outreach as needed
John Hawksworth, Jon Laine	Project Support	Provide technical support & review of process

PLAN		
Task	Date	Milestone / Deliverable
Assemble a list of stakeholders & develop interview packet materials	11/8/2016 - 12/31/2016	List of stakeholders & interview packets
Interview Board members	12/1/2016 - 1/31/2016	Summary of Board input
Develop outline for GIS analysis	12/1/2016 - 12/21/2016	GIS analysis outline
Compile layers for GIS analysis	12/15/2016 - 1/31/2016	GIS analysis layers
Meet with stakeholders	1/1/2017 - 2/28/2017	Summary of stakeholder input
Refine monitoring questions	1/1/2017 - 3/15/2017	Complete list of refined questions
Evaluate availability of information related to monitoring questions	1/1/2017 - 4/1/2017	Table summarizing the availability of information
Summarize data for GIS analysis	2/1/2016 - 3/15/2016	Summary of GIS data
Scope methods for answering monitoring questions	2/1/2017 - 4/23/2017	Summary of proposed methods for answering monitoring questions
Compile draft of Board materials	4/23/2017 - 5/24/2017	Draft of Board materials complete
Review Board materials	5/24/2017	Materials delivered to Program Manager
Review Board materials	6/7/2017	Materials delivered to Division Chief
Present completed work to BOF	7/19/2017	Project complete
Notes/Comments on Plan:		

GROUP DECISION MAKING PROCESS

Project Manager (Olson) will make day-to-day decisions with input from support staff. Problem/question resolution, Board/committee preparation in coordination with Marganne Allen and Terry Frueh. Problem/question on Board/committee preparation with Kyle Abraham and Lena Tucker.

