

State Forests Advisory Committee Meeting
Friday, October 24th, 2008
DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY¹

Committee Attendees: Matthew Betts, Wayne Naillon, Bud Henderson, Ed Kamholz, Carolyn Eady, Paul Johnson, Dave Kunert, Rex Storm, Barrett Brown, Nancy Willmes, Todd Reinwald, Mike Cafferata, Mike Wilson, Phil Cogswell, Jill Bradford, and Mike Bordelon.

Non Committee/ODF Participants/Public: Ron Zilli, Bob Van Dyke, Gregg Cline, Barbara Lee, Steve Laam, Dan Goody, Rob Nall, Wayne Auble, Jeff Foreman, Robin Meeks, Kate Skinner, Liz Dent, Angie Johnson, and Desiree Kimmell.

Public Comment: Bob Van Dyke made a number of statements and the transcript is available upon request.

Meeting Summary Approval: Meeting summary is not available at this time.

State Forests Program Updates:

- Guidance for the 2010 AOPs: The current guidance is to stay the course for 2010 until the BOF and State Forester give direction to the program for harvest levels. The BOF is in the middle of making policy decisions regarding the FMP and harvest levels. New data is being presented to the board in November and the department is awaiting the decision of the board at that time.
- General Fund: There is a downward trend in the economy. In the current cycle, the department is looking at taking a 10% cut off of the previous years expenditures in the general fund. Currently, this is being taken solely from the Private Forests program instead of across the Fire Program and the Private Forests Program. There is a high likelihood of cuts being requested by the Governor. There are going to be fewer services provided due to this reduction.
- The 2008 Fire Season was excellent. While there were two major fires on State protected lands, the amount of resources utilized were low for this year. The utilization of the severity fund (this was approved by the legislature two biennia ago), which pays for air tankers, helicopters and engine move-ups, has paid of significantly in the past couple of fire seasons.

BOF Performance Measures:

¹ Meeting Summary reflects key issues, discussions and decisions, not verbatim language.

The following information was provided to the BOF at the November BOF meeting. It came as a result of a facilitated discussion by Jeff Foreman at this meeting. Background information was provided by Barbara Lee, Mike Cafferata, Ron Zilli and Nancy Hirsch.

SFAC

Multi-Stakeholder Dialogue on Strategies to Achieve the BOF Performance Measure Targets for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests

Committee Feedback and Input

1. What information in the report was the most significant to you?

- No direct monitoring of SOC, making adaptive mgmt difficult – academic
- Too many assumptions relative to PM #6 (F&W) – industrial
- Too many data gaps or unknowns – environmental
- We need to verify assumptions (ex. structure provides habitat).
- Not enough data regarding impacts to SOC – environmental
- Need more measurement tools – non-affiliated
- There may be perils to policy from an inability to convey the shortcoming of the performance measures and the model runs, currently there is too much confidence that the performance measures and model results provide the definitive decision tool – motorized recreation
- The dependence of recreation on timber revenue is weakly acknowledged – industrial
- Report doesn't reflect the sense of urgency related to needed improvements in recreation management – motorized recreation
- No feedback mechanism to test assumptions that structure = populations (not ideal for decision making) – academic
- Broad general public (voters) opinion not factored into BOF decision space
- Need future review and adjustments in the future – environmental
- High degree of implied accuracy/precision in the model results but no measurement of error (e.g., inventory, yield, etc.) – academic

- Focus of presentation only on timber revenue. Would like more info regarding non-timber revenue sources – environmental
- Missing analysis of: 5 & 10 year effects to recreation program, long term effects to recreation, water quality, wildlife, & environmental goals – non-motorized recreation
- Why would increasing harvest now be a consideration when log prices are so low? – non-motorized recreation
- In-stream habitat improvement is not factored in as a mitigating effect to increasing timber harvest – watershed council representation
- Surprised that the base model will achieve 144 MMBF and 28% complex structure in 20 years – recreation
- Surprised that there is such a large disparity in county by county benefit from performance measure model run – non-affiliated
- Surprised that Tillamook will only reach 16% complex structure in 20 years (and the difference between districts) – environmental
- Concerned that revenue targets are the favored metric in the performance measures, the state cannot control revenue but it can control volume, ODF does not have authority to control revenue, particularly with a fluctuating market – tribal representation
- The performance measure model run is a misnomer, actually it's a structure run because it does not achieve the 30-35% revenue goal – industrial
- The performance measure model run does not analyze attaining the revenue goal as the primary objective – industrial
- The performance measure model run does not consider effects to all of the performance measures. It assumes that all of the other performance measure goals would be achieved.
- Non-motorized recreationists view the economic goals being over emphasized, water and other resource values will soon be just as valuable.
- Performance measure model run puts fish and wildlife goals at greater risk - recreation
- The new information in the model makes decision implications more clear – non-affiliated

2. What does this information tell you about the need for balancing or re-balancing economic, environmental, and social goals to achieve the GPV on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests?

- Not enough emphasis on local stakeholders and beneficiaries – industrial
- Balance of effects to stakeholders and beneficiaries is not adequately addressed in performance measures – industrial

- Economic and social interactions are more intricately linked than the performance measures represent, for example if local economies suffer, then recreational users will decline – industrial
- There is a cost for everything, the reality of balance is that there is always give and take – environmental
- The performance measure model run is too biased toward gaining economic goals – recreation
- Too much emphasis on structure and not enough on recreation & education. Statewide user information suggests there are at least 1 million Oregonians that enjoy hiking and outdoor recreation – recreation
- Non-motorized constituents favor the current plan and the 50% structure goal – non-motorized recreation
- Difficult to put a value on water because its not being sold, performance measures weakly address the value of water – watershed council representation
- Performance measure #1, the rate of return on asset value under the base model run is abysmally low (2%), indicating that the asset is being under-utilized, thus the taxpayers will not be able to derive the full potential of their benefits from state forests, instead they will have to keep paying for it. It could be they'd be better off selling it – industrial

3. What information is missing that would have been useful in determining how to move forward with recommendations and a decision?

- Too much information. Information needs to be condensed and better summarized – non-affiliated
- Report too complex, it weakly articulates results, trends, and consequences
- Other than revenue goals, can management under the current plan achieve the other performance measure goals?
- Difficult to make decisions in the face of incomplete analysis and data (i.e., wildlife/aquatics), qualitative analysis, and quantitative analysis (volume/structure/revenue), creates a challenging decision space – academic
- Lacking data of recreation users on State Forest lands and the economic impact they have – recreation

4. Other Comments

- State Forests started as a deal with the counties, the deal has come a long way; I commend ODF for sharing the analysis and seeking stakeholder feedback – non-affiliated
- Need to step back and look at the big picture, consider the intangible contributions of state forests at the macro-level and their contributions to regional ecosystems, the global climate, and the carbon cycle. State forests

have value other than what the performance measures attempt to address – recreation

- The BOF needs this information boiled down and summarized in a more compressed manner so they don't focus on details – environmental
- The State Forests program shouldn't put an inordinate amount of energy into refining the performance measures, but rather focus on improving data, conducting research and monitoring, reducing data gaps, and improving analysis confidence limits, ODF should keep these items as priorities...decisions made without qualifying the limitations of the info and the analysis risk being misplaced – motorized recreation
- Modeling and analysis of options to increase revenue while maintaining environmental and social goals should remain a high priority



Comments on the Facilitated Process:

Some members found the process for providing feedback through this meeting to be frustrating. Staff presented information for three hours and only gave the committee a limited amount of time to give their comments. Barrett Brown stated that a true multi-stakeholder dialogue process is set up to allow members to voice their opinions and learn from others input at the same time. This allows members to modify their input as other views are voiced. This process did not allow for that type of communication to take place.

Future Meeting Planning:

- The group looked at the work plan and agreed that the December meeting will cover the FY08 AOP accomplishment reports and the Wilson River Watershed Assessment findings.
- Future meeting dates for 2009 will be scheduled via e-mail by Jill Bradford.