

BOARD ISSUES WORK PLAN – 2012

Issue #2: State Forests

Date Work Plan Draft: January 2012

Contact: Mike Bordelon

Chief, State Forests Division

503-945-7213 mbordelon@odf.state.or.us

Contents

Page

BACKGROUND.....	3
Current Issues and Completed Work	4
Intermediate Board Issue 4—Review Long-range Land Acquisition and Exchange Plans or approve specific proposals.....	4
Historical Context	4
Board Products	5
Research and Information Needed.....	5
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	5
Timeframes w/Milestones.....	5
Resources Required	5
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	5
Intermediate Board Issue 5—Improve the Board’s Performance Measures for the State Forests Division.....	5
Historical Context	6
Board Products	6
Research and Information Needed.....	6
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	6
Timeframes w/Milestones.....	6
Resources Required	7
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	7
Intermediate Board Issue 6—Improve the Northwest Oregon Forest Management Plan to achieve desired outcomes	7
Historical Context	7
Board Products	7
Research and Information Needed.....	7
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	7
Timeframes w/Milestones.....	7
Resources Required	7
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	8
Intermediate Board Issue 9—Evaluate opportunities for improving economic performance on Board of Forestry forestlands (timber and ecosystem services).....	8
Historical Context	8
Board Products	9
Research and Information Needed.....	9
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	9
Timeframe w/Milestones	9

Resources Required	9
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	10
Intermediate Board Issue 10—Review and revise OAR 629-035-0020, -0030, and any other components of Division 35 the Department deems necessary to ensure an efficient and effective policy decision-making framework for the both the Board and the Department.	10
Historical Context	10
Board Products	11
Research and Information Needed	11
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	12
Timeframe w/Milestones	12
Resources Required	12
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	12
<u>Intermediate Board Issue 11—Exploring Conservation Areas.....</u>	10
Historical Context	10
Board Products	11
Research and Information Needed	11
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	12
Timeframe w/Milestones	12
Resources Required	12
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	12
<u>Intermediate Board Issue 12—Evaluating Alternative Management Scenarios.....</u>	10
Historical Context	10
Board Products	11
Research and Information Needed	11
Stakeholder and Public Involvement	12
Timeframe w/Milestones	12
Resources Required	12
Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue	12

BACKGROUND

The Department of Forestry manages about 848,000 acres of forestland in Oregon, which accounts for about three percent of Oregon's commercial forestland. There are six state forests; the, Clatsop, Elliott, Gilchrist, Santiam, Sun Pass, and Tillamook, plus scattered tracts. Eighty-five percent of the state forestlands are owned by the Board of Forestry; the remaining 15 percent are Common School Forest Lands (CSFL) owned by the state of Oregon. The Department manages CSFL under an agreement with the Department of State Lands (DSL) and the State Land Board.

Board of Forestry (Board) forestlands are managed to achieve healthy, productive and sustainable forest ecosystems that, over time and across the landscape, provide a full range of social, economic and environmental benefits to the people of Oregon. The CSFL are managed to generate the greatest amount of revenue in the long run for the Common School Fund, consistent with sound techniques of land and timber management.

Forestry Program for Oregon (FPFO) Goal A.6 addresses state forestlands managed by the Board . This goal says, “forestlands managed by the Board of Forestry consistent with its statutory authority will be promoted as an example of multiple resource management, and a practical demonstration of one forest ownership’s contributions to the Board’s statewide goals for environmental, economic, and social forest sustainability.”

This work plan contains the issues the Board chooses to work on during 2012 to achieve this goal.

Primary Board Issue #2— Consistent with statutory authority, how will the Board shape management of state forests so the forests are its example of multiple resource management, and a practical demonstration of one forest ownership’s contribution to the Board’s statewide goals for environmental, economic, and social forest sustainability?

This work plan organizes board work to meet this goal by:

1. Affirming the Greatest Permanent Value (GPV) rule as sound footing from which to depart on future work.
2. Revising and improving Performance Measures (PMs) to capture current Board values in and then evaluating and shaping forest management plan strategies.
3. Supporting program work to ensure financial viability of the State Forest Division.
4. Exploring options for Conservation Areas as a contribution to environmental, economic, and social goals.
5. Provide Board updates to include Research and Adaptive Management, follow up on the INR report and Gilchrist land acquisition efforts.
6. Following existing processes important to ongoing Board and Department work.

The intermediate Board issues in this work plan represent Board chosen issues that will be advanced over the coming year to shape management of state forests. In order to track and reference completed work, this work plan also includes previous intermediate Board issues that have been completed.

Current Issues and Completed Work

Completed Work:

IBI 1. Adapting Forest Management Plans (FMPs) through PMs. Completed - The initial PMs were adopted in 2007 and have been refined over time. The NW and SW FMPs were revised in 2010 based partially on the PMs and targets through IBI 6..

IBI 2. Assess the review framework (adaptive management). Combined with IBI 10, review and revise the GPV and Planning Rules. IBI 2 closed out. (The Board will track adaptive management through special reports and annual reports until addressing the role of adaptive management in the planning rule.)

IBI 3. Systematic Evidence Review. Completed.

IBI 7. Consider and approve the Elliott State Forest's revised Management Plan and Federal Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP).- Completed by Board adoption of the 2011 Elliot FMP.

IBI 8. Reaffirm the Board's vision for recreation on its forestlands. Combined with IBI 10, review and revise the GPV and Planning Rules. IBI 8 closed out.

Current Issues:

IBI 4. Review and/or approve Land Acquisition and Exchange Plans or Proposals

IBI 5. Improve the Board's PMs for the State Forests Division.

IBI 6. Improve the Northwest Oregon FMP to achieve desired outcomes.

IBI 9. Evaluate opportunities for improving economic performance on Board forestlands.

IBI 10. Review and revise the GPV and Planning Rules.

IBI 11. Evaluate Conservation Areas for contributions toward environmental, economic and social sustainability.

IBI 12. Evaluating alternative management scenarios.

Intermediate Board Issue 4—Review Long-range Land Acquisition and Exchange Plans or approve specific proposals

Historical Context

For both Board lands and Common School Fund lands, there are needs and opportunities for rearranging the land base. Some of this has been done in response to the DSL effort to align their forestland holdings with their asset management plan. Others are done to improve effectiveness of land management by strategic purchase, sale, or exchange with neighbors. Districts develop land exchange plans and also evaluate individual opportunities as they arise.

In 2010 the State purchased the 43,000 acre Gilchrist State Forest and continue acquisition efforts for remaining parcels of forestland in the Gilchrist vicinity that are available for sale and at risk of development. This land purchase was opportunistic: the lands came up for sale in a large block, the price was one the state could afford, and purchase advanced a number of state goals, including keeping forestland as forestland. Through this process the Board expressed an interest in better defining strategic direction for land acquisition.

Board Products

1. The Board will review updated district long-range acquisition and exchange plans prior to State Forester approval.
2. The Board will consider for approval individual land acquisition and exchange proposals.
3. The Board will review and approve the decertification of CSFL parcels prior to disposal by DSL that are consistent with the DSL’s Asset Management Plan.
4. The Board will review and refine as needed, its strategic direction (currently expressed in FMP land base goals) as a result of HB 2216, and may review and revise the Oregon Administrative Rule (OAR) for land acquisition and exchanges.

Research and Information Needed

District staff will obtain information needed for acquisition and exchange plans, consistent with policy guidance. Staff will gather information as required by OAR and Department operational policy. Staff will develop an Issue/Opportunity paper to be used for the Board’s strategic discussion related to land acquisitions and exchanges.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

Public comments will be solicited as part of the process for conducting land acquisitions and exchanges as required in the OAR. Public processes may also be utilized in the discussion of strategic direction

Timeframes w/Milestones

TBD	Review	District Land Exchange Plans
TBD	Decision	Review and approve decertification of CSFL parcels prior to disposal by DSL.
March	Update	Gilchrist State Forest acquisition process
TBD	Discussion	Strategic Direction

Resources Required

Salem and district staff time will be needed to develop and pursue district land exchange plans, review and provide input on proposals for disposal of CSFL parcels by DSL, pursue the remaining Gilchrist State Forest, and advance the discussion on strategic direction . Resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between other field and staff work. At this time, the priority will be on continuing to pursue acquisitions for the Gilchrist State Forest with limited resources devoted to District land exchanges or strategic discussions at the Board level.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

Progress on this issue will be evaluated at each session, and reflected by approval proposals.

Intermediate Board Issue 5—Improve the Board’s PMs for the State Forests

Historical Context

The Board adopted nine PMs that span the breadth of the social, economic and environmental benefits to be provided under “GPV.” These PMs are an important tool for periodically informing the Board on outcomes resulting from management of its forestlands. The Board will continue improving these tools to ensure they effectively measure whether an appropriate balance of these benefits is being provided under the management of its forestlands.

January 2010: The Board directed the Department to adjust the target for PM 3 from 30-35% to 5-15% as recommended by the Department The November 2010 PM report discussed possible improvements for each of the nine PMs.

The Institute of Natural Resources (INR) provided a report at the April 2011 Board meeting, which, among other things, recommended improvements to the PMs. The Board work on the planning rule (and the related INR recommendations) could also inform where PMs fit within the State Forests policy framework and how they are utilized.

PMs are the measuring stick against which FMPs are compared to consider achievement of environmental, economic, and social benefits. Board supported PMs are fundamental to conversations about relative strengths and weaknesses of alternative FMP strategies.

Board Products

- 1. PMs that accurately represent current Board intent, and effectively measure the appropriate outcomes.

Research and Information Needed

The Board can begin its conversation on this issue with discussion of the research and information provided through the November 2010 performance report, through the INR Report, and through discussion of the benefits expected from forest management. Further research and information gathering will be required develop concepts into accepted measures.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

The level of review and input on the PM information with beneficiaries, advisory committees and stakeholder groups will be determined as part of this work plan.

Timeframes w/Milestones

March	Information	Discussion of how PMs inform current and future management and management strategy evaluation..
	Decision	New PMs to be developed by staff based on input from the Board and Stakeholders Board endorsement of a process, associated timelines, to complete PM revisions.
July	Information / Decision	Update on PM process. Possibly review and approve revised PMs.

Other	TBD
--------------	-----

Resources Required

The department resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between this, the other board work plan products, and division operations. Additionally, the Department will seek subject matter experts to inform Board and department work on this item.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

Progress on this issue will depend on the process endorsed by the Board at the March meeting. Over the long-term, staff will present the Board with updated information, results, and background information on each PM on a biennial basis. Improvements to the PMs (metrics and targets) are anticipated to continue as new information becomes available.

Intermediate Board Issue 6—Improve the Northwest Oregon FMP to achieve desired outcomes

Historical Context

At the April 2010 meeting, the Board approved the Northwest and Southwest FMPs and adopted them into administrative rule.

The Board also requested a scientific review of the revised FMP. This review examined the body of science the Department considered as it evaluated FMPs and developed the Species of Concern strategies. The review was completed in 2010 by the INR. The department continues to follow up on this review. Remaining on this IBI is to track the Department’s work to evaluate the INR recommendations. In a longer term context, the 2010 NW FMP will be evaluated against improved PMs and used as a “baseline” to compare alternative management strategies.

Board Products

1. As developed resulting from Department updates.

Research and Information Needed

Research and information work for this issue has largely concluded.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

Involvement will be through Board meetings and public comment opportunities.

Timeframes w/Milestones

March	Information	Update on Department work with INR.
--------------	-------------	-------------------------------------

Resources Required

The resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between this, the other board work plan products, and division operations. No additional funding is likely to be available – the agency will be facilitating this process with existing resources.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

The Board will monitor achievement through Board updates.

Intermediate Board Issue 9—Evaluate opportunities for improving economic performance on Board forestlands (timber and ecosystem services)

Historical Context

In 2007, the Board adopted nine PMs intended to inform it of outcomes resulting from State Forests' FMPs. The Division completed work under the 2008 Clatsop/Tillamook Strategies project that focused on identifying a management approach to best meet all nine PMs on the Clatsop and Tillamook State Forests, and the established targets for these forestlands. This project indicated the target for PM #3 of increased revenue on these forestlands could not be met by relying only on timber harvests and existing business practices.

Additionally, economic conditions at the local, regional and national level have dramatically declined, resulting in coinciding declines in the revenue derived from timber sales. This economic downturn has consequences for the ability of the Division to meet sustainable harvest projections and revenue distributions to the Trust Land Counties, and to maintain services that contribute to all nine PMs.

The Division is examining opportunities for improving economic performance. Such opportunities include evaluating the merit of certification, exploring new opportunities that may require Board-level discussion and re-examining business practices and the business model for the Division.

In April 2010, Board directed the Department to manage the Gilchrist lands consistent with the Eastern Region Long Range FMP and continue exploring and potentially securing a carbon pilot project on those and adjacent lands. In July 2010, the Department recommended not submitting a legislative concept for wind energy due to lack of staff to support the legislative process.

In 2010, the Department conducted an investigation of the feasibility of a forest carbon project on the Elliott State Forest as a means to improve overall revenues realized from this asset. Results of this analysis indicated that, as a consequence of a number of protocol requirements, the Department would not be able to meet its mandate to “maximize revenue to the Common School Fund over the long term, consistent with sound techniques of land management” through the sale of carbon offset credits. The Department continues to pursue ecosystem services, both through carbon credits and through other developing markets.

Since 2007 the account balance in the Forest Development Fund (FDF), the account used to pay for management expenses on Board lands, has dropped from about \$40 million to about \$17million in July, 2011. Based on current and projected timber prices for State timber sales, the FDF balance is projected to decline to dangerously low levels by July 1, 2013. In addition, the management of CSF Lands is not meeting revenue or cost/revenue targets.

Starting in fiscal year 2010 (FY10) the agency reduced expenditures by about \$10 million (30%) and has continued with reduce spending for FY11 and FY12. As a result the agency has not been able to maintain pre-recession investment levels in recreation, research and monitoring, inventory, young stand management and other key aspects of forest management.

In the fall of 2011, the Department convened a workgroup to develop options and make recommendations regarding policies, strategies and actions that will result in short and long term financial viability for the agency and result in more appropriate investment levels for state forest management. One aspect of the Financial Viability workgroup effort will be to evaluate the potential economic and social values associate with Forest Certification.

Board Products

1. The Board will provide policy direction where needed.
2. The Board will receive periodic updates related to:
 - a. Gilchrist Carbon Project related to The Conservation Fund’s acquisition of the Gilchrist Tract and carbon project development on the new Gilchrist State Forest. The Department will seek endorsement from the Board before entering into any Project Implementation Agreement.
 - b. Ecosystem market opportunities.
 - c. Financial Sustainability- Policy level issues and opportunities that result from an evaluation of business practices and the business model for State Forests. By example a potential change in PMs to include a measure that relates to financial solvency of the state forest division.

Research and Information Needed

Staff will continue this work, and develop background and/or issue papers relative to identified opportunities for use in supporting any discussions and decision-making. An effort is underway through an agency workgroup and stakeholder involvement to identify short and longer term options to insure financial sustainability of the state forests division and to re-build investment levels in State Forests.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

The effort currently underway to address Financial Sustainability includes direct participation by the Trust land counties, and involvement of a diverse stakeholder group.

Timeframe w/Milestones

March	Discussion / Decision	Receive progress on financial sustainability work.
--------------	--------------------------	--

Resources Required

The resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between this, the other board work plan products, and division operations. No additional funding is likely to be available – the agency will be facilitating this process with existing resources.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

Board monitoring will depend on the direction and decision the Board provides as these opportunities are explored and presented

Intermediate Board Issue 10—Review and revise OAR 629-035-0020, -0030, and any other components of Division 35 the Department deems necessary to ensure an efficient and effective policy decision-making framework for the both the Board and the Department.

Historical Context

Events leading to the development of the current GPV rule and other planning rules associated with State Forests management.

1993: A conflict arose over a timber sale in the Cascade foothills. In subsequent dispute resolution mediation, the Department agreed to enter rulemaking on long-range planning and GPV.

1995: Legislative Session – In response to growing concerns about harvest levels by the counties and others, the Department’s budget for the 95-97 biennium included a budget note directing the agency to work with the counties on a policy statement that would clarify the purpose of the lands, and more clearly codify the counties interest in these lands.

A task force was appointed and charged to develop a policy statement describing the purpose of the lands and the relationship between the state and counties. Efforts were focused on developing a legally defensible interpretive rule to evidence the understanding of the counties in transferring these lands to the state, and to describe the continuing relationship, as well as interpret the statutory language and reflect the applicable judicial decision.

1998: These concerns and subsequent actions culminated in the administrative rules adopted by the Board.

2001: The Board adopted the Northwest and Southwest Forest Management Plans (NWFMP & SWFMP)

The 2001 NWFMP represents the Board and Department’s interpretation of the GPV rule at that time. With adoption of the plan, the Board adopted a key assumption, one validated at the time by scientists: If we focus on developing high levels of diverse fish and wildlife habitat in this mostly even-aged forest, we would in the process meet people’s desires for other benefits, such as timber revenue, jobs, and other social benefits.

June 2009: Eight years of experience has shown that a stated goal to provide both high levels of improved wildlife habitat and timber production was not achievable. Thus, the Board decided to make revisions to the NW & SW FMP’s that will result in a rebalance of the social, economic and environmental benefits being provided. The Board also decided to revisit the foundational policy framework (the GPV rule and other related planning rules), of which the plan was built upon.

At the November 2009 meeting, the Board directed the Department to proceed with review of current administrative rules Section 629, Division 35, as directed in June, by including consultation with the Forest Trust Land Advisory Committee (FTLAC) and public input through a public advisory committee, with a focus on promoting the most desired set of forest benefits and efficient decision-making processes.

During the June and July 2010 meetings, the Board discussed GPV rule concepts by utilizing a guided discussion framework that addressed 4 key policy and value questions:

1. Beneficiaries of Oregon's State Forests
2. Main elements and deliverable of GPV
3. Standards for these elements
4. Interaction of these elements

The Board then focused its attention on the planning rule during the September and November 2010 meetings. After review and discussion of other agency approaches to natural resource planning through adoption of administrative rules in September, the November meeting included an overview of the planning rule context, decision-making hierarchy, and several discussion questions; including:

- Board's role within overall planning framework
- difficulty in quantifying language
- general responsiveness and flexibility within the rule
- an openness to greater PM adjustments
- more definition around outcomes
- reference to adaptive management in other areas of the rule
- ongoing review process as opposed to the ten-year review
- inclusion of PMs

This agenda item concluded with a recap of next steps that included a point where the Board would affirm or amend rule concept narratives at a future Board meeting.

The concept narrative statements were presented and discussed during the March 9, 2011 Board meeting. Department staff recommended that this work plan (IBI 10) be moved to a "pause" status due to the Board's interest in the "conservation areas" topic and the possible linkage to the GPV rule. However, the planning rule would be re-visited following additional staff work to address several issues expressed during the rule review and discussion, including; conservation areas, PMs, monitoring and adaptive management, and levels of responsiveness and flexibility.

Board Products

1. Affirmation of the current GPV rule
2. Continue work on the Planning Rule at a future date.

Research and Information Needed

Staff will continue preparing for this work, and communicate with the Board on process and preparation of work products. Resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between other field and staff work.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

TBD

Timeframe w/Milestones

January	Discussion/ Decision	Affirm current GPV rule.
----------------	-------------------------	--------------------------

Resources Required

The resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between this, the other board work plan products, and division operations. No additional funding is likely to be available – the agency will be facilitating this process with existing resources.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

Board monitoring will depend on the direction and decision the Board provides as these opportunities are explored and presented.

Intermediate Board Issue 11—Exploring Conservation Areas

Historical Context

During the spring and early summer of 2010, members of the Board, Department staff, legislators and other interested parties began an informal conversation about the authority and mechanisms associated with providing enhanced conservation protection for specific areas of state forest land. Elements of those conversations included:

1. The Department has shared insights about the existing mechanisms based in the State Forest Land Management Classification and Designation process (spelled out in administrative rule), which enable the State Forester to craft focused or special stewardship for particular areas.
2. Some Legislators and the conservation community have expressed an interest in making those designations more visible and durable over time.
3. County interests have voiced observations about triggering potential legal issues if lands were removed from production permanently.
4. Board members have expressed a desire to work with all interests and to bring into the Board’s purview a mechanism for implementing site-specific enhanced protection measures.

As a result of these informal conversations, several parties were involved in developing specific language and mechanisms that formed the basis of legislation that was introduced during the 2011 session (HB 2736).

During the March 2011 Board meeting the implications of the legislation that had been introduced was discussed. House Bill 2736 would have authorized the Board to acquire, designate or exchange state forest lands to create natural resource conservation areas and establish a process for designation of these areas. Prior to the March Board meeting discussions about this bill occurred between legislative leaders, multiple interests, the Board Chair and the State Forester. Those discussions resulted in all parties agreeing the Board currently has existing

authority to designate conservation areas under Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 530.050 (12) and that further conversations were important to have within the Board's purview.

At the conclusion of the March 2011 meeting, the Board expressed an interest in furthering conversations on the conservation area topic and requested the Department provide an overview of the existing Board authority relating to land designation and classification. A consent agenda item was provided for the April 29, 2011 Board meeting that included three sources of background information related to conservation areas/values:

- (1) Schematic of Board authority and decision-making
- (2) State Forest Conservation Authority Backgrounder
- (3) Examples of Forest Land Management Classification acreages from Forest Grove and Astoria districts showing various levels of land base designations.

Department staff were tasked to recommend a pathway for Board work on the topic of conservation areas which is now reflected in this proposed new Intermediate Board Issue (IBI 11) Staff work on conservation areas will proceed as a two tiered approach. Tier one will focus on how to best utilize the Land Management classification system, landscape design and species of concern strategies to identify and convey the visibility and durability of conservation areas that exist within the existing FMPs and current policy.

The Second Tier of this work is to integrate the values associated with conservation areas into PMs and then to consider this strategy as a component of a potential "land allocation" approach to managing forest lands i.e conservation emphasis areas and wood production emphasis areas.

Tier one of this process started in October of 2011 when the State Forester directed staff to start preliminary work on "conservation areas" by 1) providing a framework of definitions that identifies levels of forest management activity and relative permanency of conservation status 2) by assessing and quantifying the number of acres and spatial arrangement of state forest lands that fall within this range of definitions

Additional Background/Context

Governor Kitzhaber joined the Board on November 3, 2011 to share his vision for forests and forestry in Oregon, and to provide some specific ideas and suggestions to the Board relative to State Forests. State forester Decker summarized the state forest themes in this way:

The Governor encouraged the Board and Department to strengthen state forest PMs and to consider a range of strategies that can help achieve those outcomes. He asked us to examine how we can use our existing authority to establish conservation areas that provide protection for sensitive resource areas. The Governor endorsed our focus on adaptive management, and asked us to be clear about identifying the resources we need for effective research and monitoring. In addition, the Governor recognized that we need to have a business model that funds all of this work, and that continues to generate revenues for our financial beneficiaries. The Board took his comments to heart, and members asked us to utilize these key elements as an overlay as we work together to develop the Board's 2012 State Forests workplan.

Board Products

1. Within the current NW FMP and Land management classification system, recognize existing areas that provide a contribution to conservation values or have special ecological/social significance. i.e recreation areas, waterfalls. Evaluate visibility and permanence of these areas.
2. Evaluate options for how the Board could administratively make these areas more visible to the public and provide more certainty that they will persist over time. Decide whether or not to pursue these options.
3. Incorporate conservation area values into PM improvement process and then into development of alternative management strategies.

The conservation area topic also links to the PM work. Here the expectations for contributions toward conservation values from State Forests and the expectations about public visibility and relative permanence of these lands are evaluated first on their own merits. After this, these values and concepts are rolled into performance measures and inform possible changes to management strategies.

Research and Information Needed

Staff are scoping this work, and develop background and/or issue papers relative to identified opportunities for use in supporting any discussions and decision-making.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

Staff will review and seek input on this topic from beneficiaries, advisory committees, stakeholders, and the public.

Timeframes w/Milestones

March	Information	A range of possible definitions developed from discussions with stakeholders, accounting of current areas that meet these definitions, and options for making these areas more visible and/or more permanent.
--------------	-------------	---

	Decision	Board endorsement of preferred pathway.
--	----------	---

Other	TBD	
--------------	-----	--

Resources Required

Department resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between this, the other board work plan products, and division operations.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

Progress on this issue will depend on the pathway option preferred by the Board at the March meeting. Over the long-term, staff will present the Board with updated information, results, and analysis related to the policy and planning issues for conservation area designations.

Intermediate Board Issue 12— Evaluating Alternative Management Scenarios

Historical Context

In 2010 the Board approved the revised NW and SW FMPs. At the time of this approval, the plan did not have strong support from any constituent but rather reset expectations to levels the Department believed the forests could achieve. Prior to FMP approval in 2010 some Board members expressed interest in evaluating strategies other than structure based management.

Upon approval of the first implementation plans that implement the 2010 FMP the State Forester wrote, “While I believe the current management plan is a creative and innovative approach to achieving policy objectives on state forests, it has not, as yet, produced the desired level of understanding, acceptance, and support among those interested in State Forests.”

At the November 2011 Board meeting Governor Kitzhaber recommended that the Board examine a range of forest management strategies, including a “land allocation” approach to determine which strategy or combination of strategies are best suited to deliver on desired outcomes. While there is a high level of interest in launching this work early in 2012, improving and affirming PMs is an important prior step to clearly define outcomes first and then identify management strategies to achieve those outcomes.

Board Products

1. Determine which alternative forest management strategies to evaluate
2. Choose an evaluation process and public involvement
3. Determine which, if any, alternative strategy better meets GPV
4. Refine the current FMP(s) or develop a new FMP that is aligned with the preferred alternative strategy(s).

Research and Information Needed

Board supported PMs that serve as the basis to compare different forest management alternatives. Analysis of those alternatives sufficient to make decisions between alternatives.

Stakeholder and Public Involvement

This topic will be of highest interest to stakeholders. A transparent public process will be necessary to meet the Board’s FPFO vision of the Board operating “openly and in the public interest.” This public involvement process will need to be developed.

Timeframes w/Milestones

tbd	Discussion	1 st draft of alternative strategies and develop next steps.
------------	------------	---

Other

TBD

Resources Required

Department resources necessary to support this work must be prioritized between this, the other board work plan products, and division operations.

Monitoring Achievement of this Intermediate Board Issue

Progress on this issue will depend on the completion of revised PMs and the methods chosen to evaluate alternative strategies. Achievement will be tracked through this workplan and the additional milestones developed to support this Board issue.