

A Forestry Program for Oregon:

Forest Management & Sustainability Issues

Focus Group Discussions

A Qualitative Research Project
June, 2001

Prepared for:
Oregon Department of Forestry

Prepared by:

Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig INC.
OPINION RESEARCH & STRATEGIC COMMUNICATION

1100 NW Glisan, Suite 300-B, Portland, OR 97209 ■ Phone 503-220-0575, Fax 503-220-0576 ■ E-Mail DHM@DHM-INC.COM

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
I. INTRODUCTION.....	4
A. Research Methodology.....	4
B. Statement of Limitations.....	5
C. Report Format.....	5
II. FOREST CONCERNS AND IMAGERY.....	6
A. Identified Concerns.....	6
B. Imagery Associated with Forests and Forest Management.....	7
III. SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY.....	9
A. General Imagery.....	9
B. Proofs of Sustainability.....	10
C. Sustainability Criteria.....	10
D. Sustainability Description.....	12
IV. LOCAL ISSUES.....	13
A. Unaided Local Issues Awareness.....	13
B. Aided Local Issues Awareness.....	13
C. Local Issues Discussion.....	14
V. THE FOREST'S FUTURE.....	16
VI. ADVICE FOR BOARD OF FORESTRY.....	18
VIII. OBSERVATIONS & CONCLUSION.....	19
A. Sustainable Forestry Generally.....	19
B. Criteria for Forest Sustainability/Language and Regional Differences.....	19
C. Communications Strategy.....	20
APPENDIX A.....	22
APPENDIX B.....	23
APPENDIX C.....	30
APPENDIX D.....	36
APPENDIX E.....	45
APPENDIX F.....	48
APPENDIX G.....	51
APPENDIX H.....	56

Overview

This report is phase two of a larger study to assist the Oregon Board of Forestry with its strategic planning process – *The Forestry Program for Oregon* – that will frame policy initiatives and guide the Oregon Department of Forestry, the forest community, and the public as they seek to attain the goal of sustainable forest management. The report presents noteworthy findings, including regional differences, from six focus group discussions held throughout Oregon. The focus group findings build on the phase one literature review of public opinion and provide guidance for the phase three statewide survey.

Forest Concerns and Imagery

Forest management, the environment, public use of and access to forests, balance between harvesting and conservation, and economic activity and jobs were the most important broad categories of concerns participants had about forests and forest management. Personal experiences were crucial to participants' positive feelings about the forest. The timber industry's importance to the economy, while important to all groups, was not emphasized as much as concerns about reforestation, clear cuts, old growth, and the impact of forest fires.

Sustainable Forestry

Common associations group participants made with the term sustainable forestry were “forests that remain the same,” “ability to harvest but also keep a healthy forest,” “intelligent management,” “replanting,” “sustain wildlife,” and “productive.” Participants thought forest managers should be accountable to the public for the impact of sustainable forestry practices and expected verifiable evidence of forests with diverse ages and species of trees and healthy wildlife populations.

Participant understanding of four sustainability criteria (biological diversity, ecosystem health, productive capacity, and carbon cycles) was limited. They liked the image of sustainability as a three-legged stool balancing economic, environmental, and social demands. Views differed toward which leg the stool was tipped.

Local Issues

Each group identified local forest management issues they had recently read or heard about in their area. Responses varied by group with mentions including tree sitting and mill closures in Eugene, controlled burns and fees in Redmond,

Boise Cascade in La Grande, salmon and forest fires in Portland, mill closures and poor forest management in Coos Bay, and environmental activists in Medford. There were considerable differences among the groups in their awareness of a preselected list of local issues. Participants across all groups relied mostly on television news and local newspapers for information. Word of mouth was an important source in Redmond, La Grande, and Coos Bay.

In discussing local issues, clear cutting and replanting were consistent topics in every group. Reactions were generally negative about clear cutting, with emphasis on aesthetics and resulting erosion and landslides. There was a sense, though, that it was a necessary part of the forest industry. Replanting concerns included insufficient replanting, timing, thinning, and lack of tree species diversity. Participants placed great value on old growth forests. While jobs and related economic activity were consistent concerns, there seemed to be an acceptance that the industry would not return to past production levels.

The Forest's Future

Although three-quarters of all participants were somewhat to very optimistic about the future of Oregon's forests, they were cautious. They emphasized the importance of balance in forest management, with fears that either environmental or economic interests would prevail. Group discussion revealed concerns about limits to forest access, anger with environmental groups, and mistrust of public and private land forest managers. Participants also talked about the visual impacts of clear cutting, the need to protect old growth forest, and reforestation that did not result in tree farms or large stands of the same age or species.

Advice for Board of Forestry

Balance was the dominant theme when participants expressed the most important message they had for the Oregon Board of Forestry. There was an intuitive sense that an appropriate balance among economic, environmental, recreational, and aesthetic values is achievable. There also was an understanding of the complexities involved in forest management and the public's relationship to the forest, with mistrust that any single strategy could adequately address them. Participants expressed a deep attachment to Oregon's forests, and their stories about personal experiences elicited tangible, positive feelings.

Observations & Conclusions

Although the term "sustainable forestry" was a vague concept to many participants, they were better able to understand its dimensions and equate it with good forest health with additional information. The specific *language* of the Criteria for Forest Sustainability was often confusing and did not resonate with participants. However, many of the *concepts* underlying the criteria and their indicators were expressed frequently throughout the discussion.

Certain terms resonate with the public and others do not, in part because there have been two decades of public dialogue about the future of Oregon's forests. The job of communicating with the public is made all the more challenging by the complexity of the issues and general public skepticism about government.

A serious, disciplined communication effort will be necessary to convince the public of any substantive change in forest management practices. Talking with the public about the Criteria for Forest Sustainability could build on the imagery and terminology most compatible with how the public talks about sustainable forestry issues, or it could involve undertaking a comprehensive educational effort to convince the public to use the language of the criteria.

I. INTRODUCTION

Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig, Inc. (DHM) is pleased to present the results of research conducted for the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF). This report is part of a larger study to assist the Oregon Board of Forestry with its strategic planning process – *The Forestry Program for Oregon*. This process will frame policy initiatives and guide the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF), the forest community, and the public as they seek to attain the goal of sustainable forest management, using as a framework the Criteria for Forest Sustainability (CFS) as developed through the Montreal Process.

Phase one of the larger study was a literature review of public opinion about forests and forest management over the last fifteen years. The purpose of this research, which is phase two, was to learn more about current public attitudes toward forests, forest management and sustainability for Oregon forests through six regional focus groups. This research also will be important in developing questions for statewide survey research, which is phase three.

This report presents noteworthy outcomes from the research, which involved six focus group discussions throughout Oregon. Because this was a qualitative research study the information describes, rather than quantifies, the variety of views among focus group participants.

A. Research Methodology

Between May 19 and May 30, 2001, six focus group discussions were held in Eugene, Redmond, La Grande, Portland, Coos Bay and Medford. A total of 52 people participated.

Participants were randomly recruited from the areas in which the focus groups were held. They were recruited to represent a mix of age, gender, occupation, and education. Those who were very involved in political, social, economic, or environmental issues and those who were very interested in environmental, timber, land use, or growth issues were excluded from participating. Also excluded were those who themselves or whose close friends or relatives worked in the forest products industry, news media, market or public opinion research, or were members of any environmental or conservation group. Appendix A contains participant demographics.

The questions and stimulus materials used for the discussions were developed by DHM in consultation with ODF. The research was structured to determine the range of participants' attitudes toward Oregon's forests and forest management practices, with a particular focus on sustainable forestry.

Responses during the group discussions were recorded both orally and in writing. Responses to all written exercises are in Appendixes B – H.

B. Statement of Limitations

This study was designed to qualitatively explore the range of opinions of a designated population and to gain insight into what underlies these attitudes. It was not in the scope of a study of this kind to quantitatively measure with statistical reliability the attitudes of the populations from which the samples were drawn, or to correlate any attitudes with demographic or behavioral variables. However, in addition to gathering qualitative information to supplement and possibly help validate other primary and secondary research, the information reported below is the result of multiple discussions and group-to-group validation which makes the information helpful in establishing quantitative boundaries for the attitudes expressed by participants.

C. Report Format

Each of the following sections reviews a different major topic that was taken up during the group discussions. Quotations are set out first (indicating from which group the quote came), followed by evaluative commentary based on the oral and written comments. Where applicable, differences between the various groups are noted.

The quotes and summary bullets are drawn from both the oral comments and the written exercises. The quotations were selected to represent the range of opinions regarding a topic, and not to represent quantitatively the expressed attitudes. Readers should refer to the appendixes for specific wording of the written exercises.

II. FOREST CONCERNS AND IMAGERY

“This is a logging community that’s shut down. The best paying job now is a firefighter to save the trees.” La Grande

“I enjoy seeing beautiful landscapes. I think that forest management should take that into consideration when I am driving anywhere.” Eugene

“People are too concerned about keeping forests healthy – they do not need our help, they have survived without our help for years and years.” Portland

“We are surrounded by nature. We have a different lifestyle of living than in the bigger cities.” Coos Bay

“I am concerned about the amount of cuts that our forests can sustain—can we continue at current rates.” Portland

“We need to protect our forests. They are not only beautiful to look at but it was something that was given to us that we need to take care of. The balance is figuring out how to harvest the trees and keep the animals and forest safe.” Redmond

A. Identified Concerns

At the beginning of the discussion, participants were asked to record what concerns came to mind when they thought about forests and forest management (Appendix B). They recorded numerous concerns, which were grouped in Appendix B both by frequency of mention of similar concerns and by frequency of mention in broader groupings of similar concerns.

The following table represents the broader groupings which had the most mentions, based on the best understanding of the intent of the participant:

Frequency of Mention by Groupings of Similar Concerns							
Concerns	Total	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Forest Management	44	3	3	14	5	12	7
Environment	38	5	4	5	9	6	9
Public Use/Access	32	0	6	12	8	2	4
Balance Between Harvesting & Conservation	26	4	6	0	4	9	3
Economic Activity	21	4	2	3	4	2	6
Forest Fires	18	5	7	10	5	1	6
Clear Cutting	16	3	2	4	2	1	4
Reforestation	16	2	1	5	3	2	3
Forest Health	6	0	2	2	2	0	0
Aesthetics/Forest Ambiance	4	-	3	-	-	1	-

Source: Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig, Inc. June 2001

The most prominent concern in total was forest management. Some of the specific concerns grouped in that category included forest management generally, poor cooperation between agencies, poor communication with the public, forest land

ownership, and marginal forest land. Participants in La Grande and Coos Bay had many more mentions in this broad category than did participants in other communities.

Although grouped separately, clear cutting and reforestation also relate to forest management. There was fairly even mention of these two concerns across all groups.

The environment was the second most frequently mentioned category. Included were issues like wildlife habitat, watershed protection, erosion, and the forest ecosystem. Portland and Medford had the most mentions, with the other groups nearly equal in number of mentions.

Public use of and access to the forests was the third highest grouping of concerns. This category included roads providing access, recreational uses, fees and permits, and public misuse and overuse. La Grande participants were most concerned about access, followed by Portland and Redmond.

Balance between harvesting and conservation, the next highest grouping, included preservation of old growth, ensuring forests for future generations, and concerns about conservation and excessive harvest. None of the La Grande participants recorded concerns related to balance, while Coos Bay participants had the most comments.

Economic activity and jobs was next, with similar mentions across all groups, following by clear cutting, forest fires/fire prevention, reforestation, and forest health. None of the Eugene, Coos Bay, or Medford residents recorded concerns about forest health.

B. Imagery Associated with Forests and Forest Management

During the discussions, every group expressed a deep intuitive attachment to the forest. Their attachment was based on aesthetics and access—that the forest exists and offers the opportunity for viewing, recreation and, to a lesser extent, economic use.

Their personal experiences (whether a hike to the peak of South Sister or a view from their backyard deck) were crucial to their positive feelings about the forest. Many also said personal experience created negative feelings about things like clear cuts, where the impact was so visual.

There were a variety of images of forest management. While most focused on jobs and economic values initially, there was consistent lively discussion about reforestation, clear cuts, old growth, and the impact of forest fires. Few participants included recreational uses in their definition of management practices.

Participants in more rural areas (La Grande, Medford, Coos Bay and Redmond) closely connected the economic value of the forests with the “small town” values that defined positive perceptions of their own communities. As a La Grande participant remarked: “It’s a completely different way of life here because of the beauty.”

Participants across all groups felt the timber industry was important to the economy, with participants in La Grande and Coos Bay specifically focusing on the *local* economy. In group discussions, however, the emphasis on jobs was not as great as other concerns such as clear-cutting and old growth. This was so, even in the more forest dependent communities.

There was significant confusion about where responsibility lay for reforestation. Many participants were not clear about ODF's jurisdiction over forest management practices on private land. For many, "Oregon forestland" was understood to be public land.

Clear distinctions (and value judgments) were made between large forest products companies and small landowners. There was a general sense that small private landowners were more responsible in their forest management than industrial users, and should be subject to less government restrictions.

Protection of salmon and salmon habitat was not as primary a motivator for improved forest management practices as was the value placed on clean water's importance to wildlife generally, recreation, and drinking water. While there was acknowledgement that salmon habitat protection was important, the recognition for many was only upon being prompted and was often tempered with a sense of obligation that they should acknowledge its importance, except in the Portland group.

Tourism was seen as having both good and bad elements. There was pride that visitors come to see Oregon's forests, but it was counterbalanced by other impacts. Tourism was blamed by some for the fees and restrictions placed on Oregonians' access to public and private lands, as well as a concern that they are an additional stress on the forests ("Tourists don't take care of something that isn't theirs." Portland). A few doubted the potential of forests for tourism ("We are too far away to be too hopeful. They come here for beaches, not forests." Coos Bay).

III. SUSTAINABLE FORESTRY

A. General Imagery

“The natural environment works like a machine. If it is strong enough it should be able to clean out whatever happens. We take care of the environment and it takes care of us.” Eugene

“A healthy forest that is able to support wildlife and our logging demands.” Portland

“Timber that’s out there that’s still logged and still a healthy forest, and not an eyesore.” Redmond

“Humans are involved. There’s a balance there; a healthy, living entity where it hasn’t been messed with too much.” Medford

“Keeping a forest that makes money and keeps the public happy and a balanced ecosystem”. Coos Bay

Participants in all groups made numerous associations with the term “sustainable forestry” (Appendix E). Some of the most common associations were “forests that remain the same,” “ability to harvest but also keep a healthy forest,” “intelligent management,” “replanting,” “sustain wildlife,” and “productive.”

Many felt it had to do with keeping the forest “like it always has been” (La Grande). A significant portion (although a minority) focused on the productive capacity of the forest, feeling a sustainable forest would assure adequate harvest over time.

There was not a natural inclination to equate a sustainable forest with a healthy forest, although many included forest health in their recorded associations. There was general recognition that “sustainable” would encompass multiple uses but be more balanced than current management practices. Some likened it to “a farmer who rotates his crops” (Medford).

For some, the notion of a sustainable forest prompted discussion of the need to physically separate different uses of the forest. This was related to their concern with other management practices (clear cutting, inadequate reforestation). As a Coos Bay participant said, there should be a “reproducing money-making forest...and a wild forest.”

One theme that emerged unaided throughout the project was a belief that sustainable forestry entailed a long-term perspective. This was articulated most clearly in the repeated call for forests that contained a variety of ages and species of trees.

There was some suspicion about forest managers. Negative perceptions of some of the management practices noted above have left a residue of mistrust about both the appropriateness of certain practices and the full disclosure to the public of the impacts. This suspicion is focused on both public agencies and large corporations. The same misgivings were not extended to small landowners.

B. Proofs of Sustainability

“Reporting back to us about what is actually going on.” La Grande

“How they (forests) look to the public.” Eugene

“People overseeing these forests have to win my trust. And I don’t know how they are going to do that.” Portland

“Accountability to laws.” Redmond

“A forest with different stages of growth.” Coos Bay

“A forest that will last many generations with healthy levels of animals and wildlife.”
Portland

Participants were asked to record what *specific* proofs they would require to believe that sustainable forestry was being practiced (Appendix F). Terms like “show me,” “replanting,” “selective logging,” “healthy trees and wildlife,” and “different ages of forest” were used often.

Many participants wanted “unbiased” reporting and verification to ensure accountability.

Moving beyond a rhetoric of sustainability and balance was crucial to participants’ support. The opposition to some current practices (clear cutting and inadequate reforestation particularly) seemed to lead to skepticism about the ability and willingness of public and private managers to actually change their forest management practices.

There was an insistence that forest managers be accountable to the public about the impact of sustainable forestry practices. Skepticism of their ability to change established a higher standard for both proof of different results and communication with the public about the impacts.

A demand for visual, tangible evidence was key. Participants wanted sustainable forestry to be different and, equally important, they wanted to see the difference. Particular emphasis was placed on visual evidence of forests with diverse ages and species of trees and healthy wildlife populations. Participants repeatedly commented on the need for reforestation practices that reflected a natural, less uniform landscape. A participant in Medford summed it up: “A tree farm is not a forest.”

C. Sustainability Criteria

Participants also were asked about their knowledge of four specific sustainability criteria. Generally, participants struggled for the correct meaning of any one of the criteria. Many attached their own meaning to these terms, although it was not necessarily accurate. With discussion and probing, their understanding of the terms like biological diversity and ecosystem health increased substantially.

1. BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

“The spectrum, from insects to trees to animals, the entire ecosystem.”

La Grande

“It’s all part of a system that needs all its parts.” Portland

“There is a strength when there is a lot of different species and levels that work together. It’s more resilient.” Coos Bay

“Variety, lots of different things. Animals, plants and trees.” Redmond

Biological diversity was often equated with good wildlife habitat, and was overwhelmingly viewed as a key feature of a natural forest. Some participants felt such things as clear cutting, the effect of landslides on water quality, and not replanting diverse tree species threatened biological diversity. For these participants, using the forests for only recreational purposes was the best way to protect it.

2. ECOSYSTEM HEALTH

“Look at the critters first.” Portland

“If we disturb the balance, we destroy that balance.” Medford

“How everything goes together.” Redmond

Ecosystem health was viewed as a complex puzzle of factors affecting the health of a particular place. Participants were cautious about the impact of any single factor (whether reforestation or the fate of a single species) on the interconnected balance.

3. PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY

“It’s all about money.” Eugene

“How much they can yield in a certain acreage.” Coos Bay

“Industry; feeding your families.” La Grande

“Planting the trees in a row that lets you get more in.” Medford

Participants struggled with a definition of this criterion. Once prompted, views were related directly to the economic uses of the forest, including timber production and harvesting of other forest products (e.g. mushrooms and Christmas trees).

4. CARBON CYCLES

“The growth rings on the trees.” Portland

“Dead trees.” Redmond

“They’re cutting too many of our trees and they don’t replant. It gets hotter and there’s less oxygen...we have to have trees to live.” La Grande

Generally, participants met this term with blank stares. It required significant coaching to elicit relevant responses. When “global warming” was added to the explanation, some participants were then able to define the term and to relate it to forests and forests. Most still did not easily understand the concept—and the added dimension made many skeptical of the implications for forest management.

D. Sustainability Description

Participants were asked to comment on the description of “sustainability” as a three-legged stool balancing economic, environmental, and social demands.

“Public is being pushed out. The environmentalist leg is the only leg on the stool.”
Redmond

“It is an excuse and a way to justify doing a particular practice everywhere instead of limiting it to a specific area.” Eugene

“Economic leg is missing. We don’t have it anymore.” La Grande

“Economic is clearly the short leg. And there is enough blame to go around for everyone.” Coos Bay

The image of a stool was attractive for its illustration of balance, although there was wide skepticism that an equal balance could be attained in any practical way.

Every group agreed that the stool was tipped. In Eugene and Portland, there was consensus that it was tipped in favor of economic values; Redmond, La Grande, Medford, and Coos Bay believed the environmental value was strongest (expressed in terms of the power of organized environmental groups rather than considerations of forest health).

IV. LOCAL ISSUES

“When you hit a clear cut it’s not a forest anymore.” Medford

“My daddy was a sawmill man, and he wouldn’t cut the old trees. He wanted them to stay there for the people to enjoy and the animals.” Eugene

“This is a logging community that’s shut down. The best paying job now is a firefighter to save the trees.” La Grande

“Every weekend we go out in the woods. We have seen less elk, less deer. Now if you see them you’re lucky.” Coos Bay

“Even ATV drivers want peace and quiet in the woods.” Redmond

A. Unaided Local Issues Awareness

About mid-way through the discussion, each group was asked to record, unaided, what they had recently read or heard about forests and forest management in their area (Appendix C). Although responses were unaided, they followed a discussion of a variety of forest management issues so there may have been some sensitization to the issues.

Eugene participants mentioned “tree sitters” and mill closures more than once. Other mentions included the Weyerhaeuser strike, salmon, and access fees. Among Redmond participants, controlled burns and fees had several mentions. La Grande participants, who earlier had recorded the largest number of forest concerns, had three mentions of Boise Cascade and no other local issues identified.

In Portland, half of the participants mentioned salmon and forest fires. There was more than one mention of spotted owl/endangered species, global warming, and Bull Run. Several Coos Bay participants mentioned mill closures, poor forest management, and setting aside land. Among Medford participants, two mentioned environmental activists (“forestry terrorism” and “tree huggers”), and other mentions included salmon habitat restoration, spotted owls not needing old growth, and the reversal of Clinton’s forest policies.

Most participants said their source of information for identifying these issues was television news and the newspaper, with a few mentioning radio. However, several also mentioned word of mouth and local and national magazines.

B. Aided Local Issues Awareness

After identifying local issues on their own, each group was given a preselected list of issues and asked if they had recently heard about them and, if so, the source and any comments they had (Appendix D).

In Eugene, all but one participant indicated they had heard about herbicides through local news sources and several said they had heard about landslides. Interestingly, neither of these issues was recorded during the unaided written exercise. For the rest of the selected issues – clear cutting, no harvesting on public lands, and federal management to achieve forest health goals – only one participant indicated they had heard of them.

The Redmond issues were fire problems, drought, insects and disease, forest management changes related to leveraged buyouts of forest industry companies, and access fees. All indicated they had heard about drought, and five out of seven had heard about fire and fees. Only two said they had heard about insects and disease and leveraged buyouts (examples were Crown Pacific and Willamette Industries). Redmond participants in the unaided exercise focused on controlled burns to express their concern about the drought and also had mentioned fees.

In La Grande, most participants had heard about the economic survival of the forest industry and threatened and endangered species. Few indicated they had heard about issues related to grazing and none had heard about the Governor's demonstration project.

All Portland participants had heard about forest management related to salmon protection, consistent with their unaided identification of issues. Most had heard recently about the drought related to forest management and around half had heard about access fees and Bull Run management issues. Only two indicated they had heard recently about clear cutting.

Local economic health and the economic health of the forest industry locally were familiar issues to nearly all Coos Bay participants. Concerns about mill closures and forest management were also raised during the unaided local issues exercise. Only three participants indicated they had heard about new forest management techniques.

Consistent with their own identification of issues, more than half of Medford participants said they had heard about private forest management versus extreme environmentalists. Only a handful had heard about the drop in federal timber sales and Soda Mountain National Monument's impact on forest management.

Participants across all groups relied primarily on television and local newspapers, and to a lesser extent radio, as their source of information. Word of mouth was an important source in Redmond, La Grande, and Coos Bay.

C. Local Issues Discussion

In the discussion following the written exercises regarding local issues awareness, clear cutting and replanting were consistent and lively topics in every group. Overall, reactions were uniformly negative about clear cutting; nearly all because of aesthetic concerns ("From a scenic highway, you don't need to look at a huge clear-cut. If you have to do it, why do it there?" La Grande). But, there was also a sense of resignation that clear cutting was a necessary part of the forest industry—just that it would be better if it could be better hidden from view.

Participant concerns about replanting related to insufficient replanting, timing of replanting, thinning, and lack of diversity in tree species.

Concern about landslides and erosion, resulting from clear cutting and other forest practices was mentioned in all groups, but more in Coos Bay, Eugene, and Redmond.

Participants placed great value on old growth forest. Across all groups old growth was viewed as an important part of the state's forest heritage. There was specific concern expressed about losing that resource. In Coos Bay and Medford, the imagery of Redwoods related to old growth was strong.

Jobs and related economic activity were also consistent concerns. Yet, the passionate resentment of earlier years was largely absent. There was an acceptance, and sense of resignation, that the wood products industry had changed and would not return to production levels of the past.

Personal experiences in the forest significantly informed perceptions of forest management. Regardless of the intensity of their use of the forest (whether hiking, hunting, or watching from their deck) participants had positive connections to the woods. As a Eugene participant noted, “People feel being in the forest is a restorative act.”

Forest fires, disease, and infestation were often mentioned in both written exercises and discussions. Fires and criticism of fire policies were especially active discussion topics in Redmond and La Grande, with special concern about fuel build-up and controlled burns.

V. THE FOREST'S FUTURE

“They do need to harvest. They do need to thin. And they do need to clean up their mess.” La Grande

“The government, the timber industry, the public and the conservationist groups are going to arrive at a method for working out these problems. We are just at the beginning of getting serious.” Medford

“Oregonians are very concerned about their state. We take great pride in the beauty around us (and) I think we can find a balance between economics and environment.” Portland

“We’re here doing this because someone is concerned so action is being taken.”
Coos Bay

Despite the competing demands on forest use, concerns with clear cutting, and uncertainty about the impact of sustainability, 39 of the 52 participants were somewhat to very optimistic about the future of Oregon’s forests. The following table shows how participants in the different groups recorded their level of optimism about the future of Oregon’s forests (Appendix G):

Looking ahead 25 years, how optimistic are you about the future of Oregon’s forests?

	Combined	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Very optimistic	12	1	1	2	2	3	3
Optimistic	2	1	-	-	-	1	-
Somewhat optimistic	25	3	4	5	3	5	5
Somewhat pessimistic	10	2	2	1	3	1	1
Pessimistic	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Very pessimistic	2	-	-	-	1	1	-

Source: Davis, Hibbitts & McCaig, Inc. June 2001

However, the feelings were not passionate. Only 12 of 52 participants rated themselves as “very optimistic” and nearly half were “somewhat optimistic.” Written comments emphasized the importance of balance in forest management, with fears that either environmental or economic interests would prevail. Those the most optimistic felt the forests were such an important part of the state the people “will not allow the forests to be trashed.” Some of the pessimists were concerned about the impact of population growth and lack of appreciation in urban areas for the forests. Only the Portland group expressed significant pessimism—most due to limited faith in government’s commitment to environmental needs.

The tone of the full discussions elicited more negative feelings. Participants were particularly animated on limits to forest access, anger with environmental groups, opposition to clear cuts, and mistrust of public and private land forest managers.

Participants also were negative about the visual impacts of clear cutting, the need for protecting old growth forest, and reforestation that did not result in tree farms or large stands of the same age or species. These concerns were all, on some level, aesthetic ones; but they were also, for participants, the warning signs of deeper troubles in forest health in the coming years.

VI. ADVICE FOR BOARD OF FORESTRY

“Do not take away our ability to live, work, and enjoy the forests.”

La Grande

“My main concern is that we find a balance... Good luck.” Eugene

“To serve Oregon, and her forests must be an honor. Do Oregon and her trees a justice, treat her with respect. Let her people work for her.” Coos Bay

“Harvest some, save some within the bounds of reasonable conservation of the entire ecosystem. No special interest group should outweigh the other.” Medford

“If we’re careful, we can cut trees, we can grow trees, leave the old growth, and.....there are (still) many jobs.” Redmond

“Is it coming to the point where we have to choose? Isn’t there a balance?” Portland

“A lot of people take a look at our area and say ‘Wow.’ We have this laid-back instead of fast-paced life-style. We are surrounded by nature and it gives us a different lifestyle of living than in the bigger cities.” Coos Bay

Oregonians love balance and this was the dominant theme when asked what was the one most important message they had for the Oregon Board of Forestry (Appendix H). In all the focus groups there was a conviction that we can have it all if everyone gives a little. Framed mostly in terms of the value of balance, it was not an explicit equation but an intuitive sense that an appropriate balance among economic, environmental, recreational and aesthetic values is achievable.

Aesthetic values, easy and free access, and more natural reforestation practices were key values. These values were equated with forest health, less industrialized use of the resource, and less polarized choices about the future.

People have deep attachments to Oregon’s forests. Their personal stories about the forest gave life to that attachment and influenced their perceptions. Throughout this project, participants’ stories – whether about hiking the Willows or driving a scenic highway – elicited tangible, positive feelings.

There was understanding of the complexities involved in forest management and the public’s relationship to the forest. There also was mistrust that there is a single strategy to adequately address the complexities. Many participants viewed sustainable forestry as an attempt to mount a simple answer to a complex challenge.

VIII. OBSERVATIONS & CONCLUSION

A. Sustainable Forestry Generally

The term “sustainable forestry” was a vague concept to many of the participants. However, with additional information participants were able to better understand its dimensions and equate it with positive attributes of forest health.

The example of the three-legged stool was a particularly helpful illustration of the principles of sustainable forestry. Although somewhat skeptical it could be achieved, the concept seemed very much in harmony with participants’ keen interest in balance.

B. Criteria for Forest Sustainability/Language and Regional Differences

The specific criterion *language* was often confusing and did not seem to resonate with participants. At best, the criterion language added modest value to participants’ understanding or support for sustainable practices. However, many of the *concepts* underlying the criteria and their indicators were expressed frequently throughout the discussions.

- *Criterion 1: Conservation of biological diversity.* Overall, participants related more to “wildlife habitat” than “biological diversity.” This finding was consistent with what was learned in the phase one literature review. Protecting wildlife habitat did not come up as strongly in La Grande and Redmond. Participants sometimes were more likely to mention specific species, like salmon in Portland, than endangered species generally. When asked about specific proofs for sustainability, several participants mentioned different “ages of forests in the same area” and diversity in animals and vegetation. That said, not all participants were aware of or agreed that different animals needed different types of forests to survive.
- *Criterion 2: Maintenance of productive capacity of forest ecosystems.* Reforestation was extremely important to focus group participants, although they were unsure about reforestation requirements. These findings were similar to what was found in the literature review. Some participants even felt there had been a recent de-emphasis on replanting trees. Concerns about clear cutting and setting aside old growth were topics that came up in all focus groups. Overall, participants either explicitly or implicitly wanted to ensure there would be forests for future generations and expressed support for sustainable timber production, citing balance, not overcutting, not losing forest land, and similar concepts.
- *Criterion 3: Maintenance of forest ecosystem health and vitality.* Forest health generally was not high on the list of participant concerns about forests and forest management. As discussed above, there was not always a natural inclination to connect forest health with sustainability. That said, there was some expressed concern about the forest ecosystem generally and about air quality, mostly related to controlled burns. Although most participants had concern about forest fires, there was not a link made to overall ecosystem health and vitality. Understandably, disease and insect infestations were of most interest to La Grande and Redmond participants.

- *Criterion 4: Conservation and maintenance of soil and water resources.* Terms like “watershed protection” and “watershed preservation” were used by several participants, most often in Portland and Medford. Concern about landslides and erosion, resulting from clear cutting and other forest practices, and the impact on water quality was mentioned in all groups, but more in Coos Bay, Eugene, and Redmond.
- *Criterion 5: Maintenance of forest contribution to global carbon cycles.* Similar to the findings in the literature review, participants had little awareness of the relationship between forests and carbon cycles. Although global warming was more familiar, participants generally did not associate sustainability with the indicators for this criterion.
- *Criterion 6: Maintenance and enhancement of long-term multiple socioeconomic benefits to meet the needs of society.* Many indicators for this broad-ranging criterion were touched on in participant comments. The most important and consistent across all groups was the strong relationship between forests and economic activity, usually described as jobs. Many aspects of forest recreation were mentioned, including specific activities like camping and hunting, access to the forest, and possible public misuse. La Grande and Redmond participants were particularly concerned about access fees. A number of participants articulated their deep love of the forest, including for some an apparent spiritual attachment to old growth.
- *Criterion 7: Legal, institutional, and economic framework for forest conservation and sustainable management.* Many participant concerns about forest management fit within this criterion, including concerns about poor communication with the public and poor cooperation between agencies. A few participants mentioned agency decisions about expenditures on equipment and managers. Some also mentioned laws they thought were too restrictive, while at the same time supporting reforestation and balance in forest management.

C. Communications Strategy

Public communications regarding forest sustainability generally and the CFS specifically needs to be viewed in the context of two decades of serious and often contentious public dialogue about the future of Oregon’s forests and serious public relations and educational efforts by the forest products industry. As a result, the public has become accustomed to thinking and talking about forest management issues in certain ways. This report talks a great deal about the different imagery and terminology with which the public seems to feel most comfortable.

We found both in the focus group research and the literature review that certain terms resonate with the public, and others do not. As noted above, the exact language of the criterion does not appear to be all that helpful given current understandings, but the concepts are relevant to people.

Further complicating the use of language are the complexity of the issues and general skepticism about government. This makes the job of communicating with the public all the more challenging. A serious, disciplined communication effort will be necessary to convince the public of any substantive reform of forest management practices.

The following are two approaches ODF could take to talking with the public about CFS:

1. Build on the imagery and terminology that seems most compatible with how the public talks about these sustainable forestry issues, emphasizing the concepts of the seven criterion and minimizing the exact wording of each.
2. Undertake a comprehensive, major educational effort to convince the public to use the language of the CFS.

In the area of communications, regional differences as more fully discussed throughout the report are important considerations. Also, word of mouth in smaller communities could supplement traditional media. The literature review also cites academic studies suggesting using local forums and new research and consensus building techniques to help implement sustainability and improve forest stewardship. These might be particularly useful tools in smaller communities where the connection to the forest is closer.

Demographics

Occupation		
Eugene	Redmond	La Grande
Optical, Makes Glasses	Homemaker	Field Representative
Mill Worker	Missionary	Retired—2
Retired	Bank Associate	Part Time Answer Service
Homemaker	Land Surveyor	Homemaker
Homemaker	Self-Emp. Legal & Info Services	Laborer at Travel Trailer
Groundskeeper	Mgr Oregon Water Resource	Railroad Engineer
Typesetter	X-ray Tech for Aero Space	Student—East Oregon U.
Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Homemaker	Retired – 2	Computer Instructor
Computer Engineer	Inventory Control	Pizza Place Cashier
Semi-retired—Car Transportation	Customer Service—Computer Co.	Environ. Improvement Tech.
Welder	Craft Store	Bookkeeper
Retired	Registered Nurse	Disabled Veteran
Waiter	Crane Operator	Insurance Sales
Teacher	Self-Employed Retail	IRS Monitor
Medical Insurance Billing	Full Time Student	Alarm Installer
Caregiver	Part Time Caregiver	Training Services Coord.—RCC
Retired/Piano Teacher	Full Time Student	

4-Year Degree						
	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Yes	1	3	1	4	2	3
No	6	4	7	6	9	6

Gender						
	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Male	3	3	3	4	4	4
Female	4	4	5	6	7	5

Age						
	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
18-34	1	2	3	3	3	1
35-44	3	2	2	2	4	3
45-64	1	2	1	3	3	4
65+	2	1	1	2	1	1
Blank	-	-	1	-	-	-

Written Exercise

Thinking of forests and forest management in Oregon, what concerns come to mind.

Frequency of Mention in Written Exercises of Similar Concerns							
Concerns	Total	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Jobs/Economic Activity	17	4	1	3	3	2	4
Clear-cutting	16	3	2	4	2	1	4
Forest Fires/Fire Prevention	14	2	4	5	2	-	1
Reforestation/Replanting	14	2	1	4	3	1	3
Old Growth/Preservation	10	2	3	-	2	3	-
Access/Roads	9	-	2	4	3	-	-
Poor Forest Management/Cooperation Between Agencies	9	-	-	3	-	4	2
Forest Management	8	2	1	-	3	-	2
Habitat/Wildlife Habitat	8	1	1	2	2	1	1
Balance Between Harvesting & Conservation	7	-	2	-	1	1	3
Recreation	7	-	-	3	2	1	1
Water	7	-	1	-	3	1	2
Fees/Permits	6	-	3	2	1	-	-
Land Ownership	6	-	-	3	-	3	-
Erosion	5	-	-	1	1	2	1
Controlled/Prescribed Burns	4	-	1	1	1	-	1
Disease/Insects	4	-	2	1	1	-	-
Forests for Future Generations	4	2	-	-	1	1	-
Housing/Marginal Forest Land	4	-	-	2	1	1	-
Roads	4	1	1	2	-	-	-
Lumber Exports	4	-	1	-	1	-	2
Environmental Extremists	3	1	-	1	1	-	-
Hunting	3	-	1	2	-	-	-
Loss of Forest Land	3	-	1	-	-	2	-
Public & Forest Management Worker Safety/Cost	3	-	-	1	1	1	-
Too Much Money Spent on Equipment & Managers	3	-	1	2	-	-	-
Aesthetics	2	-	1	-	-	1	-
Air Quality—Controlled Burns	2	-	-	-	1	-	1
Cattle Grazing	2	-	1	-	1	-	-
Communication Between Public & Forest Managers	2	-	-	1	-	1	-
Endangered Species	2	1	1	-	-	-	-
Environment Generally	2	1	-	-	-	1	-
Forest Health	2	-	-	1	1	-	-
Too Restrictive	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
Types of Trees	2	-	-	1	-	1	-
Overuse of Wilderness Areas	2	-	-	1	-	-	1
Peace & Tranquility	2	-	2	-	-	-	-
Natural Forest Cycle	2	1	-	-	1	-	-
Misuse of Forests by Public	2	-	-	-	2	-	-

Frequency of Mention in Written Exercises of Similar Concerns (continued)							
Concerns	Total	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Changing Job & Home Location Styles—New Management Ideas Needed	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Conservation Generally	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Current Volcanic Activity	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Environmentalists ("tree-huggers")	1	-	1	-	-	-	-
Excessive & Improper Harvest	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Forest Ecosystem	1	-	-	1	-	-	-
Increasing Population in Oregon	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Indirect Impact of Logging	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Laws Restricting Timely Harvest & Reforestation	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Animal Attacks	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Balancing Energy & Environment	1	-	-	-	1	-	-
Best Usage of Materials	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Care of State & Federal Parks	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Mill Location	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Money Has Too Much Influence	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
No Progress Toward Obsolescence of Proper Documents	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Political Views Taking Precedence Over Forest Care	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Pollution	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Respiration	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Rotating Closures of Camping Sites	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Ski Area Expansion	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Soil	1	-	-	-	-	1	-
Too Much Concern For Endangered Species	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Too Much Protection of Wildlife	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Waste of Wood	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
Watershed Preservation	1	-	-	-	-	-	1

Frequency of Mention in Written Exercises by Groupings of Similar Concerns							
Concerns	Total	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford
Forest Management Generally	8	2	1	-	3	-	2
▪ Poor Forest Management/Cooperation between Agencies/Communication With Public	11	-	-	4	-	5	2
▪ Forest Land Ownership	6	-	-	3	-	3	-
▪ Housing/Marginal Forest Land	4	-	-	2	1	1	-
▪ Roads	4	1	1	2	-	-	-
▪ Laws Too Restricting	3	-	-	-	-	1	2
▪ Public & Worker Safety	3	-	-	1	1	1	-
▪ Too Much Money Spent on Equipment & Managers	3	-	1	2	-	-	-
▪ Best Usage of Materials/Waste of Wood	2	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total Forest Management	44	3	3	14	5	12	7
Environment Generally	2	1	-	-	-	1	-
▪ Habitat/Wildlife Habitat	9	1	1	2	2	1	2
▪ Water/Watershed Preservation	8	-	1	-	3	1	3
▪ Erosion/Soil	6	-	-	1	1	3	1
▪ Environmental Activists	4	1	1	1	1	-	-
▪ Endangered Species	3	1	1	-	-	-	1
▪ Forest Ecosystem	3	1	-	1	1	-	-
▪ Pollution/Air Quality (Controlled Burns)	3	-	-	-	1	-	2
Total Environment	38	5	4	5	9	6	9
Public Use of Forest/Access (including roads) Generally	9	-	2	4	3	-	-
▪ Recreational Uses	10	-	-	3	2	2	3
▪ Fees/Permits	6	-	3	2	1	-	-
▪ Public Misuse/Overuse of Forests	4	-	-	1	2	-	1
▪ Hunting	3	-	1	2	-	-	-
Total Public Use/Access	32	0	6	12	8	2	4
Balance Between Harvesting & Conservation Generally	7	-	2	-	1	1	3
▪ Old Growth/Preservation	10	2	3	-	2	3	-
▪ Forests for Future Generations/Loss of Forest Land	7	2	1	-	1	3	-
▪ Conservation/Excessive Harvest	2	-	-	-	-	2	-
Total Balance	26	4	6	0	4	9	3
Jobs/Economic Activity Generally	17	4	1	3	3	2	4
▪ Lumber Exports	4	-	1	-	1	-	2
Total Economic Activity	21	4	2	3	4	2	6
Forest Fires/Fire Prevention	14	2	4	5	2	-	1
▪ Controlled/Prescribed Burns	4	-	1	1	1	-	1
Total Forest Fires	18	5	7	10	5	1	6
Clear Cutting	16	3	2	4	2	1	4
Reforestation/Replanting Generally	14	2	1	4	3	1	3
▪ Types of Trees	2	-	-	1	-	1	-
Total Reforestation	16	2	1	5	3	2	3
Forest Health Generally	2	-	-	1	1	-	-
▪ Disease/Insects	4	-	2	1	1	-	-
Total Forest Health	6	0	2	2	2	0	0
Aesthetics/Forest Ambiance	4	-	3	-	-	1	-
Cattle Grazing	2	-	1	-	1	-	-
Other*	11	-	-	-	3	5	3

**Other includes the following: animal attacks; balancing energy and environment; changing job and home location styles—new management ideas; current volcanic activity; increasing population in Oregon; indirect impact of logging; mill location; money has too much influence; no progress toward obsolescence of proper documents; political views taking precedence over forest care; respiration*

VERBATIM WRITTEN RESPONSES

Eugene

- My job; environment; if the people managing the forest really know what they're doing; future generations.
- The problem of endangered species being eradicated due to too much logging; forest fires; clear cutting (ugly).
- Cutting old growth trees; replenishment of trees; are forests being managed properly; what will replace lumbering jobs when lumber runs out.
- If there will still be plenty of forests for the next generation to enjoy.
- Tree-sitters, people who protest; whipping out the trees—clear cutting; replanting new trees; forest fires; jobs.
- Clear cuts; jobs; roads; downed trees; leaving dead trees in the cycle.
- Natural habitat; wildlife; preservation of wood.

Redmond

- Water; fire; economic activity; wildlife habitat; access, legal; visual effects; roads; peace and tranquility; big old trees; hunting.
- Building/developing too much; fire protection; fees to use trails.
- Protection of old growth areas; not over cutting in certain places; balance between utilizing the forest products and conservation; forest management to prevent fires and disease.
- Clear cutting; owls; moth-kill; fires; export of lumber; public access; save the trees; tree huggers; permits, trails, wood cutting.
- Prescribed burns seem to always get out of control; always see government officials in new rigs, lots of new equipment—I believe money should be spent on restoration or more sub work; don't agree with trail fees.
- Clear cutting shouldn't be allowed; there needs to be a balance between environmental issues and harvesting; need to continue allowing cattle to pasture in forest lands.
- Thankful for reforestation; believe trees are a renewable resource; husband has 2 cousins who worked in Crater Lake in forest management; thankful for God's great gift of trees.

La Grande

- Wildlife—too many wild animals killed on highway, also come to town; recreation; industry; housing; ownership (private lands); replanting; fires and prevention of.
- Very poor marginal lands are considered forest instead of housing area; shutting roads—seniors and handicapped have no access; permits for everything—precludes many outdoor activities for families; bug infested areas causing fire hazard; too many forest managers and equipment; communications between forest people and public very poor—in this area; logging practices vary with who owns it and government regulations; logged areas replaced/replanted with poor choice of trees.
- Logging roads—makes road hard to use; loss of jobs—because of problems with government saying where and when things can be managed; forest fires—not

enough cleaning up in some areas and cause fires; too much government involved sometimes; clear cutting—makes places ugly.

- Clear cuts—not observed from scenic highways; fires—keeping forests thinned for control; public access; regular programs to plant trees as they are logged.
- Waste of clear cutting; poor management and resource distribution of the US Forest Service; the terrorist environmentalists; erosion; (poor) hikers/uneducated and uncaring users of the wilderness; the concept of only letting a certain amount of people into wilderness areas; the fact that so many people are in wilderness areas.
- Animal safety and habitat; hunting restrictions; replanting and re-growth? is it being done? properly?; how does it effect the forest ecosystem? (i.e. forest fires, water flow, etc.).
- Clear cutting; controlled burns; being basically locked out of the wilderness because of no roads; being charged to go into our forests; the closing of existing roads.
- Who owns the property; are the trees healthy or not; what kind of roads are available; is it where people can hunt; how can they use for logging; is it available for cabins and resorts; can it be made safe from fires; is it a good area to plant future trees; is it protected by police and parks care; can it have homes and stores; are there lakes or beaches or rivers; Douglas fir and tamaracks and ponderosa.

Portland

- Dry—no rain—summer fires; fishing due to forest being DRY (closed); recreation due to weather; loss of jobs due to weather.
- First thing—are we letting some fires burn? Recently in mountains we had terrible fires, but it seems I've heard that sometimes fires can be healthy for new growth, etc. But don't let too much building close to the forests; are the forests accessible for the public to enjoy (but not ruin); are we replanting trees after logging.
- Fires—Tillamook burn was started by people, as are most; forest safety people always go out and get lost, their search and rescue sometimes adds great financial burden to the taxpayer; felling too many trees and not replanting leads to flooding and avalanches.
- I really do not know too much about the forests in Oregon; I am concerned about the cutting of the trees; forest management in Oregon—I can't give any comment about something I know nothing about; they need to stop cutting the trees.
- Logging old growth trees; “managed” forests—does it really work; landslides; environmental activism—e.g. the fires at UW and a poplar tree farm this week; perceptions versus reality—how well are the issues understood by the general public; impact of logging that's indirect, e.g. logging around streams changing water temperatures.
- Animal attacks; taking too many trees—clear cutting; export logs to Japan.
- I am concerned about the amount of cuts that our forests can sustain - in other words can we continue to cut at current rates; I am worried about the general health of forests—diseases, practices that caused some segments of forest to be over harvested (in recent years a cutback has allowed diseases to propagate);

forest management—impact of cutting practices on rivers and salmon habitat—have cutting methods harmed spawning areas; what's the long term strategy.

- People are too concerned about keeping forests healthy—they do not need our help, they have survived without our help for years and years; littering—no respect for nature; charging money to see nature—you shouldn't have to pay to see nature (parks).
- Recreation and public accessibility; wildlife; renewing resources—replanting; commerce and trade; clean water; balancing energy needs and environment; clear air.
- Preservation of old growth forest; cutting too close to streams which ruins the quality of the water and endangers the forest; the diminishing of the forest product and the loss of jobs; clear cutting—wonder about this; mainly, it is a concern to me that there might not be any natural unpolluted forest left in this state.

Coos Bay

- Too much ground locked up while metro areas over populated; changing job structure allows for expansion and decentralization of population; need for new, fresh look at management and changing work/home location style; money rules the ideas.
- Clear cutting causing mountain sides being totally clear and clearing not only trees but brush to totally empty—it is getting better but it still needs more work for both sides.
- Having just left the Portland area this weekend I have to say decreasing the influx of gross numbers of new residents and (?) builders would be number one; leave the wild areas wild; rotate the camping sites so that for two years campground X is closed to the public; erosion; respiration.
- Personal safety of forestry workers; laws constricting the ability to successively harvest forest and replant them before land becomes deteriorated and useless; lack of proper education of the public about forestry conditions in Oregon—the successful forms of harvesting that can be used.
- Tendency of large timber companies to cut too quickly and disregard the future of the earth; tendency of environmental groups to reject all tree cutting—their success in (?) is the real concern; lack of clear boundary or definition to separate the farmland from natural forest; no long-range plan to provide sustainable production of building materials; non-progress toward the obsolescence of proper documents; apparent lack of cooperation by state and federal agencies.
- Would like to keep all the acreage we still have; keep the ones we have pristine; would like to see more money dropped into areas the public can use—perhaps one could still camp out somewhat privately; would like to see old growth within reason; private ownership should not be regulated within acreage limits.
- I think they're doing a bad job selling off our timberland to make farms and homes.
- Negative long-term environmental impact (if not replanted); jobs; loss of beauty.
- Timber sales; Elliott Forest; streams; dirt; length between cut/harvest; replanting with different vegetation.
- Excessive and improper harvest; best usage of material; ownership.
- Reforestation; wildlife protection; old growth; conservation.

Medford

- Balance between conservation and use of resources; effective management; watershed preservation.
- Clear cutting; replanting; too restrictive; poor planning; stream concerns; cost of harvesting; mill location; waste of wood.
- Protecting wildlife; planting trees; jobs; water conservation; preventing fires; pollution.
- Old growth; hiking trails over use; forest fires—are we preventing too many; replanting; clear cutting; burning off brush and air quality; erosion; ski area expansion; current volcanic activity (use 'em before we lose 'em?); lumber not logs—they're OUR logs.
- Under forestation; too much concern over endangered species; too much protection of wildlife; forest related jobs should come first.
- Too restrictive; a great renewable resource.
- Needs to be a balance between conservation and the need for lumber; no clear-cuts, reseeded always in areas which are logged; we need to do our own sawing, not sending logs out to be done and taking jobs away from local areas.
- Concerned about excessive clear cutting; concerned about political views taking the place of what actually is best for the forests; mismanagement of forests.
- Total trees cut down—clear cutting; control over management of federal and state; recreational use and abuse; care of state and federal parks.

The Coos Bay and Medford groups were asked an additional question. Do you feel more informed, less informed or informed at about the same level on forest management in Oregon as you were 5 years ago?

	Combined	Coos Bay	Medford
More Informed	9	5	4
Less Informed	2	1	1
About the Same	9	5	4

Written Exercise

What if anything about forests and forest management in this area have you read or heard about recently? What was the source of information, and what if any comments do you have about each one?

Eugene		
Issue	Source of Information	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weyerhaeuser strike ▪ Compensation (Measure #7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newspaper Newspaper, radio 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No feeling No comment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Salmon ▪ Not charging to use the forest 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TV news TV news 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How it affects our water supply Might be a good idea
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tree sitters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TV news 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I do not agree with this
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Closing of wood products plants ▪ 3-year "tree sitters" ▪ Lost jobs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newspaper Newspaper Newspaper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sorry Contempt, wonder Sorry
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The closure of lumber mills ▪ The trials of the tree sitters ▪ Something about chemical dumping ▪ Security tightened around forest ranger stations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newspaper & TV news TV news Newspaper TV news 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mixed feelings Not really interested Not good Good idea
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ I think I read about somebody who wanted to cut some of his private forest land but wasn't able to because of protestors 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Register Guard Newspaper 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think if it's his land they're his trees
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Beverly property 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TV - mayor conference 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leave it alone, let Dad just take a loss

Redmond		
Issue	Source of Information	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Larry Smith, my husband's cousin, was in forest management. He is a teacher in Jacksonville - with his class preserved. ▪ Setting aside monuments and huge areas without consulting people in the area is wrong. 	Blank	Blank
Blank	Blank	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Knapp weed control ▪ Noxious weed control 	Bugle Magazine - Rocky Mt. Elk Foundation	Over grazing - logging
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Control burns out at Sisters 	Drove by - word of mouth	Do believe that it is good and long overdue
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Controlled burns 	TV news - 21	Was worried because it is so dry this year they might get out of control
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fees 	Newspapers, word of mouth	Who made the decision? Is it really needed?
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fuels management ▪ Trail fees 	Newspaper	Article described concern over fuel buildup
	Newspaper	Letters to editor, hate them

La Grande		
Issue	Source of Information	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dam Boise Cascade's 	Ads	Yuk
Blank	Blank	Blank
Blank	Blank	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boise Cascade will be moving and expanding 	Blank	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boise Cascade closures 	Blank	Blank
Blank	Blank	Blank
Blank	Blank	Blank
Blank	Blank	Blank

Portland		
Issue	Source of Information	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spotted owl ▪ Old growth preservation ▪ Global warming, i.e. loss of forest land 	TV news TV news Magazine	Blank Blank Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Land use planning in the gorge ▪ New dams in Bull Run ▪ Forest fire in LaPine ▪ Wildlife in urban areas ▪ Salmon runs 	Paper, TV news; elections TV news TV news TV TV	Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forest fires ▪ Salmon - building dams 	News News	Blank Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There has been change in administration - the implication from the newspaper article is that there would be an increase in cuts ▪ The impact of logging practices on salmon habitat ▪ There has been an ongoing debate about building roads ▪ Setting aside of some areas for protection - the policy is being renewed by current administration 	Oregonian Oregonian Oregonian Oregonian	Blank This one might be a little older A slightly older issue Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Salmon runs 	National Geographic	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Salmon preservation ▪ Fires at UW and poplar farm ▪ Non-native species ▪ Landslides ▪ Forest fires ▪ Spotted owl/endangered species ▪ Logging techniques 	NPR, Oregonian, Bonneville Dam NPR NPR TV news Blank Blank Blank	Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank Blank

Coos Bay (continued)		
Issue	Source of Information	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have heard our forest management is not sufficiently taking care of our forests ▪ Environmentalists seem to think we don't have any salmon and that it's the loggers fault 	<p>TV</p> <p>Talk from locals around here</p>	<p>Blank</p> <p>Blank</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Weyerhaeuser recently dismantled the mill on Highway 101 in North Bend 	<p>Visually, I drive by all the time</p>	<p>Sad commentary on the planning involved in our local timber industry</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Absolutely nothing 	<p>None</p>	<p>Blank</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forest management sold to Japan then sold back to us ▪ "Poorly managed" ▪ Weyerhaeuser left community in lurch 	<p>Friend</p> <p>Local Joe's</p> <p>Local Joe's</p>	<p>Blank</p> <p>Blank</p> <p>Blank</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ That the laws have been enforced ▪ Laws changing (about where and how much) ▪ Endangering species (rivers) ▪ Government claiming more land 	<p>Read in local paper</p> <p>News</p> <p>News</p> <p>Radio</p>	<p>Blank</p> <p>Blank</p> <p>Government not really knowing what they are doing in first place</p> <p>Blank</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opal River - large area fought for to protect several years ago, you hike into it, has a "guide" or management group, info group near the river for your info 	<p>Sunset Magazine</p>	<p>I went to go see it but was not impressed with the info group</p>

Medford		
Issue	Source of Information	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spotted owls can just fly to new area after home forest is cut down 	Talk radio	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spotted owls don't need old growth forest 	Talk radio	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Blank 	Blank	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Forestry terrorism, burning, spiking 	TV news	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Have not heard anything 	Blank	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tree huggers 	Radio, Tribune, On-line	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Boise Cascade fire 	Saw it	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Corporations anchoring logs in streams for salmon egg habitat 	TV	Was surprised
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bush administration may reverse Clinton's forest policies? 	Mail Tribune	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Development of Mt. Ashland 	TV	Blank
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Water control on the rivers because of the lack of rain 	Blank	Blank

Written Exercise

Have you recently heard about these issues and, if yes, please list source and comments.

Eugene			
Herbicides	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Register Guard	Damage
	Yes	Newspaper, Radio	Use of manual labor over herbicides
	No	-	-
	Yes	Register Guard	-
	Yes	Local news program	Commentary insight
	Yes	Unsure	-
	Yes	Paper	Personally don't like them
Clear cutting	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV	Leave wildlife alone
Landslides	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	News	-
	Yes	Paper	People's houses too close to old units
	No	-	-
	Yes	Register Guard	On Route 126
	No	-	-
	Yes	Paper, TV, Radio	That it wasn't a good thing
	No	-	-
No harvesting on public lands	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV, Radio, Paper	-
	No	-	-

Eugene (continued)			
Federal management to achieve forest health goals versus no management	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	Paper, TV	-
	No	-	Not lately

Redmond			
Fire problems	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Newspaper	Too many fuels
	Yes	TV news	Not enough snow pack - dry season
	Yes	Newspaper	-
	Yes	Work, word of mouth	Could be high
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV, Paper	La Pine fire
Drought	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	My own data collection	We are in one
	Yes	TV, newspaper	Very scary - what can we do
	Yes	Newspaper, TV, Radio	It's a little worrisome
	Yes	Work, word of mouth	Low water
	Yes	Paper, TV	-
	Yes	TV	Not enough water supply from mountain snow pack
	Yes	TV, Newspaper	Thank God for more snow
Insects and disease	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Radio	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	Magazine	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-

Redmond (continued)			
Forest management changes related to leveraged buyouts of forest industry companies	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Newspaper	Crown Pacific purchased Brookslands
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	Paper, TV, Friends	Willamette Industries & Weyerhaeuser
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
Fees to access forest service recreation	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Newspaper letters to editor	All were negative
	Yes	TV, Newspaper	Nobody's happy about it
	Yes	Husband	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	News, Friends	Bad idea
	No	-	-
	Yes	-	-

La Grande			
Economic survival of the forest industry	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	The Forest Service always maintained their parks, I believe in Oregon and Washington
	Yes	TV news	Boise Cascade closing plant in Idaho
	Yes	Observer	Mill at Joseph opened
	Yes	Boise Cascade Employees	Regulations making it harder to log and jobs are cut
	Yes	Gossip	Boise Cascade expanding or moving
	Yes	Newspaper	Heard mill in La Grande was moving
	Yes	Newspaper	The opening of one Joseph mill
	Yes	Newspaper	Opening of the mill in Joseph - I like it

La Grande (continued)			
Active forest management to improve forest health and reduce chance of fires/Governor's demonstration project	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
Grazing issues	Y/N	Source	Comments
	-	-	Only certain areas are healthy for grazing cattle and other animals
	No	-	-
	Yes	Newspaper	Price increased per cow-calf unit. Protection of stream bank
	Yes	Paper, TV	Laws being passed
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
Threatened and endangered species (e.g., lynx, etc.)	Y/N	Source	Comments
	-	-	Can they shoot a dangerous animal that threatens people in their areas
	Yes	TV news	Salmon
	Yes	TV	Wolf protection and area expansion
	Yes	Paper, TV	Salmon only
	Yes	General conversation	Cougar population coming into urban areas
	No	-	-
	Yes	-	Salmon only
	Yes	TV, Newspaper	Salmon only

Portland			
Forests and forest management related to salmon protection	Y/N	Source	Comments
	-	Radio, TV, Newspaper	-
	Yes	TV	Actually it was more related to the dam and water let out
	Yes	TV report	Salmon
	Yes	-	Injection of salmon to make them bigger
	Yes	Oregonian, NPR, Bonneville	Water temperature
	Yes	National Geographic	-
	Yes	Oregonian	Logging too close to rivers affects spawning
	Yes	News	-
	Yes	TV	Both water levels in the Columbia and spawning areas
	Yes	TV news	Preserving springs
The drought related to forests and forest management	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	-	-
	Yes	TV	More related to water usage and electricity - not forest management per se
	Yes	TV report	Drought
	No	-	-
	Yes	Oregonian	Irrigation practices/over subscribed water rights
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	News	-
	Yes	TV	Recreation use - forest fires
	Yes	TV news	A lake near Grants Pass almost dry

Portland (continued)			
Clear cutting	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	Clear cutting
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV news	As related to landslides
	No	-	-
	No	-	Recently (within a year)
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
Fees to access Forest Service recreation	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV report, Newspaper	Increase campground fees
	No	-	-
	Yes	Oregonian	Park permits for forest/recreation areas
	No	-	-
	Yes	Oregonian	But I don't remember much
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV, Paper	Day use fees to offset money spent on upkeep
	Yes	TV news	Obtain a ticket for all national parks
Forest management related to water quality/Bull Run, etc.	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Newspaper, People	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV news	-
	Yes	Oregonian	Water quality
	No	-	-
	Yes	Oregonian	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV	Adding dams
	No	-	-

Coos Bay			
The health of the local economy, generally, being bad	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Word of mouth	Concerning whether or not to put in the natural gas pipes from Coos Bay to Roseburg
	Yes	Newspaper, Locals	Economy dropping
	Yes	News	Losing jobs, no big business
	Yes	-	The economy is terrible around here, we need new ways to make a living
	Yes	-	There are no jobs for people to stay around to reap
	Yes	TV, Newspaper	Most recently - closure of schools (people moving away from the area - lack of jobs (2 weeks ago)
	Yes	Radio	Mill closure, no work
	Yes	Newspaper	Don't pay much attention
	Yes	-	-
	Yes	Newspaper, local conversation	Downtown North Bend is now non-bank finance-able
	No	-	-
The economic health of the forest industry locally	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	-
	-	Not read	Local and state timber industry failing
	Yes	News	People losing jobs - jobs not available
	Yes	My union	The timber industry went down with the mills, the big companies took all the gravy and left us with nil, in turn affecting the longshoremens and all the other union workers around here
	Yes	-	We have hardly any mills here any more, we have one or two
	Yes	-	Friends in the business of forestry being laid off, etc.
	Yes	TV	Mill closures
	No	-	-
	Yes	Newspaper	Economic condition in this part of Oregon
	No	-	-
	Yes	My father is a guard and info on news	Weyco Strike

Coos Bay (continued)			
Anything about new forest management techniques or managing forests differently than in the past	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Word of mouth	Government practices of South American countries regarding forestry practices
	No	-	Europe had reforestation issues many years ago, maybe study failures of other countries
	Yes	News	Clear cutting, how it's being done (slides)
	-	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	-	Specific designation of farmland and natural preserves
	No	-	-

Medford			
Private forest management vs. extreme environmentalists and vandalism	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Newspaper	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV, Newspaper, Radio	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	TV news	-
	Yes	TV	Tree damaged that had a tree-sitter in it, may die (old growth tree)
	Yes	Talk Radio, TV	-

Medford (continued)			
Federal timber sales effectively dropping to 0 and the effects of this	Y/N	Source	Comments
	Yes	Newspaper	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	Friend	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	Radio, Mail Tribune, On-Line	I seem to recall
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
Soda Mountain National Monument and impact on forest management - - severely restricting how they can be managed	Y/N	Source	Comments
	No	-	-
	Yes	Mail Tribune	Don't have enough info to comment
	Yes	TV	Political motivation
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Yes	Internet, Radio	Should not be a national monument
	No	-	-
	No	-	-
	Don't Know	-	-

Written Exercise

What comes to mind when you hear the words "sustainable forestry?"

Eugene

- I don't know.
- Forests that remain the same.
- Replenishing the forest so that future generations never run out of product.
- Forests for our kids—grandkids.
- Keeping the forests in good condition and green.
- To meet needs of forest - cycle.
- Tree plantations on private land.

Redmond

- Sustainable forestry—can continue to produce all of the products and life opportunities that a forest is capable of.
- A forest that can be kept healthy and maintained in its original state.
- Well-managed use of forest to accommodate wildlife, recreation, products.
- Being able to produce lumber at a rate that logging will not be able to end.
- Plentiful in trees, able to log.
- Forests that can sustain themselves - replenish themselves - sustain wildlife.
- Intelligent management.

La Grande

- Carrying capacity (concept).
- The proper cutting and replanting of the same varieties of trees.
- I think that means the forest will look and be like it always has.
- Managed, healthy forest with normal, natural fires and replanting.
- Forestry that keeps going. Finding other ways to create certain products that come from wood.
- One that replaces itself and can be utilized.
- Harvesting.
- New places to maintain; people planting certain kinds of trees that can be productive; also orchards and vineyards and gardens; Christmas trees to sell; flowering trees to sell for beauty; trees planted for windbreaks; tourism - wood products; environmental - natural burning; protection to waterways; campers - outdoor recreation; economic, environmental, social.

Portland

- Do not know what "cons" means.
- A forest that will last for many generations and allows the animals, fish and birds and plants that are native to it to maintain a consistent level.
- Upkeep of forests, controlled logging.
- Taking care of the forest. To keep the forest as it is.
- Logging in such a manner as to have a steady supply of wood from the same piece of land. Does it really work? Is it economical? Could apply to wild areas or tree farms. Full environmental impact not well understood?
- To keep our forests at a certain level.
- Cutting timber at a rate that will allow indefinite cycle of growth—cut - re-growth. It sees forest as a kind of "farm" for logs.
- Healthy forest that is able to support wildlife and our logging demands.
- Balance between the number of trees being taken out and those replanted We shouldn't log to the point where timberlands are being lost.
- Keeping the forest as is, or attempting to maintain the forest in a sustainable way, i.e. keep it viable, healthy and ecologically in tune.

Coos Bay

- That there is a balance of harvesting and preservation in which the industry can survive and not deplete its sources.
- Usable for campers, hunters, industry and wildlife.
- Forest that can hold an ecosystem.
- Tree farming.
- Planning to produce the same amount of products from a designated area in perpetua.
- Keeping a forest that makes money and keeps the public happy and a balanced eco system.
- Lasting forest for energy, one able to have use from the forest.
- Long-term forestry practices, ongoing.
- Long-term.
- Cut = growth.
- To work with forestry in a (?) of (?).

Medford

- Proper over all management with a long-range plan.
- Reforestation; managed cutting of timber; cooperation between landowners/timber companies and government agencies.
- Proper replanting and managing so that the forest can be sustained over the eons with harvesting.
- Blank.
- Replanting fast growth trees; "renewable resource;" making sure forests continue.
- The ability to continue to not only harvest the forest for domestic products but also keep a healthy forest.
- Replanting after clear cutting usually on private land.
- Maintaining forests, allowing some logging but sustaining the environment.
- Forests that can be sustained by humans, meaning healthy forests.

Written Exercise

What specific proofs would you require to believe that sustainable forestry is being practiced?

If you aren't sure, just say so.

[Put a single star by the most important proof, two stars for the second most important, and three stars for third most important. ¹]

Eugene

- Replanting in specific plantation area; manual methods of weed control; water quality.
- No clear cutting; replant trees; old growth not touched; old trees dying—recycle of life.
- How they look to the public.
- No jobs lost in lumber industries; no losses of species due to cutting.
- Accountability by way of federal services and an accounting to the public of all practices.
- Conservative logging; buffer zones; fire management; forest workers or stewards; better forest management.
- I don't know what it means.

Redmond

- *Correct information given to school children; accountability to laws; **laws made by people in forest areas instead of D.C.
- *Healthy looking forest (no disease), no clear cutting; **replanting of harvested trees; ***much wildlife.
- *Show me trees that were planted 20 years ago - 10, and 5; **show me second growth trees some kind of estimate of log-able timber.
- *Visual proof; **public relations; ***TV.
- *Healthy trees, plants; **adequate animal population; ***ability to enjoy the forest, beautiful; plenty of jobs.
- *When I go hiking I see that there's life in the forest; **the loggers are able to feed their families without wiping out the whole forest; ***a lot of new growth.
- *Statistics of measured products (water, etc.); **aerial photos, less than 10% cut at one time; ***self-sustaining animal populations; my own eyes.

La Grande

- Blank.
- *Housing; **logging; ***fuel for heat.
- See reforestation planting done at the proper season and method for good growth; evidence that ground is not left with huge ruts and the general area is as Mother Nature intended; selective logging has been done.
- *Healthy trees; **less forest fires; ***diversity; replanting; more wildlife; less disease.

¹ The Eugene and Medford groups were not asked to asterisk their first, second, and third most important proofs.

- *Thinning and clean up; **replanting correct types of trees; ***keeping a natural habitat along waterways.
- The biggest proof would be to go out in the forest and see new trees had been planted and the forest was cleared. I would like to see articles in the paper about what companies and landowners have done to sustain our forests.
- *The selective logging of trees; **the putting of logs in streams for fish; ***the sometimes leaving a buffer zone at stream edges.
- One report that includes annual aerial photos of given lands, an average new growth chart in region and an unbiased report of just the facts of water temps, fish count and silt erosion.

Portland

- *Proof that the agency involved with forest preservation is competent, i.e. competent persons in charge; **some areas designated as not available to the public; ***testing of streams and air.
- *Countable timber - growing and going out; **no drop in number and types of animal life; ***land use planning regarding housing and recreation; water quality.
- Specialists in the area of forestry widely in agreement that sustainable forestry is taking place.
- *Multiple ages in trees - range of tree ages; **large numbers in each age group.
- *A long-term study of all the animals; **soil; ***air, water, plant life.
- *Ratios of species balance, e.g. are we only replanting fast-growing trees where we harvested slow growing trees; **trends on flora; ***trends on animal population; clarification of what "sustainable forestry" means (tree farms versus wild forests, continual harvest versus rotation); data on the impact to wildlife and plant ecosystems.
- *The forest stay as is; **management taking care of the forest.
- *Video and photography of the results.
- *The wildlife are living - no species is increasing or decreasing too much out of proportion; **trees are replaced and some old growth forest is left; ***water and soil and air are not becoming polluted; access to public is controlled - public are educated to keep it a sustainable forest.
- *President Bush on TV; **headline in newspaper; ***certified letter.

Coos Bay

- *Clear distinction between land uses; **clear, not ambiguous farming techniques/practices; ***measurable outcomes - \$ - clear rules/regulations regarding habitats within farming zone.
- *35-year record of constant forest-product production.
- *Selective logging; **reforestation; ***watershed protection; animal protection.
- *Water quality data; **fly-over photo.
- *"Natural" habitat resurfacing (animal and plants); **replanting; ***longer between harvests; flying over.
- *Replanting - burning the land enabling replanting; **selective forestry (not reaping the entire area).

- *We are taking our trees all in sections; **we are taking it out all at once; ***early on a little of the trees are sold at a time.
- *Maintenance of quality; **diversity re: vegetation plants and animals; ***profitable enough to put money back into as well; access for the public.
- *Different ages of forest in same area; **animal life (signs of life); ***enough food in area to have animals survive.
- Trees in the ground (they will be here after I die); money in local community (don't want to die of hunger); a killer place to camp; cycles of life—all of equal importance.
- Blank.

Medford

- I would have to have it confirmed by an uninterested third party whom I trusted.
- Checks and balances set up to show no noticeable changes in the environment as relating to animals, trees, and plants—to show no long-term damage.
- Verification by both private and government agencies.
- Monthly report from companies; monthly report from government agencies both state and federal; an independent third party/oversight committee.
- Independent research group with absolutely NO ties to any major corporations; long-term studies on re-growth and wildlife returning.
- Nothing, not sure.
- Federal government official report by non-involved agencies.
- Blank.
- The condition of the total forest.

Written Exercise

Looking ahead 25 years, are you very optimistic, somewhat optimistic, somewhat pessimistic, or very pessimistic about the future of Oregon's forests?

Ratings Frequencies							
	Eugene	Redmond	La Grande	Portland	Coos Bay	Medford	Combined
Very optimistic	1	1	2	2	3	3	12
Optimistic	1	-	-	-	1	-	2
Somewhat optimistic	3	4	5	3	5	5	25
Somewhat pessimistic	2	2	1	3	1	1	10
Pessimistic	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
Very pessimistic	-	-	-	1	1	-	2

Eugene	
Rating	Comments
Very optimistic	I think everything looks good for the future. The management is getting better all the time. I think they will be learning new ways as time goes by.
Optimistic	With good management with good guidelines - rules <u>strict</u> . Someone to be accountable to the public.
Somewhat optimistic	Because I think that people are smart enough to figure out how to use trees and still keep the forest for recreation and habitat.
Somewhat optimistic	In this social climate, economics <u>rule</u> . In this area, people are <u>aware</u> and environmentally sensitive. Socially responsible people, in informed society, <u>might</u> prevail.
Somewhat optimistic	There is a slow transition out of forestry in the area. New industry will take up the slack because there's money in it for them.
Somewhat pessimistic	The way of the world is those with money will make the rules. Economic concerns will overpower all others eventually. Although I do hope for a change, hence the "somewhat."
Somewhat pessimistic	The reason I say so is Lane County is expanding so rapidly I think we'll be left with very little forests at all in 25 years.

Redmond	
Rating	Comments
Very optimistic	The tree huggers and government seem to be trying to close more of the forest to public because they say we are damaging the woods due to over use. Instead of using management as a tool.
Somewhat optimistic	I think forests will continue to do relatively well because there are so many environmental groups looking out for them.
Somewhat optimistic	God is the source of life and renews things. If we treat forests as a renewable resource and are careful and diligent all three can become balanced.

Redmond (continued)	
Rating	Comments
Somewhat optimistic	I think that the people in the state of Oregon will not allow the forests to be trashed, however I think invested interests will try to pursue their own agendas. The Oregon people through their congressmen, however, will preserve our forests for future generations. These forests may be different than we are familiar with.
Somewhat optimistic	I think that Oregon has done a pretty good job with balancing but I think we're at a point where we could go either too "environmental" or too much economic - too much protection or too much production - if we can keep a good balance I think we'll be okay.
Somewhat pessimistic	Environmentalists are getting more attention - there isn't a balance or creativity in solving problems. Solutions are too extreme and hurt lots of people - Klamath Falls, i.e. I think those in charge are wasting our money - not using it wisely.
Somewhat pessimistic	Private forestlands will find maximum profits in development. Public forestlands will be managed for the "politically correct" fad of the moment. No one will be able to apply general, balanced view.

La Grande	
Rating	Comments
Very optimistic	When traveling some in Oregon, there are many forests on future mountains that have never been considered. People are coming to our country. They will immigrate into the new mountains to discover the new environments. People are dreaming of the new venture - new <u>organization</u> . New theories and inventions to help.
Very optimistic	Supply (replant/harvest 25 years, steady growth) and demand (housing/paper products, recycle).
Somewhat optimistic	Believe there are enough private owners to maintain enough forests. Main problem is government regulations and employees like Forest Service personnel payroll.
Somewhat optimistic	With all the special interest groups and studies by people within the forest industry, a lot has been learned and it seems the environmentalists are more willing to compromise. 25 more years should be enough time to study further what's best for the forest, economy and environmental issues.
Somewhat optimistic	I don't believe the people in Oregon will let the forests completely go away. Oregonians have pride in their forests and hopefully legislators will not let that happen.
Somewhat optimistic	If they can manage the forests so that we still have the beauty but can still have industries like our sawmills and the building of homes and such we will have our forests to enjoy in 25 years.
Somewhat optimistic	I believe we have the ability to figure it out but scared.
Somewhat pessimistic	People from the Western part of the state make the major decisions and forget that there are communities that thrive on forestry - with the population boom people are going to forget where the wood comes from to build their houses.

Portland	
Rating	Comments
Very optimistic	Oregonians are very concerned about their state - we take great pride in the beauty around us. Many are concerned about doing the right things - finding a balance between economics and environment and I think we can do it and keep healthy forests.
Very optimistic	I believe that there is a good mix of environmentalist and laborers who will manage to combine efforts to sustain our way of life. The people will demand it of their leaders. St. Helen's - nature itself, if given a chance, will sustain itself.
Somewhat optimistic	I frequently hear about environmental issues here in Oregon. This leads me to believe that there is a lot being done to preserve what we have.
Somewhat optimistic	Well, just the fact that you are here today makes me think that somebody is trying to make things right.
Somewhat optimistic	I think over the last 20 years we have become less dependent upon forest revenues so there is not the extreme pressure to cut. We are gradually learning about the importance of forests and global warming so there will be more public support for keeping forests or for cutting fewer trees.
Somewhat pessimistic	It is my hope that we can survive Bush and that someone more supportive of natural environment and ecology will be in office. Yet, if this is a country where the balance of power is in effect, then maybe our forests will survive civilization. Cultural, environment, economics.
Somewhat pessimistic	We aren't enacting enough regulation and enforcements to protect the natural environment. A great example is the recent conflict between hydroelectricity and salmon in our rivers. What a shame that we've spent years rebuilding the salmon population, but that in the first power crunch that comes along, we're willing to sacrifice them to power our TV's. When push comes to shove, our greed will nearly always outweigh our sense of responsibility to the planet.
Somewhat pessimistic	I believe that the government will have reasons why they can't come up with the money for the management of the forest. It seems as if some people don't care anymore.
Pessimistic	I do not think people will throw away our forests and trees. Reforest or something to save them.
Very pessimistic	Because people are changed. Their values are not the same any more and the thing that always seems to be uppermost (or the winner) is big business. Most of us are city dwellers and are not as familiar with the forests, or as appreciative as people were 50 years ago. Morals and values.

Coos Bay	
Rating	Comments
Very optimistic	New minds are coming with high expectations in the area of financial security! Having a life they are well aware of the past mistakes.
Very optimistic	Market changes will occur to enhance the situation.
Very optimistic	(?) since I've been here we have not run out of trees yet.

Coos Bay (continued)	
Rating	Comments
Optimistic	The whole future of our forests will follow the future of our government. The dollar seems to be overtaking the role of (?) but the intelligence of the dollar will find the best role of our forests.
Somewhat optimistic	Lots of trees out there! Replanting pretty good.
Somewhat optimistic	We're here doing this because someone is concerned so action is being taken.
Somewhat optimistic	This community is full of organic, granola types that are coming into their own and may not allow for failure.
Somewhat optimistic	I believe that it is getting better. I think that we are starting to learn about our mistakes and as long as the government doesn't get in and try to make money off of it that it will get better.
Somewhat optimistic	Because I'm an optimist.
Somewhat pessimistic	Afraid we will either be out of forest to harvest or the federal government will block more land than what we have.
Very pessimistic	They are not allowing the timber to be harvested.

Medford	
Rating	Comments
Very optimistic	I think the government, timber industry, public and mainline conservation groups will get a method worked out for proper management of our forests - a method of solving problems all can live with reasonably well.
Very optimistic	There will always be people, in the past as well as now, who will favor conservation, thereby protecting the forest, and those who will favor economic use of the forest. A system of checks and balances. There will always be unforeseen natural phenomena which may dilute or kill off forests but man will always want to keep at least a semblance of a forest.
Very optimistic	Because I think balances will always be struck, not in spite of the various groups but because of these groups. The warring parties, i.e., environmentalists versus logging companies, keep each other in check. The pendulum is only allowed to swing so far before it's pulled back the other way.
Somewhat optimistic	Depends upon how much management can start to balance, public land and private land as for a recreational commercial use.
Somewhat optimistic	Optimistic because of local efforts to bring landowners, timber companies, government agencies and conservation agencies together to create plans to plan for sustainable forestry that will benefit everyone and hopefully create a balance between cutting and preservation. Not so optimistic because of federal administration changes that continually change and can have adverse effects.

Medford (continued)	
Rating	Comments
Somewhat optimistic	People will use the land until it's unusable but at some point it will become unusable so nobody will go to destroy it and nature will repair it without intervention, OR someone will stop the destruction and let nature take its course.
Somewhat optimistic	I hope that we continue to value our forests and also are able to use the resources from them - to conserve wisely but also benefit from forest products - to find a good balance between the two.
Somewhat optimistic	Because, like here today, we are discussing the dilemmas openly. It seems that the tide has changed from cutting too much to more conservation in the past few years. I think most want a "balance."
Somewhat pessimistic	I don't think that there is as much being done now as there was in the past. Replanting and land management used to be bigger issues. I don't see a lot being done in the future to manage our forests.

Written Exercise

Regarding all that we've been talking about tonight, what is the one most important message you have for the Oregon Board of Forestry? Be specific.

Eugene

- Please keep the environment safe.
- That we have beautiful forests and that we should try our very best to preserve most of it for the environment.
- Try with all your knowledge and understanding to make decisions based on the common person's concerns.
- Manage our forests so that our grandkids can build homes of lumber.
- No clear-cuts.
- Don't clear-cut.
- Limit forestry land use to specific high intensity tree farms.

Redmond

- Balance and common sense. Don't bend science to match a pre-determined outcome. Preserve economic activity and plan 500 years ahead. And keep Oregon green.
- Please help us to keep our forest beautiful. I love Oregon because it has such awesome places you can go to do outdoor things. Also Oregon is special because we have a lot of job opportunity in our forests - please keep the balance - not too much production and not too much protection.
- The key word is balance - I like the visual of a three-legged chair - economic, social, and environmental. We need more creativity in coming up with solutions that both protect the environment but don't hurt people. People ultimately are more important than animals. But I think there can be balance where neither is hurt.
- The controlled burns are a long awaited way that our forest should have been managed. I have seen Yellowstone and many other areas that have burned and truly feel that burns are a natural way to keep our forests healthy.
- Don't over cut but don't under cut - selective cutting and thinning - prescribed burning I believe is good if done carefully.
- Preserve our forests in spite of political agendas. Be fair to all 3 legs of the sustainable forestry stool—economic, environmental and social.
- Return logging as a sensible part of forestry with wise use of the beautiful forests God has given Oregon.

La Grande

- That we are so close to a working answer not to give up or in. Value all 3 legs equally and fairly. Don't be swayed by the lopsidedness of the stool as it sits. They will balance.
- Do not take away our ability to live, work and enjoy the forests. We need to have a clear plan to protect our forests but to not be locked out of them and keep our forest industries alive.
- I would like you to know how important the forest is to my family. I don't live in a big city by choice. I want my children to grow up knowing what different species of trees are, and camp and fish and love the forest. I also want this to be a place where "city folk" can come and visit a beautiful state.
- Balancing the importance of the forest between economics and esthetics.
- Oregon needs its forests for stability of jobs, tourism and health. We live in a beautiful state—let's keep it that way!
- Laws made for the coast and Willamette Valley do not and cannot always be applied to other forest areas such as Joseph and La Grande and Baker. You need a better PR with the taxpayer—fancy pickup and 4-wheelers do not enhance you to the taxpayer.
- Keep free lands free. Harvest with intent to plant and re-harvest in plots, clean up after yourselves, keep Washington out of local government.
- The expense of expanding has so much to do with the new building-on. Completion of past plans and efforts to be perfected (and made safe for those who are working with it, living with it).

Portland

- Please make sure that those persons in charge of our forestlands are educated, reliable and morally responsible to the people of Oregon and the forestlands. The key is sustainable forests and keeping the legs of cultural, environment and economics balanced.
- That we have to take a balanced view. Economics, environment and culture have to be seen as equally important. To value one over another will eventually lead to the destruction of all three, and all we, as Oregonians, value.
- I am concerned about there being a balance between regulating what forests people can go to and what forests they cannot go to. I want to be able to go and enjoy forests without driving across the state, and without paying too much to see it.
- I think there needs to be a long-term mission for care of the forests—5 years may be too short (100, 1000 years?). Try to figure out what needs to be in place—what policies and strategies will keep forests for a long time. I would also say that when making hard choices, I would err on the side of making the best environmental decision over economic and cultural issues.
- As of right now the very most important message is to save the salmon. If we have to take dams out and reforest our banks to help our fish then I say do it. I would be willing to spend the extra money for electricity.
- We must maintain our natural resources, including old-growth forests. Take the time to really understand the long-term impacts of proposed models of sustainable forestry before implementing widespread initiatives.

- I would like to have our government listen to the forest management. I would like for the government to give management forestry monies to test our soil, air, fire, etc.
- I care about the forests and the environment and the preservation of the species but humans are species too and I think when push comes to shove, if one thing must be sacrificed it should not be people. Salmon are great, if you can afford them, but most people I know haven't had salmon in years.
- My main concern is that we find a balance. Don't stop logging, keep some (most) forests accessible and keep environment healthy. Good luck.
- I would like to see selective forest cutting. I would not like clear cutting, which causes mud slides, job loss and families to move.

Coos Bay

- Smell the trees!!! Get out of the office and smell the trees. All of you, not just those in the trenches - you in the suit.
- State and federal ownership of timber-producing land is wrong. There needs to be (?) going of timber-producing and naturally preserved land. Multi-use is an unworkable concept.
- I would like to see the forest reopened with better monitoring by government and state.
- Make it livable!
- Think about the land formation hillsides/rocks/streams before you allow logging in an area so the wildlife will not flee. Wildlife, animals, fish and plants.
- Think of the long-term. I don't think we're going to run out of trees any time in the near future but in the long-term we've got to manage.
- I would like to have the lumber for all times so we would never run out. I think this is important.
- Please keep our state beautiful and please let us the people that live here have an advantage to access—perhaps let those tourists pay for our costs.
- I want you to remember that all the legs on the chair are the same length ... make sure economically sound, make sure environmentally stable, make sure socially accessible.
- I have lived in most of the U.S., being an Air Force brat. I have never seen anyplace as beautiful as Oregon. To serve Oregon, and her forests must be an honor. Do Oregon and her trees a justice, treat her with respect. Let her people work for her.
- Forestry must be looked at in two macro levels involving all forms of socio-environmental concerns and you cannot make proper judgments until you have made a comprehensive effort to understand all your options.

Medford

- Be careful with old growth and redwoods, use common sense, like doctors - DO NO HARM.
- Please manage the forests to not eliminate logging and include conservation methods to keep the beauty and value of our forests intact.
- Don't cave in to the environmentalists, balance is very important.
- Lower costs for residents in enjoying our woodlands, parks and recreational areas.
- If you open forests to logging companies make them hire local people to turn them into lumber. And yes, small landowners should have the same restrictions as large.
- I think clear cutting is an issue that has been addressed but there is still more that needs to be done to stop it. I don't like seeing huge patches of empty space when I drive through and walk through the forest. Thanks.
- Most important—balance. Harvest some, save some within the bounds of reasonable conservation of the entire ecosystem. No special interest group should outweigh the other.
- Continual dialogue between varying factors to make creative solutions.
- We are at a point in time when we have to take the right direction to manage what we have in our forests while we still have them.