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### Relationship of FMP → IP → AOP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Management Plans</th>
<th>Implementation Plans</th>
<th>Annual Operations Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tactical Plan</strong></td>
<td><strong>Operational Plan</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Adopted as Administrative Rule - Equals GPV | • Achieves goals of FMP  
• District Specific  
• Mid Range Plan | • Achieves IP Objectives  
• District Specific  
• Fiscal Year Plan |
| Contains                | Contains             | Contains               |
| • Guiding Principles    | • District overview of key resources and land ownership  
• Goals                  | • Management opportunities  
• Strategies             | • Average annual harvest objective  
• Guidelines for IPs, Asset Management, etc. | • Current forest structure  
• Implementation levels   | • Desired future forest condition  
|                          |                      | • Description of harvest operations and forest projects  
|                          |                      | • Timber Sales  
|                          |                      | • Habitat Improvements  
|                          |                      | • Young Stand Mgmt.  
|                          |                      | • Recreation  
|                          |                      | • Road Mgmt. Projects  
|                          |                      | • Monitoring/Research  

Adopted by BOF

Approved by State Forester

Approved by District Forester
## Relationship of FMP → IP → AOP

**Example:** Complex Forest Conditions and Harvest Levels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Management Plans</th>
<th>Implementation Plans</th>
<th>Annual Operations Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adopted by BOF</td>
<td>Approved by State Forester</td>
<td>Approved by District Forester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Strategic Plan
- Achieves GPV

**Examples:**
- Establishes long term goal for desired future condition 30-50%
- Retains all existing old growth, and existing OFS where mapped in Implementation Plans
- Active management framework

### Tactical Plan
- Achieves goals of FMP

**Examples**:
- Mapped landscape design for complex forest development currently 30 – 45%
- Landscape design created collaboratively with resource specialists
- Establishes average annual harvest objective

### Operational Plan
- Achieves IP Objectives

**Examples**:
- Harvest prescriptions aligned with mapped Desired Future Condition
- Achieves average annual harvest objective
Overview:

– AOP development is a multi-year collaborative process
– Aligned with District Implementation Plans and Forest Management Plans
– Results in fiscal year plans for:
  • Harvest operations
  • Road projects
  • Young stand silviculture
  • Aquatic habitat enhancement
  • Recreation projects
  • County/Common School Fund revenues
Initial Scoping:

– 1 to 3 years prior to AOP year
– District staff and resource specialists identify timber sale candidate pool, identify trade-offs, and select candidates to move forward
– Threatened and endangered species surveys scheduled where required
– Forest projects for recreation, roads, environmental enhancements and young stand silviculture considered
State Forests AOP Process:

Internal Review:

– Occurs in the summer/fall prior to AOP year
– Office/field reviews by district staff and resource specialist conducted (GeoTech, Aquatics Specialists, Wildlife Biologists, Division Engineer, etc.)
– Preliminary preoperations reports are prepared that incorporate input from district staff and resource specialists
External Review:

- Occurs in the fall/winter prior to AOP year
- AOPs are reviewed by resource specialists from multiple agencies who give feedback specific to their areas of expertise:
  - ODFW Wildlife and Fish Biologists
  - ODOT Archaeologists - cultural/historic resource review
  - OPRD - Scenic Waterways
  - USFWS - T&E information sharing
  - Government to government engagement with Oregon’s nine federally recognized tribes
State Forests
Annual Operations Planning Process

Public Engagement:

– Ongoing process prior to AOP year
– Two AOP informational sessions were held in February (Astoria and Salem)
– 45-Day Public Comment Period (March – May)
– Web map tool for the public to view sale locations and detailed pre-operations reports
– State Forests Advisory Committee review and feedback
– District engagement with local governments and neighbors
AOP Finalization and Approval:

– District Foresters and staff consider public comments and make final refinements to AOPs

– AOPs approved by District Foresters prior to June 30

– Specialist consultation continues as needed during sale layout
Questions on State Forests Annual Operations Planning Process
FY2021 Annual Operations Plan
Public Comment Themes

- Recreation
- Pesticide Use
- Climate Change & Carbon
- Roads
- Slopes and Aquatics
- Targets & Performance Measures
- Timber Harvest
Recreation Comments

- Majority of comments voiced support for plans to develop trailheads at a downhill mountain biking trail area and the Wilson River Trail in the Tillamook State Forest
- Others requested increased services including hiking trails, horseback riding, mountain biking, or OHV opportunities
- A few related to maintaining public access and reducing number of gates
Pesticide Use Comments

• Requests to:
  – Reduce/eliminate use of pesticides
  – Reduce/eliminate aerial applications
  – Increase communication with public about pesticide use
Climate Change/Carbon Comments

- Concerns:
  - Planned activities will reduce carbon sequestration
  - Make landscapes more vulnerable to wildfires and climate change
Roads Comments

• Concerns:
  – Building too many new roads and requests to close more existing roads
  – Hydrologic connectivity of roads to streams
  – Investment levels in road maintenance
Streams and Steep Slopes Comments

- Concerns:
  - Planned timber sales on steep slopes near streams
  - All Geotechnical reviews not finalized prior to AOP public comment period
• Concerns:
  – Plans focus on revenue
  – Lack targets for other forest values
Timber Harvest Comments

- Concern about clearcutting layered stands/older stands
- Requests to increase harvest/not harvesting growth
- Support for harvesting to generate revenue to rural communities and provide timber related Jobs
- Concern about harvest sustainability
Questions on FY2021 Public Comments and Responses
Draft FY2021 AOP
Modified Clearcut Harvest by Age Class
Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests

Modified Clearcut = 0.9% of Total Acres
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Clatsop and Tillamook Age Distribution Comparison 2003 to 2017
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Astoria Age Graph Comparison 2003 to 2017
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Forest Grove Age Comparison 2003 to 2017
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Tillamook Age Graph Comparison 2003 to 2017
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