

Board of Forestry Issues List: Development of Management Strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests to Achieve the Performance Measure Targets

Current Process & Timeframe		Staff Assessment and responses	
1	<p>Related to revising/ updating/adding a performance measure target. Current schedule is to revisit in November 2008.</p>	<p>A target relative to the ratio of OFS and layered was not discussed in November 2007. Based on the analysis done last summer and fall related to the November 2007 discussion, the range of management scenarios modeled, including the current FMP, all produced a relatively small percentage of OFS in the first two decades (i.e. a few percent of the landscape) due in large part to the length of time needed to grow OFS.</p> <p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>	<p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>
2	<p>Related to revising/ updating/adding a performance measure target. Current schedule is to revisit in November 2008.</p>	<p>The current management plan with this longer term goal will continue to be in place until the Board takes action to modify the plan. The department recommendation in November 2008 will include information on implications to developing structure in the long-term, given what is needed to achieve the PM targets.</p> <p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>	<p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>
3	<p>The current Salmon Anchor Habitat (SAH) strategies are set to expire in 2013. The department recommendation in November 2008 will include a proposed species of concern strategy for salmon developed in order to meet all nine PM targets which, if approved, would replace the existing SAH strategies.</p>	<p>The current process and timeline for staff work on this issue, as it relates to the PMs, is reasonable and workable from the department's perspective.</p> <p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>	<p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>
4	<p>The PMs and targets do not currently include a specific target relative to SBM. The department recommendation in November 2008 will include information on the extent to which structure-based management may continue to be used as a management tool to achieve all nine PM targets.</p>	<p>The PMs and targets do not currently include a specific target relative to SBM. The department recommendation in November 2008 will include information on the extent to which structure-based management may continue to be used as a management tool to achieve all nine PM targets.</p>	<p>Part of the presentation/discussion on the box A, B, and C figure from the November 2007 meeting was to be sure the Board understood that PM targets within boxes B and C would likely result in significant modifications to the current FMP. Targets in these boxes are likely to reduce the area and extent to which the structure-based management (SBM) tool might be used to meet Greatest Permanent Value. The recommendations in November 2008, and accompanying analysis, will provide information on the implications for the continued use of SBM as a management tool.</p>

Board of Forestry Issues List: Development of Management Strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests to Achieve the Performance Measure Targets

#	Issue	Current Process & Timeframe	Staff Assessment and responses
5	<p>Ecological Consequences of Habitat Target – (a) What habitat target would be necessary to sustain viable populations of all native species and recover all listed species and species of concern to viable levels? –Peter Hayes</p> <p>(b) Is there still a commitment to one of the current FMP goals, “maintain biological diversity across the landscape”(p.3-14)? If yes, what amount of complex habitat is needed to confidently reach the goal? How does this figure compare to the 17 – 20% target that we asked staff to explore? –Peter Hayes</p> <p>(Policy Item)</p>	<p>Related to revising/ updating/adding a performance measure target. Current schedule is to revisit in November 2008.</p>	<p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p> <p>(a) Using the framework of the box A, B, and C figure from the November 2007 Board meeting to try and determine what would be comparable to sustaining “viable populations of all native species and recover all listed species and species of concern to viable levels,” the corresponding target for PM #6 might lie somewhere either within or to the left of box A. Within box A, the analysis showed two modeling scenarios achieving 22-23% complex structure within the first 20 years. If further analysis were done, there may or may not be other management scenarios that could meet or exceed that level of structure within a two-decade management horizon.</p> <p>(b) What might be necessary to “sustain viable populations of all native species and recover all listed species and species of concern to viable levels” is one possible interpretation of one of a number of current FMP goals: “maintain biological diversity across the landscape”. There is a broad range of interpretations of this goal that could be articulated as Board policy, depending on what outcomes the Board would like to see for the other eight PMs. For example, one end of the range could be defined as ‘a very high level of biodiversity across almost every acre of the landscape,’ while the other end of the range could be defined as ‘a very low level of biodiversity on relatively few acres across the landscape.’ Both ends of the spectrum would be consistent with the goal “maintain biological diversity across the landscape”. Scientific information can describe (1) the range of biodiversity that is possible and the associated ‘bookends’; and (2) where within this range State Forestlands could be managed to, given what the Board wants to achieve with the other eight PMs. The 17-20% target and narrative for PM#6 can be seen as a ‘surrogate’ for the level of biodiversity the Board would like to achieve on State Forests, in light of the other eight PMs and targets.</p> <p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that both (a) and (b) are policy items, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>

Board of Forestry Issues List: Development of Management Strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests to Achieve the Performance Measure Targets

Current Process & Timeframe		Staff Assessment and responses	
#	Issue		
6	<p>Consider restating our projected targets – Revise the targets for PM#3 and PM#6 to $\geq 30\%$ and $\geq 20\%$, respectively. – Bill Hutchison (<i>Policy Item</i>)</p>	<p>Related to revising/ updating/adding a performance measure target. Current schedule is to revisit in November 2008.</p>	<p>The current management plan and goals will continue to be in place until the Board takes action to modify the plan.</p> <p><u>March 5, 2008 Board meeting:</u> Board agreement that this was a policy item, to be potentially revisited in November 2008 as part of the next performance measure review.</p>
7	<p>Revenue-Harvest Relationships - Is the target for payments to government services indexed in some way to fluctuations in log values, and, if so, how? –Peter Hayes</p>	<p>The methods used for this PM can be shared with the Board through the periodic updates, and will be summarized as part of the PM review next fall.</p>	<p>An index to log values is one method that may be considered for the inflation adjustment associated with this PM, and is being explored by staff to build into the methodology for this PM.</p>
8	<p>Monitoring Resources – Are adequate financial resources available to implement and monitor the plan? If not, is it realistic to assume that increased harvest revenues could address this need? –Peter Hayes (<i>Information Need</i>)</p>	<p>Adequate financial resources are available to implement the current management plans. In terms of monitoring, the current operating budget allocates 5% of the program operating funds to monitoring, or about \$3.2 million per biennium. A 30-35% increase in revenues will result in a corresponding increase in available monitoring funds, which would amount to about an additional \$1 million per biennium.</p>	<p>An additional \$1 million per biennium would allow substantially more monitoring to occur. How much more is dependent upon a combination of whether additional positions are needed and legislative approval of those positions could be achieved, and/or if additional monitoring efforts would need to occur through third-party contractors. While current resources do, arguably, allow for adequate monitoring of the management plans over time, additional resources would increase the amount of monitoring that could occur (e.g. increase the number of projects) at a given time. This could potentially lead to more timely answers to key monitoring questions and greater success with the continuous improvement performance measures process we are moving forward on.</p> <p><u>April 29, 2008 Board meeting – Staff presentation:</u></p> <p>The SF research policy provides for up to 5% of the program fiscal budget for research, monitoring, and technology transfer. Since the budget will vary, in fact the agency is going through some belt-tightening right now, it is important to recognize that we have built a conservative and sustainable baseline program that will survive funding fluctuations, rather than a large aggressive program that would be faced with cuts in critical elements. We can enlarge the program in good times, but we must always have a solid base to fall back on. As one way to achieve this, we have built on existing expertise within the agency. An example of this is with Private Forests monitoring, where we have common information needs, such as in riparian areas.</p>

Board of Forestry Issues List: Development of Management Strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests to Achieve the Performance Measure Targets

#	Issue	Current Process & Timeframe	Staff Assessment and responses
9	<p>Species Plan – Species of Concern Plan – Are these plans currently in place? If not, what is the plan and timeline for getting them in place? –Peter Hayes <i>(Information Need)</i></p>	<p>The department recommendation in November 2008 will include a proposed Species of Concern (SOC) strategy, as directed by the PM#6 target. Further, it will be developed in a way that is intended to also meet the other eight PM targets.</p>	<p>There has been a steady increase in investments in the program, both in projects and staff. For example, between FY2003 and F&2007, expenditures increased from \$580k, or about 2.6% of the fiscal budget, to \$1,307k, or about 4.0%</p> <p>Increased revenue/budget would require more budget limitation in both FTE (ability to administer contracts) and in contracts.</p> <p>A SOC strategy is currently in place, and will continue to be in place until the Board takes action to modify that management plan strategy.</p>
10	<p>Decreasing Uncertainty re Habitat – Given our concern that the range of certainty about current level of complex habitat (3 to 11%) is remarkably large, what is the plan and timeline for narrowing this gap? What amount of improvement in accuracy is anticipated? –Peter Hayes <i>(Information Need)</i></p>	<p>An updated report on this metric will be provided as part of the November 2008 PM review. We anticipate that the gap will be narrowed through imputation of the standing inventory, but at this time we do not know the amount of improvement in accuracy.</p>	<p>How ever we move forward with the management of the Clatsop and the Tillamook, including under the current plan, this range of uncertainty exists. The program will be working towards narrowing this uncertainty in time, with some expectation that the 3-11% range (the range represented at the November 2007 Board meeting was actually 3-10%) is more likely to narrow towards the higher end, rather than the lower. Within the context of the biennial review of performance measures, this metric will provide a forum for the Board to regularly review the relevant target(s), and the department to report on the progress for improving the range of certainty on this measure. If this target ends up being met sooner than expected, the Board will have the opportunity to update the target at that time.</p> <p><u>April 29, 2008 Board meeting – Staff presentation:</u></p> <p>A sub work group has been formed to address this issue. Field and staff representatives are conducting on-site tests in the Astoria and Forest Grove Districts, examining many existing stands that may be “complex” that are not identified using the current Diameter Density Index (DDI) algorithm. Field reviews indicate that current DDI thresholds for “complex” stands may be too high for some stand types, and results in under reporting of existing “complex” stands.</p> <p>By the end of May, the Department hopes to have tailored DDJ’s for different stand types. Once the DDI algorithm is refined, SLI will be calibrated to</p>

Board of Forestry Issues List: Development of Management Strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests to Achieve the Performance Measure Targets

#	<u>Issue</u>	<u>Current Process & Timeframe</u>	<u>Staff Assessment and responses</u>
			reflect these changes. At that point there should be an updated current forest condition in SLI that has increased confidence.
11	<p>Ecosystem Services Study – What should we anticipate receiving from the OSU researchers, by when, and how will this information be integrated into our process? –Peter Hayes (<i>Information Need</i>)</p>	<p>The language in PM #2 target will be the guide, and in November 2008 progress on this effort will be reported in the context of if/how it can be used as a performance measure metric and potentially a target. Information on this effort can be provided to the Board during updates throughout the next year, as information is available.</p>	<p>A workshop was recently held with OSU researchers to determine the course of action for the project. At the workshop it was determined that there probably would not be sufficient data by November to report in a meaningful way on specific metrics (recreation; biodiversity; passive use; carbon sequestration; surface water quality) that might be considered in the context of the performance measures. OSU is currently revising the scope of work, and is anticipated to concentrate on the ‘upper level’ PFFO indicators that relate to the metrics for which there are adequate data.</p>
12	<p>Imputation – How well does imputation work on the Tillamook with SLI at 18%; is our data solid? –Bill Hutchison (<i>Information Need</i>)</p>	<p>Staff can provide a response at either the annual State Forests research and monitoring update, or as part of the next update on the improvements to the Clatsop/Tillamook, both during the April 2008 Board meeting.</p>	<p>This information is available and can be provided to the Board within the current scope of work.</p>
13	<p>Provide a checklist of proposed adaptations of the FMP – Clarify what stays the same, verses what is adapted or changed relative to any recommendation in November 2008. –Bill Hutchison (<i>Information Need</i>)</p>	<p>The department recommendation in November 2008 will include information comparing any alternative management approach to the current FMP, all in the context of achieving all nine PM targets.</p>	<p>This information can be generated within the current scope of work of the project, and summarized for the Board as part of the analysis and recommendations presented in November 2008. The depth and breadth of the accompanying analysis at that time, however, will depend on staff capacity and other competing workloads.</p>
14	<p>Further PM Refinement – What is the plan and timeline for continuing refinement of the performance measures? What will be done prior to Nov. 2008? What is the division between Board responsibility and staff responsibility on this? –Peter Hayes</p>	<p>The current process includes reviewing the performance measures and targets in November 2008. Immediately following this review, a process will be initiated with the Board in order to make a decision on revising/refining them as appropriate for the next report in 2010.</p>	<p>Between now and November staff will be working on reporting on the current PMs, and further development on some of those based on Board direction provided within the current targets (e.g. ecosystem services and recreation). As appropriate, staff will provide recommendations on new or updated PM metrics and targets in November, based on the guidance in the current targets and input from the Board over the course of the year. Staff will report on recommended revisions or additions only as resources and time allows. Board direction on PM metrics and targets following the</p>

Board of Forestry Issues List: Development of Management Strategies for the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests to Achieve the Performance Measure Targets

#	<u>Issue</u> (<i>Process Clarification</i>)	<u>Current Process & Timeframe</u>	<u>Staff Assessment and responses</u>
			November 2008 report (a separate process) will potentially result in an updated set of metrics and targets to report on for the 2010 review.