

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|---------|---|---|
| Dan Shults ODF | 2 | | Actions | 9 to 30 | We have a lot of "trivial many" mixed in with the "vital few." Many of the actions listed in the plan are far more tactical than strategic. The agency strategic plan should stick to the vital few actions in each program we want to accomplish described at a high level. Many of the items listed should be included in program work plans for the biennium, not in the agency's seven year strategic plan. A good example of a vital strategic action is to combine forest practices and forestry assistance administration in the field so the service is provided by the same individual to the landowner. One (of many) examples of a tactical action is "the department will develop and distribute educational materials encouraging active management of urban and rural forests." The strategic part of that is that the department will promote active management of urban and rural forests. The "how" is tactical. | All programs have been asked to review their "vital few actions" lists and revise as needed based on the comments received. It is intended that the more tactical actions and those dealing with day-to-day program operations be detailed in two-year program action plans, rather than the eight-year strategic plan. |
| NW Oregon Area | 13 | | Actions | | A strong sense of concern about the term "vital few." The last paragraph on page 7 seems to downplay the role that most agency employees accomplish. There are 224 "vital few" items. The "vital few" actions are defined in the document as being changes from what we do, but that didn't really pan out across the strategic plan. A lot of this looks like "continue doing the same." Seems like there is a disconnect between the majority of vital few actions, and the actual work done on a day-to-day basis by agency employees. Some programs' "vital few" are other program's "trivial many." | "Vita few" actions have been relabeled "vital" actions and remain defined as those critical tasks of the highest importance to the department. Also see response to Dan Shults comment #2" |
| NW Oregon Area | 14 | | Actions | | The vital few misses out on describing a significant amount of the real workload of the agency and could marginalize many employees. Potential to delineate program vs. field. Potential to make one more step down from the vital few to establish a connection with employees work. Possibility to prioritize the vital few? Can we expand on the overarching vital few (such as 1.1.1 on page 54). Potential to list "Day-to-Day Activities" as this next step down. Perhaps we need some further context here that links these action plans with the two-year update process to action plans. | See response above. ODF field districts may wish to develop their own operations plans to further connect agency strategic planning with the work of field employees. |
| NW Oregon Area | 16 | | Actions | | Disconnect between the term "vital few" and the fact that there are so many of them. If we really mean vital few, then maybe each program has just a few. | See above responses. |
| NW Oregon Area | 17 | | Actions | | Who is responsible for implementing the vital few? | The strategic plan indicates the program responsible for implementing each vital action. Two-year action plans may designate individual responsibilities. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| NW Oregon Area | 18 | | Actions | | Vital few actions in State Forests (for example) should list implementation of specific plans, such as transportation plans, recreation plans, etc. Concern that some programs are placing tactical and operational tasks at this level. | See above responses. |
| NW Oregon Area | 19 | | Actions | | This plan could be more meaningful to most employees if the action plan components were made more explicit and brought down to the next level so employees can see the general components of how they contribute to achieving agency mission/vision. See also comment 2.B. above. | Some employees may see more value in the more detailed two-year program action plans which will be tiered below this strategic plan. |
| NW Oregon Area | 21 | | Actions | | Add "Develop and Implement Business Plan for South Fork Forest Camp," and "Develop and Implement Business Plan for JE Schroeder Seed Orchard" into appropriate State Forests, Fire Protection and Private Forests vital few. Same for Nursery. | These proposed actions were not added into the plan by the programs, but can still be added into the two-year action plans. |
| NW Oregon Area | 24 | | Actions | | There is a serious disconnect for the Seed Orchard and how it ties into this document. Enhancing forest productivity and encouraging cooperative relationships, for example. These are important priorities for the Seed Orchard and it's hard to find them, as the Seed Orchard delivers them, in this document. | This proposed action was not added into the plan by the programs, but can still be added into the two-year action plans. |
| NW Oregon Area | 25 | | Actions | | This plan is much stronger and useful (in its current format) for staff, and not strong enough for the field. This lead to a discussion about the possibility of developing district action plans to bridge this gap. | Field offices are encouraged to develop operations plans that are tiered beneath this agency plan and the two-year program action plans. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 1 | | Actions | | We need to be more transparent to our constituents; make it clear what is most important and how we are going to get it done (example: state forests inventory work). | That is the intent of the agency strategic plan. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 6 | | Actions | | More clearly state how we are trying to dovetail the board's and the department's actions more closely than in previous planning cycles. | The text attempts to make it clear that this is the primary purpose of the strategic planning process. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 7 | | Actions | | Overarching department action to be building in more time for board/department discussions on important issues. | Board of Forestry process issues are beyond the scope of the agency strategic plan. |
| Astoria Unit ODF | 1 | | Actions | 7 | The use of the word "few" and "Vital Few" bothered me. Apparently this comes for the Covey training and is an understood reference. But for me, as a layman reading our plan it did not make sense. Maybe an explanation to explain this term or use a "lay" term. | This term is defined on page 4 of the May 27 draft. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Jewell Unit ODF | 11 | | Actions | | The inclusion of the vital few actions in the Agency Strategic Plan allows for better comprehension of how the plan itself applies to the field forester. Rather than being a vague document that the field forester is unable to relate with, the vital few actions provide a type of outline that is easily measurable and thus one can more easily connect with the agency mission as a whole. | That was our intent. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 8 | | Actions | | 244 ODF actions listed; what are the priorities (“critical tasks of the highest priority to the agency”)? | Priorities are set by the program, but department actions that address the Board of Forestry’s “key actions” are intended to the highest priority. |
| Steve Mealey Boise Cascade | 1 | | Actions | | From a process standpoint we suggest you might want to make a final check of all your “vital few actions” to make certain that each set taken as a whole is both necessary and sufficient to assure that each BOF action will be met. | Successful implementation of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> will require not only coordinated ODF program actions but also actions by others outside ODF jurisdiction. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 16 | | BOF A.8 | 11 | The conservation community should be prominent in these discussions. As mentioned above, too much emphasis is placed on OFRI, OSU, and others’ involvement and not enough on the conservation community and the public. It should not be the BOF’s role to promote OFRI propaganda that is more in line with industry’s objectives. We are wary of a communications and marketing plan without knowing details on the concepts that will be promoted. | The department welcomes opportunities to work collaboratively with the conservation, sustainability, and forest products communities on all actions listed under BOF A.8, within the sideboards set by state statutes and the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The department disagrees with the commenter’s characterization of OFRI. We believe OFRI is a valuable public education partner that is fulfilling its statutory mandate. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 17 | | BOF A.9 | 12 | Anywhere in the strategic plan where the term “active forest management” is used should include the word sustainable . The term should be “active, sustainable forest management.” | “Active management” is already defined in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and in administrative rule. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Audubon Society of Portland | 19 | | BOF B.2 | 13 | We do not feel that the BOF should develop programs to promote industrial development. | This comment is specific to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> approved by the Board of Forestry in October 2003. Further revisions to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> are not beyond the scope of this agency strategic plan development process. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 1 | | Core Business | 7 | I don't think the new core business function, "maintain the organizational capacity...", fits. Certainly maintaining capacity is desirable, arguably necessary, in order to carry out the core business functions, but it is not a core business function in itself. If we did not have the internal capacity, we would look to accomplish the true "core business functions" in other ways. | The core business function text has been revised after considering the comments received. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | 5 | | Core Business | 7 | The section on core business functions contains a bullet (second bullet) that says "manage state-owned forest resources." This statement should be expanded to include the language used in BOF strategy B.5. | The text has been revised to state, "Manage state-owned forest resources consistent with statutory, Board of Forestry, and State Land Board direction." |
| NW Oregon Area | 11 | | Core Business | 7 | Question about the paragraph that follows the core business bullets. What is the intent of this disclaimer? Could this be better incorporated into the body of the text before the bullets? | The text has been reformatted in the final draft. This additional information is key to understanding what supports the core business functions of the agency. |
| Astoria Unit ODF | 2 | | Core Business | 7 | The last item is at the top of page 7 of 73. When I read this I felt I could look at it in two ways. One from the point of view of the Department based on our Mission, Vision and Value statements. Or, I could look at from the other side of the things and ask "Minimize loss for whom?", and "Manage for what?" with the purpose to stop logging. Perhaps if you added a statement saying what the functions of the Department are founded on would help clarify the core business functions (beyond your statement that it is based on an ongoing assessment etc.). | The text was not modified as a result of this comment. Minor rewording of the functions was made for clarification. Our intent was to keep this section of the document as concise and brief as possible. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Jeff Peck ODF | 4 | | Core Business | 7 | I had a few comments on the draft Core Business Functions. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Minimize loss of forest... including fire, insects, disease, fire, {move fire to front} and damaging forest activities.</i> - Actively Manage state-owned forest resources. - <i>Facilitate forest stewardship... {good, keep}</i> - Maintain Ensure the organizational capacity within the department necessary to successfully carry out the above three functions. | Good suggestions. Some of these changes were made. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 6 | | Core Business | 7 | The Core Functions are well stated, except that the third bullet refers to "Facilitate", whereas the action verb "encourage" would be more appropriate. The word facilitate implies that ODF has an active role in private land management. ODF more accurately is a player, or advisor, rather than a leader of private forestry. | "Facilitate" has been retained as an appropriate descriptor of the department's role. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 8 | | Core Business | 6 | The term <i>core business function</i> : Question - is there another equivalent term/phrase? What is the distinction between "mission" vs. "core business function"? | As the text states, core business functions are intended to further describe the agency's purpose and amplify its mission. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 8 | | Executive Summary | | List in the Executive Summary the program strategies and leave the much longer list of vital few actions more for internal use. | The Executive Summary text has been revised after considering the comments received. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 17 | | Executive Summary | 1 | Executive Summary should better describe the substance of the plan. | The Executive Summary text has been revised after considering the comments received. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 5 | | Executive Summary | 1 | Statutory mandates - Would a list of mandates (in Appendix) be helpful to readers? Mandated programs as opposed to other programs are also (and remain) a part of the FPFO. Possibly the idea that the FPFO will continue to meet statutory mandates as well as assisting the BOF in achieving the strategies, actions and visions | It the interest of brevity, this additional information has not been added. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | *1 | | Format | | The format of the plan is complex, making it a difficult read. In this regard, the plan is “front-loaded” with planning jargon and description of the planning process where normally one would expect to find information about the department, its vision, mission, goals and major strategies (as identified in the 2003 <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i>). This is especially the case with the Executive Summary. It only describes the planning process and its relationship to budgeting and performance measurement. The Executive Summary should describe the substance of the plan. Similarly, the section of Planning Principles describes the principles that guide the planning process. Most readers would be more interested in learning about the principles that guide the department. | The introduction to the strategic plan has been revised. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | *2 | | Format | | The section entitled Agency Mission, Vision, Values and Core Business Functions would be an excellent beginning to the strategic plan. In this section, I would encourage the use of the phrase “healthy forest ecosystems” rather than “healthy forests.” This would signal an important recognition of forestland values. Related to this comment, a set of definitions early in the document would be valuable. In the 2003 <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> , there is a section about the language used in that document. This section would be a good addition to the strategic plan but should be expanded to define other terms that should include “sustainability or “sustained yield”, “conservation”, “stewardship” and “ecosystems” as well as other traditional forestry concepts. | It the interest of brevity, a glossary has not been added. Some of these terms are defined in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The text has been rearranged as suggested. |
| Scott Hayes ODF | 1 | | Format | | Specific comments and edits from Scott Hayes will be incorporated at a later date. Broader concepts he suggested were incorporated in the NW Oregon Area comments. | |
| NW Oregon Area | 1 | | Format | | There was a clear appreciation for the good work and thought that has gone into preparation of this document, and a consensus that this is leading the agency in the right direction. There was a sense that our comments here are more about the best way to package this and utilize this with employees and stakeholder, with few concerns about the strategic direction it leads the agency. | |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|----------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| NW Oregon Area | *2 | | Format | | Discussion about the audience for the document. Not formatted and written with clarity if this is an ODF-specific document. Suggestion about putting the action plans up front. Might be more straightforward for ODF internal use. General consensus that it would be difficult for a member of the public to really understand and respond to this material. | The primary audience for the document is the Board of Forestry and department managers. An objective of the planning process is to consider the department as a whole rather than as eight separate programs. Therefore, it is appropriate that the main body of the document remain organized around the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> framework. |
| NW Oregon Area | *3 | | Format | | Looking for a particular part of the document that is truly ODF-focused (as in, pertaining closely to day-to-day actions), perhaps done by program. Again, suggestion about putting the action plans up front. If the bedsheet format action plans are supposed to be the heart of the document, we're missing out by not making them more prominent. Look at the Watershed Assessment Manual as an example of a plan going from general to specific. Usually the background information is in the appendix and the most important stuff is up front. In this document, it seems just the opposite. | The program-specific strategic plans will remain an appendix to the strategic plan document. |
| NW Oregon Area | *4 | | Format | | Even accepting the two different ways of viewing the various actions and their relation to FPFO strategies, the document is still challenging and sometimes confusing to read, mostly because the transition between key components is less than obvious. | Breaks between major section of the document will be made more clear. |
| NW Oregon Area | *5 | | Format | | Question about the intent and purpose of public review of this document. Isn't this really an internal document? We recognize that we are trying to achieve UAS, but isn't that what the FPFO has already done? This should be an ODF document, and formatted and built so as to be clearly understandable to ODF employees, not necessarily worrying about having the document do the UAS work. Stakeholders are going to be more interested in performance measures. Perhaps this should be a two-step process: first, internally focused on getting a document that we support; and then second, run it through a stakeholder review. | We agree most stakeholders will be more interested in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The primary audience for the document is the Board of Forestry and department managers. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|----------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| NW Oregon Area | *6 | | Format | | We need to be clear about our expectations for successful review and understanding of this document, depending on the audience we have in mind. There's a sense that the document is trying to do too many things for too many audiences. Format and language are going to vary depending on the audience we are trying to target. | We agree most stakeholders will be more interested in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The primary audience for the document is the Board of Forestry and department managers. |
| NW Oregon Area | 7 | | Format | | The footnote style references from the Program Action Plans back to the FPFO provide more clutter than value. This was a unanimous feeling. Accomplish this by creating a matrix that links strategies and actions to FPFO components, and put it in an appendix. Suggest putting hypertext links in the electronic document to be the crosswalk between these documents. | Earlier drafts of the strategic plan proposed using a matrix as described, but this was also complex and problematic. The interconnectedness of department and board actions is an important concept that should not be lost, but it is difficult to display in a linear document. |
| NW Oregon Area | 22 | | Format | | Utilize the same structure as the eight-year plan for the two-year plan program action plans to facilitate the connection between employee, program, FPFO, etc. | The format for the two-year program action plans will be different. More details on deliverables, timelines, lead workers, and resources required will be included for each program action. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | *15 | | Format | | The FPFO and SP is not "lite reading" and doesn't leave the reader with any clear sense of what our focus will be over the next 8 years- I like the linkage of the SP to the FPFO- but because the key actions are overwhelmingly policy development and assessment. It does not give a clear picture of the connection to the "work of the agency." i.e. fighting fire, educating, assisting and regulating private forests, managing state forests etc. | As stated on page 7 of the May 27 draft, the purpose of the strategic plan is to focus primarily on new actions needed to achieve the department's strategies, without diminishing the importance of the ongoing work of all department programs. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 15 | | Format | | Need a better transition between document sections. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #4 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 18 | | Format | | Format differently if primary audience is ODF employees; organize main body around programs; format to gain employee understanding, acceptance, and support. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #2 above. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 1 | | Format | | It would add clarity, and help the reader wade through the voluminous Plan, if the Vital Few Actions were listed [in a paraphrased/key-word format] in the Executive Summary, and then again at the onset of the 24-page section. The utility of this Plan is fatally impaired by the ineffectiveness of the Executive Summary to capture the “taste” of the 73-page document. The summary tells what the Plan is “designed to” do, rather than briefly telling what the Plan says. | Rather than paraphrasing vital few actions, staff recommends listing the higher-level strategies proposed by the eight programs. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 7 | | Format | | The transition from Strategies A.-G. to Vision Statements 5 and 6 is awkward and unclear. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #4 above. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 8 | | Format | | The linkage between the Forestry Program for Oregon and the Plan is adequate. | The strategic plan is intended to be directly tiered to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . Not sure what additional linkages are being requested. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 2 | | Format | | Under “Agency Mission, Vision, Values, and Core Business Functions”: - Order of Review suggested should reflect orders of document. - More understandable for the public too - Similar format as FPFO | |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 3 | | Format | | There was agreement with the comments which were made from the Northwest Oregon Area Staff Meeting about the “Overview” of the draft Strategic Plan. | |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 6 | | Format | | Strategic Plan’s Pathway to Future does not link well with day-to-day activities/work. Link to a Programmatic “Action Plan.” | The two-year program action plans are intended to provide this linkage. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 7 | | Format | | It’s an “evolving” process” – make links you can now – it’s a good start. | |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 2 | | Format | | Possibly some text reorganization (such as chapters/sections) might be helpful. | Text has been formatted to make section breaks clearer. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 4 | | Format | 1 | Does the Executive Summary include pages 1 through 37 or does the Executive Summary end on page 2? | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #4 above. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 13 | | Format | 26& 27 | Suggest that the mention of seven strategies, four categories, and Visions statements 5-6, and also text addressing ~ ... <i>the following department actions</i> ...~ is difficult to follow. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #4 above. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 14 | | Format | 31-37 | Caption 5 Measuring Agency Performance . Question: this caption is under what higher topic heading? | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #4 above. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| Dan Shults ODF | 5 | | General | 8 | In my mind, PA, IT, HR and Bus. are support for the other programs, not programs themselves. More of a terminology thing. Maybe call P&CF, PFF, SF, and RP core businesses and the others programs? | |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | *3 | | General | | The plan appears to be designed to provide a means of ODF staff to identify priority tasks to be undertaken in the future. However, the plan should also serve as an important source of information for diverse stakeholders, who are less interested in process and staff tasks, and more interested in agency vision and goals. I am sure that the latter are contained in the 2003 Forestry Program for Oregon. Assuming they are, then the 2003 Forestry Program for Oregon is really a "strategic" plan and this document might be more appropriately described as an "operational" or "work" plan. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #5 above. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | *4 | | General | | It is difficult to discern the difference between a Key Action and a Vital Few. One seems to apply to the Board of Forestry and the other to the Department of Forestry. This relates to a major source of confusion about the plan in which there appears to be considerable effort to make a distinction between the Board and the Department. Shouldn't the two bodies be characterized as one and the same for the purpose of adopting a vision, goals and strategies? | Staff agrees and in hindsight would prefer that different terminology was used in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . The final draft will attempt to make the distinction between board actions and department actions clearer. |
| NW Oregon Area | 8 | | General | | Remember that this is an eight-year plan. Tactical two-year +/- plans (and further detailed operations plans) must carry forward with the expectations about who does what, when. Need to provide this context more clearly (particularly for internal reviewers), so as to set the expectation for the use of this document. | Staff agrees. |
| NW Oregon Area | 9 | | General | | There is no implied priority for the strategies and actions in this document. How do we prioritize all the good things to do here in the face of limited resources and time? Example: carbon sequestration. It's FPFO Strategy G and has multiple vital few, but if we do not have the resources, how much emphasis do we place on this, what do we not do, and is it truly a vital few? | Department actions associated with statutory and budget mandates, and actions associated with <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> key actions are intended to be the highest priorities. These priorities will be further evident in the two-year action plans. |
| NW Oregon Area | 23 | | General | | Discussion about a desired future where strategies and vital few are truly integrated across programs, and don't belong only to specific programs. Business practices and methods is an example, as is carbon sequestration...appropriate for multiple programs. | We agree that many actions will require cooperation between programs. The lead program is indicated in the plan. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 13 | | General | | The connection between FPFO- ODF strategic Plan and "real" work of agency employees is there for some of the FPFO strategies- things like carbon storage have almost no relationship to work at the field level. | The purpose of the strategic plan is to build those connections. But at the same time, it is unrealistic to expect every ODF employee to see a connection between their job and every action proposed in the plan. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 2 | | General | | The board wants to feel more empowered as a partner with the department. | That is one of the desired outcomes of this strategic planning process. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 3 | | General | | The strategic plan needs to show department alignment with the FPFO. | The format of the strategic plan is designed to show that alignment. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 9 | | General | | Stimulating outside-the-box thinking on forest sector economic development. | Forest sector economic development is a central focus of the board and department actions associated with <i>Forestry Program for Oregon Strategy B</i> . |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 10 | | General | | Request that the strategic plan be brought back to the board in October for "concurrence." | The State Forester-approved plan and a department progress report on <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> implementation will be provided at the October meeting. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 9 | | General | | Being a new employee it was beneficial for me to see a visual illustration of how the Department of Forestry approaches strategic planning. | Great! |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 10 | | General | 45 | Also, the table illustrating the relationship between the Mission/Vision, Strategic Emphasis Areas, Strategies, and Vital Few Actions helps me to see that how effectively I do my job can have an influence on whole system. | Great! |
| Coos Bay ODF | 2 | | General | | Dollars to implement usually deciding factor. How do you fund long term? | The strategic plan will be used to build future department budget priorities. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 3 | | General | | FPFO is complex - Could be clearer for the public to understand. | The <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> pocket guide was developed for this purpose. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 4 | | General | | Goal to encourage private sector commitment to local economies. | |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Jeffrey Raymond McClain University of Oregon | 1 | | General | 41 | Fire, floods, and insects are referred to as "natural disturbances." This is not the proper language for these ecological events. Fire, floods, and insects are natural occurrences, necessary for the ecological health and well being of the forest. Referring to them as "natural disturbances" reveals your natural leanings towards protecting the forest as an economic resource, not as an environmental end in itself. | See response to Audubon Society of Portland comment #19 above. |
| Jeffrey Raymond McClain University of Oregon | 2 | | General | | Lean towards treating forests as ends in themselves instead of as economic resources. | See response to Audubon Society of Portland comment #19 above. |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 1 | | General | 8 | Several times throughout the document acronyms are used for other state agencies. I was just wondering if on p. 8 they might be listed as well. Most people probably know them, but for those who aren't as familiar, and your outside customers who may be interested in the document, it might help clarify. | All acronyms will be defined or removed in the final draft. |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 2 | | General | | Along with this, several times I've seen a phrase similar to "The department will cooperate with XX, XX, 'and others' " ... and I'm wondering if that could be clarified to read other agencies, or other organizations. | Staff recommends identifying specific cooperators when they are known. |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 7 | | General | | And a general comment - I notice sometimes timelines are used and sometimes they aren't. The more they can be used, in my opinion, the better because it gives us something to shoot for. If not in this document, they could be defined more in the two-year plans. | Programs were asked to include timelines where possible. More detail will be provided in two-year plans. |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 8 | | General | | Another similar issue is in statements like BOF G.1 ODF a - 'the department will play a leading role ...' - leads me to ask how? | Text in the final draft will be made more specific. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 1 | | General | | Trying to do too much for too many audiences in one document. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #5 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 2 | | General | | Too much jargon for external readers. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #5 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 3 | | General | | Keep external stakeholders focused on the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> ; ODF strategic plan for internal use. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #5 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 4 | | General | | Plan does not go down into the agency far enough for all employees to see their roles. | See response to Dan Shults , ODF comment #2 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 5 | | General | | Salem staff will see their jobs in the plan, the field will not. | See response to Mike Bordelon, ODF comment #15 above. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 6 | | General | | No clear linkages to the daily work of the agency in the field; mostly references to policy development and assessments. | See response to Mike Bordelon, ODF comment #15 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 7 | | General | | Vital Few? Seems more like Vital Many/Trivia Many? | See response to Dan Shults , ODF comment #2 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 9 | | General | | Terminology confusing: Key Actions vs. Vital Few Actions. | See response to Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. comment #4 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 10 | | General | | Reads more like a tactical/operational plan rather than strategic; many listed actions would fit better into two-year program work plans. | Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 11 | | General | | Not clear what will be the agency focus over the next eight years - Lacks Strategy. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #9 above. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 12 | | General | | Separation between Board and Department may be confusing to external stakeholders; should their missions, visions, values be the same or different? | The final draft will more clearly address this issue. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 13 | | General | | No internal consensus on agency mission, vision, core business functions. | The final draft will more clearly address this issue |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 16 | | General | | Put agency mission, vision, vision, values, before planning process discussion. | Staff agrees. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 19 | | General | | Cross references not helpful, perhaps add a matrix in the appendix. | See response to NW Oregon Area comment #7 above. |
| Jeff Peck ODF | 1 | | General | | I have heard that future steps include for ODF Programs to develop detailed 2-year strategic plans to show planning and implementation for that period of the overall 8-year plan. I think the 8-yr strategic plan and subsequent 2-year period plans are and will be a great aid/communications tool to Salem Program staff and personnel, but does not provide the same level of value and ownership to the Field-based side of the organization. A discussion on the equivalent value of having District or Area-wide 2-year plans may provide more value to field units and help fill the stated planning principle that "strategic planning will consider the department as a whole rather than as eight individual programs." | Staff agrees. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Audubon Society of Portland | 1 | | General | | <p>Though we are aware that this strategic plan was written prior to Governor Kitzhaber's "Vision," we would like to see important aspects of it included in ODF's strategic plan. We share the belief with both former Governor Kitzhaber and current Governor Ted Kulongoski that there should be three fundamental elements in sustainable forestry. These elements include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A single overarching policy objective [watershed health], which drives the management plan. 2. Decisions based on interdisciplinary science. 3. Management at the landscape level. <p>Audubon Society of Portland strongly feels that these three elements should be included in ODF's mission, in its vision as fundamental guiding values and priorities, and considered high priority actions to be taken by the BOF. Watershed health should be emphasized more strongly throughout this entire document.</p> | These strategic plan has been developed within the policy sideboards established by existing statutes and the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 2 | | General | | We feel that the strategic plan too closely aligns ODF with both the Oregon Forest Resources Institute (OFRI) and with the Oregon Business Plan (OBP). OFRI and the OBP are not representative organizations and it is widely known that they are aligned with timber interests. | The Department of Forestry supports the Oregon Business Councils efforts to develop a clear Oregon forest sector economic development strategy and maintains that the Oregon Forest Resources Institute is successfully fulfilling its statutory mandate. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 3 | | General | | Also, the economic benefits of recreation should be emphasized just as much as timber production throughout this document. | |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 4 | | General | | Finally, we strongly recommend that the term "forest ecosystem health," or "forest ecosystem integrity" be used throughout this document and throughout all ODF documents in place of the term "forest health." We prefer the following over the definition provided in the 2003 Forestry Program for Oregon. Forest Ecosystem Health: Forest ecosystems exhibit health and integrity when they support native species, productive watersheds, ecological processes within historic ranges, and have stand composition, structure and ages that are resilient to likely disturbances (fire, wind, insects and disease), thus allowing productivity of soil, water and habitats to be maintained over time. | All definitions of "forest health" and similar terms are subjective. The department will use the definition approved by the Board of Forestry in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 1 | | General | 3 | <p>Under heading, "Department of Forestry Approach to Strategic Planning":</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Add ODF – Not clear for us. | ?? |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 4 | | General | | Not enough "Help" on understanding FPFO/Strategic Plan linkages. | The final draft will attempt to make these linkages clearer. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 5 | | General | | Not having adequate presentation on materials – (clearer to those who put it together than those who have to present it and gather comments). | Our intent was to make information about the strategic plan available to all employees who might be interested. More information is available upon request. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 1 | | General | | The day-to-day activities of all employees have to be recognized and made part of the strategic plan. Somehow, I see the conveyance of "a team effort" slipping away from what it really is. Suggestion: additional text mentioning "all-forestry" participation. | See response to Mike Bordelon ODF comment #15 above. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 6 | | General | 3&4 | Suggest a title such as " Overview " to caption 1. Purpose , and 2. Department of Forestry Approach ... , etc. | This change was not made. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 9 | | General | 7 | Insert "(FPFO)" after "Forestry Program for Oregon" to set off the caption. | The revised text avoids using the acronyms. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 10 | | General | 7 | Last paragraph - Suggest a more inclusive tact (the idea of a team approach). | This text was modified. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 15 | | General | 32 | A caption is suggested that associates new SFM indicators to OPB indicators. | No changes made. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 16 | | General | 32 | Last paragraph (3rd) and continuing through page 33: Suggest condensing this text; skip 3rd paragraph on page 32 and Figure 2 on page 33. Suggest relocation to an appendix, with a footnote to this effect. | No changes made |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 17 | | General | 33 | Page 33: Caption suggested followed by the introduction ~ ... <i>Department performance measures ...</i> . This provides the lead-in for the table Oregon Department of Forestry Agency Performance Measures now on page 34. | No changes made. |
| Wayne Giesy | 1 | | General | 20 | For example, in Strategy E, "The scientific term for this concept is Biological Diversity." Mark my work this terminology will come back to haunt us. This is the type of wording used by opponents to stop logging. | See response to Audubon Society of Portland comment #19 above. |
| Wayne Giesy | 2 | | General | | For sure Best Available Science is not an option, use Peer Reviewed Science. | No changes made. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| OFIC | 1 | | General | | Executive summary is well written, but the focus of it (and the rest of the document as well) is on <i>new</i> things that need to be done, not on the quality work the Department already does. By many measures, the Department would be considered very successful if they simply kept doing what they are doing now. For example, the second bullet in the executive summary uses the word “ <i>establish</i> ” when many of us believe those values and priorities are already appropriately established. | In a changing political, social, economic, and natural environments, ODF believes simply doing what we are doing now may not be adequate to achieve the future vision articulated by the Board of Forestry. The strategic plan focuses on new actions for the sake of brevity, but does not intend to diminish the ongoing work that the agency continues to do well. |
| OFIC | 2 | | General | | Too much emphasis is placed on planning. Multiple layers of planning, budgeting and evaluation tend to overshadow the importance of the work itself. In addition to budgets, apparently programs will be required to produce <i>biennial implementation plans</i> . This level of planning seems like it could easily become redundant and not add value. Consider removing some layers of planning and evaluation. | The department believes that planning is needed prior to developing budgets and that these two processes should be better integrated than in the past. |
| OFIC | 3 | | General | | The Department offers a brief disclaimer in the executive summary about their ability to predict the future. It is prudent in a plan of this scope and duration to further emphasize the unpredictable nature of this business. That can assist the Department later when major changes to the operating landscape occur. | The strategic has built in a two-year cycle of trend and assumption review and revision |
| OFIC | 4 | | General | | Throughout the document there seems to be an emphasis on achieving environmental protection goals, but less emphasis on the economic goals. For instance, a core business function is simply “Manage state-owned forest resources.” Why is it not “Manage state-owned forest resources for revenue production for counties and schools?” I am not advocating for the economic piece being portrayed as more important, but simply to have the same attention paid to it as to the environmental piece. | The cited text has been modified. The intent of the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and this strategic plan is to integrate environmental, economic, and social values in a sustainable manner. |
| OFIC | 5 | | General | | Throughout the plan the Department uses overly prescriptive language. Phrases such as “by 2005” and “the Department will” are used frequently. A strategic plan is supposed to guide actions, not trap the authors into doing things (and under timelines) that no longer make sense. | The planning process is designed to be adaptive and the strategic plan will not “trap:” programs into actions that no longer have a valid purpose. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| OFIC | 6 | | General | | Other phrases, like “ODF will be viewed credibly” or “the Department will influence federal decisions” are totally outside of the control of the Department. That language should be rewritten to dictate what is within the control of the Department. For example, “ODF staff will continue to work diligently to produce quality information and behave in the utmost professional manner.” | It is appropriate for the department to articulate the desired future it is working to create, including outcomes that it does not directly control. |
| OFIC | 7 | | General | | Many landowners disagree with language that purports to “create healthy forests.” Changing phrases like that to “create <i>and maintain</i> healthy forests” neither offends people nor changes the intent of the Department. Another example of this is the need to “establish a favorable business climate.” This already exists. | These statements are consistent with text in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . |
| OFIC | 8 | | General | | Specificity - Some items to be accomplished are very specific, while some are very broad. The Department should attempt to “level the playing field” a bit here. | The programs were given the opportunity to review these comments and revise their vital actions appropriately. |
| OFIC | 10 | | General | | Future Updates - This section should be eliminated. This appears to be planning for the sake of planning. | This section is needed to show how strategic planning will be integrated with the budgeting and performance measure cycles required by the Oregon Legislature. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 1 | | Mission | 5 | Shorten to- To serve the people of Oregon by protecting, managing and promoting stewardship of Oregon's forests in order to contribute to economic, community and environmental sustainability. | Mission statement text has been slightly modified. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 5 | | Mission | 5 | We feel that the Department of Forestry's Mission Statement should read, “To serve the people of Oregon by protecting, enhancing , managing, and promoting stewardship of Oregon's forests in order to strengthen their contributions to a sustainable environment that includes healthy watersheds and wildlife populations , a sustainable economy, and sustainable communities. | Mission statement text has been slightly modified. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| Jeff Foreman ODF | 1 | | Mission Statement | 5 | My 2 cents worth: The current proposed mission statement in the agency's strategic plan doesn't inspire me. It's too long, hard to remember, repetitious ("sustainable" 3 times) and the construction seems awkward (are we protecting and managing stewardship?). For discussion purposes, I'll offer a similar (but simplified) version. It follows. To protect, manage and promote healthy, sustainable forests to bring economic and environmental quality to the lives of Oregonians. | Mission statement text has been slightly modified. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 1 | | Mission/Vision | | Language in mission on sustainability contains moving targets – different definitions by different people. | Mission statement text has been slightly modified. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | 6 | | Strategies | | Strategies B and C are very similar and many of the key actions could have been written for either strategy. Likewise, Strategies D, E, F, and G are all related to ecosystem health and overall environmental quality and could be combined into a single overarching strategy. | These strategies have been established by the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and are not subject to revision in this document. All strategies are adapted from the internationally-recognized Montreal Process Criteria for the Conservation and Sustainable Management of Temperate and Boreal Forests. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 11 | | Strategies A - G | 9 | Table on pages 9 through 26 (FPFO Strategies A through G) is not titled but rather captioned under #4. Suggest some sort of table caption. | No changes made. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 10 | | Strategy A | 9 | We see little incorporation of conservation values in this strategy. The strategy should read, “Promote a sound legal system, effective and adequately funded government, leading-edge research, and sound economic and environmental policies.” | This strategy has been established by the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> is not subject to revision in this document. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 18 | | Strategy B | | We recommend you change this strategy to read, “Ensure that Oregon’s forest provide diverse social, economic and environmental benefits...” In general, we feel that this strategy is far too industry-biased and production-based. More emphasis should be placed on recreation values. | This strategy has been established by the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> is not subject to revision in this document. |
| Jeff Peck ODF | 3 | | Value | 6 | List of Value Statements should be as short as possible and include core values that are unchanging. A greater chance of drilling in the core agency values would be achieved by all employees in the agency if these are fewer, maybe 5 or less. Some statements may fit better in other areas. Some ideas given. | Value statement text has been modified in response to comments. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|--------|---|---|
| Audubon Society of Portland | 8 | | Values | 6 | Regarding ODF's value statements , we believe that the first bulleted item should read, - We strive to be a leader in professional, sustainable forestry, | Value statement text has been modified in response to comments. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 9 | | Values | 6 | And the second bulleted item should read: - We promote innovation and conservation based on sound science. | Value statement text has been modified in response to comments. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 7 | | Values | 6 | Suggest a statement to the effect that ODF's corporate philosophy is also to value its employees. | Value statement text has been modified in response to comments. |
| NW Oregon Area | 10 | | Vision Statement | 5 | Nothing particularly new here re: vision, values and core businesses. OK with this material. It has been institutionalized and points us in the right direction. | |
| Jeff Peck ODF | 2 | | Vision Statement | 27 | Statements 5 & 6 seem long and could either be shortened or removed. | The vision statements are written to be consistent with the vision statements already approved by the Board of Forestry in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . Staff believes it is important for the board and the department to share the same vision. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 2 | | Vision Statement | 6 | AOL suggests that a Vision and/or Value Statement be added, which articulates the important business-government relationship. Specifically, we believe that it is appropriate for "ODF to contribute to an atmosphere where private business prospers to create healthy and sustainable forests." This different, yet essential role, is not embodied in Vision Statement #2, which says "...landowners willingly make investments..." My concern here is that all the landowner "willingness" in the world would not overcome a potentially stifling burden of future regulation, if it were to occur. | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 3 | | Vision Statement | 6 | Another Vision and/or Value Statement worthy of consideration would be recognition of private property rights-values and the benefit of minimizing the negative impact of Department regulation or policies. | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 6 | | Vision Statement 1 | 5 | In terms of ODF's vision statements that will determine success, we would like to recommend a re-write of the first statement to reflect the importance of watershed health. We recommend that vision statement 1 read, "Healthy forests driven by watershed health , providing a sustainable flow of environmental, economic, and social outputs and benefits." | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------------|--------------------|--------|---|---|
| Walt Schutt ODF | 12 | | Vision Statement 5 | 26 | Suggest Caption. Suggest short introduction. | |
| NW Oregon Area | 12 | | Vision Statement 6 | 28 | ODF Vision statement 6 is a grab bag and not particularly understandable. All of the vision statements set the bar high and have the ring of bureaucracy. | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 7 | | Vision Statement 7 | 6 | We also feel that a 7 th statement should be added that reads, <i>“Adhered to the requirements of the Federal Endangered Species Act, Clean Air Act, and Clean Water Act in implementing management projects to ensure protections for threatened and endangered species, clean air and clean water.”</i> | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 22 | Business Svcs | Program Mission | 68 | Note the phrases ~ ... <i>“global business and asset management”</i> ... <i>“global business management policies and strategies ...”</i> . Suggest “global” to most readers means “world-wide.” Possibly the term <i>departmental</i> would be more descriptive and not quite so ambitious. (see Information Technology for an association or shared linkages and questions). | Text modified as a result of this comment. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | *11 | FRP | | | For clarity, the actions listed as ODF actions under BOF actions on pages 9 through 25 should also be clearly referenced in the table. They are referenced in the text on page 7, but not carried forward into the table. | The program actions listed by <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategy are the same actions listed in the appendix by ODF program. |
| George Ponte ODF | 5 | FRP | 4.2.4 | 60 | I have no problem with this but the question is how? I need the training and time to do this. I do not have a good understanding of land-use planning. Forest Resource Planning needs to have a stronger tie to the field of we are expected to monitor or influence local land use issues. | The field role in land use planning has been addressed by a recent ODF directive. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 6 | FRP | A.1, c | 9 | Disconnect between this strategy and what happens on the ground. This is a low priority due to funding. We are certainly not “actively participating.” | The field role in land use planning has been addressed by a recent ODF directive. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 4 | FRP | A.1.c | 9 | Delete “and local level.” | The field role in land use planning has been addressed by a recent ODF directive. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 5 | FRP | A.1.c | 9 | Not a vital action (comm plan for PCF). | The field role in land use planning has been addressed by a recent ODF directive. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| OFIC | 14 | FRP | A.8.a | 11 | If one doesn't accept that there is a problem, he or she would not need to "make progress." Terminology should be changed to address measuring current success. | ODF believes it is inappropriate to declare success and then measure it. Measurement should come first. |
| OFIC | 16 | FRP | B.2.a | 13 | I would delete the third and fourth bullets. Those are controversial and arguably outside the scope of Department authority | Text has been modified. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | 7 | FRP | BOF A.2 | | Should make reference to other natural resource and forest land-owning state agencies. It only mentions federal agencies. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. The focus of this board action was intended to be federal agencies. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 13 | FRP | BOF A.4 | 10 | We question whether the BOF should promote experiments in other states. And again, we feel that the BOF should go through the appropriate NEPA channels in the revision of the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP). We'd like to hear from the BOF what changes they feel they should promote and support and what changes they feel are necessary. The Audubon Society of Portland strongly feels that the forest protection provisions in the NWFP should remain intact. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. Federal policies that lead to outcomes that are not sustainable or that are contrary to the board's policies are where the board would want changes made. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 14 | FRP | BOF A.5 | 10 | We are confused by the statements referring to adverse financial effects to private landowners from increased public benefits and "undue regulatory burden," and desire further explanation. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. See that document for more background information. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 15 | FRP | BOF A.7 | 11 | The BOF should use both regulatory AND non-regulatory methods. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 2 | FRP | BOF A.8.a | 11 | This does not seem to apply to this action. | The board and ODF believe use of a measurable sustainable forest management framework can lead to greater collaboration and consensus building. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 4 | FRP | BOF A.8.c-h | 11 | These are more about communications than the sub-strategy. May need to go somewhere else. | These program actions seem to fit best under this board action. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| Audubon Society of Portland | 22 | FRP | BOF B.12 | 15 | Conservation groups should be included with the other interest groups mentioned. | That is our intent. This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 20 | FRP | BOF B.3 | 13 | See our comments about the term “forest health” above. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 21 | FRP | BOF B.8 | 14 | The BOF should not be responsible for determining what and where wood could be removed from federal forests. This should be the job of federal land managers. In general, no large diameter trees should be removed from federal or state forests. All fire resistant, large diameter trees should be left in place in any wood removal project. Wood removal should be limited to small diameter trees, brush, and ladder fuels in plantations or near communities. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. The board and the department both believe they have important roles in influencing management policies on Oregon’s federal forestlands. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 24 | FRP | BOF C.3 | 17 | The BOF should not have a role in encouraging federal land management agencies to use commercial timber harvest. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. The board and the department both believe they have important roles in influencing management policies on Oregon’s federal forestlands. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 25 | FRP | BOF D.2 | 18 | The Forest Practices Act (FPA) should not be the primary means of protection of soil and water resources. The Clean Water Act should be consulted. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. federal forestlands. The Forest Practices Act is the mechanism by which federal Clean Water Act and Oregon water quality standard compliance is achieved on private forestlands. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|-----------|---|---|
| Audubon Society of Portland | 27 | FRP | BOF E.2 | 20 | We oppose that a policy be adopted and ratified by all of Oregon's natural resource boards, commissioners, and the Oregon Legislature and recognized by federal agencies that, "recognizes that the primary purpose of most private forestland is to grow and harvest commercial tree species," without requirements to protect watershed health and threatened and endangered species and their habitats on private lands. Private lands contribute more to the loss of endangered species habitat and watershed degradation than state and federal lands. | This text is from the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and not subject to change in this plan. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 7 | FRP | BOF F.2.b | 23 | I am not sure we are going to implement on Federal Land. | The word "provide" has been changed to "promote" |
| OFIC | 17 | FRP | C.1.a | 16 | The Board of Forestry is trying to keep acres in forestland. The Department is advocating land use planning in this statement, when it should be your intent to keep forestry the most desirable land use. The focus on restricting forest land from going out of forest use is viewed by some as inappropriate and in cases limits the value of property. | The department supports Oregon's land use planning system, which does not prohibit the conversion of forestland to other uses, but rather manages and directs where such development should best occur. Determining the "most desirable land use" is highly subjective. |
| George Ponte ODF | 1 | FRP | Core Business | 7 | "Conversion to other uses" should be included in the first bullet statement as one of the damaging agents we're protecting from. This may put us at odds with our landowners but it is a key element of the FPFO. | Encouraging forestland retention is implied in the third core business function bullet. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 5 | FRP | F.2, b | 23 | "The department will provide implementation of the Healthy..." What does that say? I don't see the department implementing the federal Healthy Forests Initiative on federal lands. Is there an opportunity on private lands? | The word "provide" has been changed to "promote" |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 3 | FRP | General | 73 | The organization chart included as the last page of the appendices has had changes to it - I realize it is an ever-changing document, but if it has been updated it might be nice to replace it. | The final draft will include updated organization charts. |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 6 | FRP | General | 17& 30 | A few really minor and picky things I noticed on p. 14 were that under BOF B.4 ODF a - the word Association is abbreviated and I'd spell it out; and under BOF 6, ODF a - the close parenthesis is missing after [FRP]. On p. 30 item I I think the word 'a' needs to be added between 'provide' and 'safe'. | All good catches. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------------|---------|---|---|
| Coast Range Guardians and Canaries Who Sing | 1 | FRP | General | 3 | This strategic planning effort is designed to help Oregonians achieve the “triple bottom line” of sustainable environmental, economic, and social performance. In the 2003 Forestry for Oregon the definition of “sustainable” is not based on the biology of sustainability. In private and State forestry management schemes the forest is clearcut, burned, sprayed with herbicides, replanted with only one species of trees (and often clones at that), sprayed again (with herbicides, and often also with rodenticides, deer repellent, fungicides and/or insecticides), and later chemically fertilized. This is not sustainable, it is just intensely and artificially manipulated to have the appearance of regrowing wood fiber trees quickly. | The board and department rely on the definition of sustainability set in statute by the Oregon Legislature (ORS 184.421). The commenter lists a variety of valid forest management tools that may be appropriate or inappropriate for a given forest site. It would be very rare for all of these tools to be used on a single forest stand. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 9 | FRP | Performance Measurement | 31 | I liked the display of Agency Performance Measures. It clarified the process and showed in a simple way the relationship among OPB Benchmarks, FPFO Performance Measures and the other measurement items. I also liked your treatment of Trends and Assumptions and how they were used in developing the plan. | |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 18 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | Table - Suggest an example explaining associations. | This table has been reformatted. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 4 | FRP | Performance Measures | 9 to 30 | The performance measures look OK, by and large. In the plan, however, we are way to tactical. Should be rolled up to a more strategic level. | The performance measures have been revised. Because they are annual measures, they may appear more tactical than the higher-level, longer-term indicators that are proposed in the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> . |
| NW Oregon Area | 15 | FRP | Performance Measures | | Is there a method to link performance measures to vital few actions, or strategies? | The measures are linked to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategies. It is assumed that the cumulative results of the vital actions of the program responsible for each measure contribute to the measure’s results. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|----------------------|--------|--|---|
| NW Oregon Area | 20 | FRP | Performance Measures | 33 | Policy analysts on staff can pick this up and see their job. If I am a Stewardship Forester, a road grader, a South Fork Crew Coordinator, I cannot find myself. This may be a fatal flaw with how this document has been built. Consider providing example jobs in figure 2 on page 33. Link this into annual performance agreements (or position descriptions) to show alignment with mission, vision, goals. There is a nice alignment in the “so that” table on page 33, but it does not go “down” far enough. | A example was provided using stewardship foresters. Other department positions can be substituted to conduct a similar “so that” analysis. |
| NW Oregon Area | 26 | FRP | Performance Measures | | In response to question 4, we would generally say yes, but they don’t seem to be easy to connect back to vital few. We recognize there are different reporting needs, audiences and scales. Possibility to make this distinction. | See response to NW Oregon Area Comment # 15. |
| NW Oregon Area | 27 | FRP | Performance Measures | | We need to clearly show or establish a link between the vital few and performance measures. The table does not do this. For example: How do you connect the dots between page 35 vehicle accident performance measure and page 67 strategies and vital actions? If a “vital few” is not measurable, then is it really a vital few? | See response to NW Oregon Area Comment # 15. Administrative performance measures, such as vehicle accident rates, are not directly linked to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategies, but they are intended to be linked to the strategies and vital actions of the responsible program. In this case, Human Resources. |
| NW Oregon Area | 29 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | Sorting performance measures by program as opposed to FPFO strategy would facilitate employees seeing a connection. | The strategic plan is organized around <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategies, but the lead program for each performance measure has been listed. |
| NW Oregon Area | 30 | FRP | Performance Measures | 31 | The table on Page 31 would be more appropriate as an appendix item. | The table has been retained in the body of the document. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 14 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | The proposed measures are OK in measuring the performance of agency programs but appear less useful to measure progress toward the strategies. They are indicators of progress toward the FPFO strategies but are not very direct. | The strategic plan also discusses <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> indicators which will be used by the board to measure progress towards <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategies. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------------------------|-----------|---------|----------------------|--------|---|--|
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 4 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | How do we take the pulse of the department to determine if we are winning or losing? | That is the purpose of performance measurements and annual progress reports to the Board of Forestry. |
| Bill Hutchison Board of Forestry | 5 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | He is interested in a mix of output and outcome performance measures. | The proposed measures are a mix of outputs and outcomes. |
| Eastern Oregon Area ODF | 14 | FRP | Performance Measures | | Unclear performance measures linkages to <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategies and to ODF vital few actions; perhaps sort by ODF programs rather than by <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> strategies. | See responses above. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 31 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | Performance measures should focus more on ODF's actions that contribute to the potential for future forest sustainability and forest ecosystem integrity. Monitoring on at least a quarterly basis should be a requirement. | See responses above. ODF is following Oregon Progress Board requirements for annual performance measure reporting. More detailed program monitoring will continue in addition to tracking these agency performance measures. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 9 | FRP | Performance Measures | 34 | There appears to be a missing link in the performance measures surrounding the Department's core business functions. I can't find reference to two areas: 1) forest protection from pests & fires, and 2) forest stewardship concerning productivity & reforestation. I'm concerned that measures are lacking for regeneration-establishment success, reforestation after catastrophic fire/pests, forest health, minimized pest losses, sound forest roads systems, or the like. | Revised performance measures 3, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 address these issues. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 3 | FRP | Performance Measures | | In the section on <i>Oregon Department of Forestry Agency Performance Measures</i> . The terms indicator , performance measure , and benchmark , and their "linkage" to the PFFO might be further discussed. | The text has been slightly revised. |
| OFIC | 9 | FRP | Performance Measures | | Agency Performance - The Department should evaluate the usefulness of the Progress Board benchmarks. An analysis should be done to determine the accuracy of the measurement and its appropriateness. | The Oregon Progress Board has a process in place to critique and improve the statewide benchmarks. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 14 | FRP | SF 6.1 | | Need to add bullet: State Land Board/Dept. of State Lands. | Change has been made. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | 9 | FRP | Strategy B& C | 15 | BOF B.11 and BOF C.3 should be expanded to include reference to other state agencies that own and manage forestlands. | The intent of these two measures was to specifically focus on urban, community, and federal forests. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 23 | FRP | Strategy C | 16 | We recommend this strategy read, “ Maintain and enhance the productive capacity of Oregon’s forests to improve the economic and environmental well-being of Oregon’s communities. ” | This strategy has been established by the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> is not subject to revision in this document. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 26 | FRP | Strategy E | 20 | We recommend this strategy read, “ Contribute to and enhance the conservation of diverse native plant and animal populations and their habitats... ” Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) are mentioned throughout this strategy, but it is our understanding that ODF does not have any HCPs. We encourage the development of such plans for threatened and endangered species such as the northern spotted owl and the marbled murrelet. | This strategy has been established by the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> is not subject to revision in this document. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 28 | FRP | Strategy F | 22 | Again, we recommend use of the term sustainable active management . Active fuels and vegetation management should be limited to small diameter trees and brush. We do not feel that it should be ODF’s responsibility to provide implementation of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act on federal forestlands especially given the current lack of an appropriate level of federal funding for such projects. If funded, ODF should not remove mature or old growth trees, sensitive habitat, or perform treatments in roadless and undeveloped lands. | The success of the Healthy Forest Restoration Act will directly affect the success of the department’s fire prevention and suppression efforts, it’s insect and disease programs, and help to achieve its forest sector economic development strategies. All fuel reduction prescriptions should be developed on a site-specific basis. ODF will most likely not be directly involved in fuel treatments on federal lands. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 29 | FRP | Strategy G | 25 | ODF should not promote forest biomass as the central component of the Governor’s Renewable Energy Plan. Other components such as conservation, use of alternative fuels, and wind farms when sited properly should also be central to this plan. Restrictions should be replaced on removal of biomass so that it is done sustainably. | The other elements are outside the expertise of ODF but are addressed in the Energy Plan. The department agrees that both biomass accumulations and removals should be actively managed in a manner that is environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|---------|---|--|
| Audubon Society of Portland | 30 | FRP | Strategy G | 25 | We see the connection between the Forestry Program for Oregon, this department strategic plan, and the work of the department's eight programs we do not understand why so much emphasis is placed on cooperative efforts with OFRI while so little is placed on cooperation with conservation organizations. | The department welcomes opportunities to work collaboratively with any organization interested in achieving the same goals. It is appropriate to highlight linkages to closely related state agencies such as the Oregon Forest Resources Institute. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 4 | FRP | Vision Statement | 6 | A Vision Statement that seems confounding is Vision Statement 5. Accomplishing anything near to more than a small minority of "citizens who understand...forestry..." is unrealistic. | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Associated Oregon Loggers | 5 | FRP | Vision Statement | 6 | The lead-in phrase to the Vision Statement list is quite idealistic, or even somewhat far-fetched. Stating that the Department "will be successful...when..." all the visions are accomplished sets an insurmountable and unnecessarily high expectation for ODF performance. I would offer that the Dept. is successful when some sufficiently lower accomplishment if the visions happen. | This wording is consistent with the preamble to the board's vision statement. Staff believes it is appropriate to set high expectations for agency performance. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 2 | FRP | Vision Statement 5 | 27 | Citizens who understand, accept and support sustainable forestry and who make informed decisions about natural resource issues. | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 3 | FRP | Vision Statement 6 | 28 | End sentence after ...Board of Forestry. | See response to Jeff Peck, ODF comment #2 above. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 4 | HR | General | | The only concrete suggestion I can offer is to spend more time of career development tour at Salem Headquarters. Many of the second and third level positions are there. I sense that most employees have little knowledge of the positions in Salem until they become vacant and get advertised. I have seen no listing of positions by grade level. Also, a tour of the entire office at Salem would help people assess the working conditions there. | Good points on issues that are beyond the scope of this plan. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 5 | HR | General | | An example of a helpful practice that was employed on my career tour and at the State Lands Conference was having each ODF speaker outline their career path. We then need to realize that our cadre of second-career people don't have decades left but they may have the ability to catch up with long-term employees of the same experience level. | Good points on issues that are beyond the scope of this plan. |
| Pam Strobel ODF | 4 | HR | General | 24 & 29 | A couple times in the plan the word 'audit' is used (p. 24 & 29). I am just wondering if another word could be used to better describe what agency personnel will be doing - is it really a standards following audit or a review/assessment. | The reference on page 24 has been changed to "assess". |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|---------------------------------|--------|--|--|
| Pam Strobel ODF | 5 | HR | General | 29 | HR - Personnel management j - the word 'all' is used. It may be difficult to define 'all key' ... the word 'all' could probably be dropped without changing the meaning. | This change has been made. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 20 | HR | Vision Statement 6 | 29 | Coordination with and interaction/input to OR-OSHA is an important role I didn't see mentioned. | A new vital action has been added. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 21 | HR | Vision Statement 6, HR training | 29 | HR lists some very specific training courses for some programs. That is more tactical than strategic. | No change recommended. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 7 | HR | Vision Statement 6, n | 29 | The use of "or" in the series of things you are going to improve leads me to question if you are going to sacrifice safety for efficiency. | "Or" has been changed to "and". |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 8 | HR | Vision Statement 6, s & x | 29 | It sounds to me that these two action items are redundant. | The redundant action has been deleted. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 21 | IT | | | Information Technology's mission/vision statement focuses on ~ ...supporting the business needs of the agency ... ~. Pages 6 and 7 addresses core business functions (4 forest resource concerns are listed). Business Service's mission/vision statement on page 68 focuses on global business management policies, strategies, and accounting processes . Suggestion: revisit these strategic plans. Let's see if we can recognize certain team efforts and "cross-foot them." What are the facets and components of "business" as viewed by the department as opposed to the public's interpretation? | No changes recommended by the programs. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 19 | IT | Vision Statement 6 | 28 | Should include re-instituting ISAC or some other mechanism to use field and program input to assess needs, evaluate opportunities and recommend a course of action. | No changes recommended by the program. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 6 | IT | Vision Statement 6, a | 28 | You identify two agency programs (I assume) with the bureaucratic acronyms FACTS and SFAARS. Am I the only one who doesn't know what those are? Is there any reason for me to worry about this? | Acronyms have been spelled out. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 18 | IT | Vision Statement 6, e | 28 | I take strong exception and object to the statement "and provide the resources necessary to succeed" in accomplishing high, but realistic expectations for IT. Funding for IT may not be our highest priority (and probably won't be). | Text has been changed to "seek to provide. . .". |
| Ted Lorensen ODF | 2 | PA | 1.1.6 | | Provide a referral service and resources to assist educators implement the natural resources curriculum in primary and secondary schools throughout Oregon. | New vital action text has been added. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|-----------------------|--------|--|--|
| Ted Lorensen ODF | 3 | PA | 1.1.7 | | Provide outreach and displays about the department, forests and forest issues at a range of events including the State Fair, county fairs, family forest association meetings, forestry professional association meetings, and other community events. | New vital action text has been added. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 10 | PA | A.8 | 15 | A strategy I didn't see listed was to increase the public contact in the Portland and Willamette Valley areas. | No changes recommended. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 22 | PA | General | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Important to educate the public about positive things we do based on science. - Need more effort on "selling forestry" statewide. - Provide information to public on what their "stake" is in state forest management. - Need to reach public early on (public schools) - Encourage employee participation outside of work. - Continue to interface with existing organizations (OFRI as example) - Need to communicate our independence from private industry while providing education outreach. - Better communication internally/externally on ongoing education efforts. - Capitalize on local activities, i.e. fairs/etc. - More support for employees to be on outside boards/committees. May lack support at unit/area level. | Good points. The Agency Affairs Program list of vital actions has been significantly revised. |
| Ted Lorensen ODF | 1 | PA | Overall | 62 | Significant rewrite with specific comments and edits from Ted will be shown in "track changes" to this program and attached and distributed for input. | The Agency Affairs Program list of vital actions has been significantly revised. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 17 | PA | Performance Measures | 34 | Include a "performance measure" to evaluate how ODF is providing education to the public. (No way to quantify on going efforts to educate public – i.e. - stewardship foresters). | No public education performance measure has been recommended. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 17 | PA | Vision Statement 5, c | 27 | Is measuring media opinion annually our role? How do we do that? | The text has been revised to clarify that polling would be done in cooperation with OFRI and on a periodic, not annual, basis. |
| Russ Anderson ODF | 2 | PCF | 1.1 | 45 | New: Promote BMPs through the use of the notification process, and the use of an appropriate number of well-trained foresters to allow for personal contact with operators and landowners. | The text has been revised to address this comment. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 26 | PCF | 1.1.1 | 45 | Fourth bullet - How is certification to be used to meet under P&CF Objectives? | No changes recommended. Certification is anticipated to be addressed in the current process underway. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 27 | PCF | 1.1.2 | 45 | Public values on private land is sensitive. | This legislative concept has been withdrawn at the direction of the Board of Forestry. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 28 | PCF | 1.1.5 - 1.1.6 | 46 | Is a better fit under 2.1. | This reformatting has been done. |
| Russ Anderson ODF | 3 | PCF | 1.2 | 45 | New: Promote BMPs through the development of strong working relationships with operators and landowners and using a mix of education, technical assistance, incentives, and regulation to achieve public values from private and community forests. | Similar text has been added. |
| Russ Anderson ODF | 4 | PCF | 1.2.1 | 45 | New: I would add a VFA of: Develop and maintain a clearly presented printed version of the most current FPA rules and statutes that is able to be used by an average operator/landowner to understand what is required by the FPA. | No change recommended. This idea was originally embedded in the HB 3264 rewrite of the rules. The scope of this project is now being reassessed. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 29 | PCF | 2.1.2 | 46 | Identify existing recognition programs. | Text has been modified. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 30 | PCF | 2.2.2 | 47 | What is Executive Order 99-01? Give a brief description. | Text has been modified. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 16 | PCF | 2.2.3 | 47 | Removing authority regarding prior approval on written plans puts us in "enforcement mode." | No change recommended since this is a comment on interpretation of statute changes of HB 3264. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 31 | PCF | 2.2.8 | 47 | Inconsistent use of "the goal will be." (Not used in any other vital action.) | Text has been modified. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 32 | PCF | 3.1.1 | 48 | Confusing and hard to understand. Simplify the language and main points. | Text has been modified. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 33 | PCF | 3.2 | 48 | Sounds political. Sounds like we have an agenda and is that a negative? | No change recommended. This is a goal of the Oregon Plan Assessment being conducted for the Coast ESU. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 34 | PCF | 3.3 | 48 | SF's Do educate L/O's on marketing opportunities. Could be stated as a "Vital Few." | Text has been slightly modified to acknowledge current efforts. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 35 | PCF | 4.2.1 | 49 | Do Fed programs include \$\$\$? If not, where do dollars come from? | Yes, annual federal grants provide significant funding for forest health work. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 37 | PCF | 5.1.1 & 5.3.1 | 49 | Overlapping and repetitive. | 5.3.1 has been deleted. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 36 | PCF | 5.2 | 49 | In-District Data Mgt/IT Support. Strategies need to be developed. | Text has been modified. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 38 | PCF | 5.2.1 | 49 | Timeframe? | Text has been modified. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 40 | PCF | 6 | 50 | Urban Forestry – Now a separate program? | Urban and Community Forests is being identified as a subprogram under the Private and Community Forest Program for the 2005-07 biennium. No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 41 | PCF | 6 | 50 | We don't want to be involved in urban area regulatory responsibility. | Plan does not propose urban regulatory responsibilities beyond existing statutes. |
| OFIC | 11 | PCF | A.1.b | 9 | Enforcement is inappropriately equal in importance to education and engineering. The vast majority of landowners comply willingly and knowledgeably. Enforcement is a last resort, used sparingly. | See Board of Forestry actions A. 5 and A.7. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 6 | PCF | A.2 | 9 | Sounds like the state is taking on some role relative to the ESA-reword? | This comment is specific to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and outside the scope of this plan. As with any stakeholder, the board participates in NEPA public involvement processes, but also has the option of working with the Governor's Office and the Oregon Congressional delegation to seek changes in federal policies and statutes when appropriate. |
| OFIC | 12 | PCF | A.2.a | 9 | Oregon should not promote federal laws or policies. | Text has been revised. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 7 | PCF | A.3 | 10 | Add strategy that speaks to our active involvement with OSU, FRL and the PNW lab to shape and guide key forestry research efforts. | Text has been added. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 1 | PCF | A.7 | 11 | Is this where Forest Legacy fits? | The most direct reference to initiatives like the Forest Legacy Program is vital action E.3. a. |
| OFIC | 13 | PCF | A.7.a | 11 | Why only existing incentives? Some of those don't work well now, especially for some landowner classes. The emphasis here should be on the development of new, viable incentives. | Text has been revised. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 8 | PCF | A.8 | 11 | Add committee for family forest lands as one of the methods we use to promote collaboration and resolve natural resource issues. | Included in 3.1.3, |
| Dan Shults ODF | 7 | PCF | A.8, b | 11 | Seems unrealistic to establish a date for an outcome (federal recognition of the Oregon Plan) that is outside our control (arguably outside our influence as well). | Time reference has been deleted. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 2 | FRP | A.9, a | 12 | My comment concerns "building coalitions with other organizations in the sustainability movement. I'm ok with that as long as "sustainability" includes active management. "hands off" does not yield sustainable forests. | Organizations such as Wallowa Resources and Sustainable Northwest endorse active forest management. |
| John Seward ODF | 2 | PCF | Action 2.2.1 | 46 | Alternate language: "It is the policy of the Department of Forestry to gain compliance with the Forest Practices Act through a program that maintains an effective balance of science and technology-based rules, incentives, educational and technical assistance efforts, and uniform enforcement." | Text has been revised. |
| John Seward ODF | 3 | PCF | Action 4.2.4 | 60 | With respect to 1999 Senate Bill 12 (Landslides and Public Safety), the legislation makes it clear that the counties can rely on ODF for assistance in reviewing private geotech reports when building permits are processed in further review areas. The bill gave ODF funding and 3 geotech assistant positions, 2 of which were cut from the budget. My point is that the agency likely does not have the personnel to adequately address this "vital few action" (at least for the landslide issue-and probably others as well). | No change recommended. See new ODF Land Use Planning General Scope And Responsibilities Directive. |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | 10 | PCF | Actions | 25 | There are no vital actions tied to Strategy G. If G rises to the importance of a separate strategy, it seems logical that some actions are worth mentioning. | There are vital department actions listed under Strategy G. The Board of Forestry has chosen not to designate any of its actions under G as "key actions". |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-----------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 22 | PCF | Actions | | Intensively work with cities and counties for them to assume regulatory authority in their jurisdiction. | No change recommended. There has been limited success in identifying incentives to encourage local jurisdictions to take on regulatory authority. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 24 | PCF | Actions | | What are the priorities? - Context, responsibility, where is it in process? | Each program will develop two-year action plans with more details on responsibilities and timelines. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 39 | PCF | Actions | | Need timeframes and responsibility for tasks – need action plan – maybe this document should set priorities for the action plan. | Each program will develop two-year action plans with more details on responsibilities and timelines. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 10 | PCF | B.4 | 14 | Add committee on family forestlands. | A new vital action has been added. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 11 | PCF | BOF A.2 | 9 | We disagree that the BOF should actively seek changes to federal policies. The BOF should abide by the laws of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for input in federal policies. Only in circumstances where a federal policy might lead to the ecological degradation of Oregon's forest ecosystems should the BOF seek changes to policies. | This comment is specific to the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and outside the scope of this plan. As with any stakeholder, the board participates in NEPA public involvement processes, but also has the option of working with the Governor's Office and the Oregon Congressional delegation to seek changes in federal policies and statutes when appropriate. |
| Audubon Society of Portland | 12 | PCF | BOF A.3 | 10 | Monitoring should be performed on a quarterly, not an annual basis. | Forest heath (insect and disease) surveys are conducted annually because they can only be conducted under certain foliage conditions. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 1 | PCF | BOF A.7.a | 11 | This looks limited to existing incentives. What about making recommendations for new incentives? | Text has been revised. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 3 | PCF | BOF A.8.b | 11 | "Will influence" may be too strong. How about, "Will dialogue with feds to achieve goals." | No change recommended. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 11 | PCF | C.2 | 16 | Are we really developing a work plan for incorporating the concepts of dynamic ecosystems. | Yes. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| OFIC | 18 | PCF | D.4.a | 19 | This is another commitment that may be difficult to achieve. I would delay the time or take out a time commitment altogether. | Time commitment has been deleted. |
| OFIC | 19 | PCF | D.5.a | 19 | This is much too specific. You can be committed to watershed scale research without that level of specificity. | Text has been slightly modified. |
| OFIC | 20 | PCF | D.7.a | 19 | This statement is worded incorrectly. One doesn't encourage inheritance. The Department should encourage the land to stay within forest use and not worry about who owns the property. | Text has been modified. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 3 | PCF | E.3, a | 20 | Has the legislative climate changed enough to get this concept out of committee? I wish you luck, but I severely "bent my pick" on Forest Legacy in the last two sessions! | This topic remains a high priority for the department and the Governor's Office. |
| OFIC | 21 | PCF | E.6.a | 21 | This item should be eliminated. | This addressed the technical review directed by OAR 629-680-0100. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 23 | PCF | Format | | Format program 'Vital Few' to separate field/staff Fx's - What is expectation of field role? | Field personnel will likely more clear see their role in the programs' two-year action plans. Field offices also have the option of developing their own operations plans, tiered beneath the agency and program plans. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 25 | PCF | Format | | Link Vital Few & performance measures to PD. | Vital actions and performance measures are linked to department programs. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 16 | PCF | G.4, a | 25 | Is this a realistic expectation? Could be, I'm not in that loop. | Date reference removed. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 3 | PCF | General | | I understand the connection between the FPFO, the Strategic Plan, the budget and my job. I'm not sure a lot of the field folks, at the operational level, understand. One idea might be a flowchart type example illustrating the relationship to a SF's daily routine. | See Figure 2. This "so that model" can be applied to any ODF position. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 15 | PCF | General | | Not clearly addressing goal of maintaining forestland base as opposed to urban development. Continue to see more and more homes being built in forest areas. | See agency actions under board action C.1. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------|--------|--|--|
| Coos Bay ODF | 18 | PCF | Performance Measure 629-2 | 34 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Does not accurately identify results. Majority of operations (acres) on large industrial / majority of inspections on small landowners. Should focus on those not visited. - Operations in compliance – when, at what point? On going process/moving target. Not a good “measuring stick.” - Use monitoring: May be a better tool to measure compliance. | No change recommended. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 19 | PCF | Performance Measure 629-3 | 34 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ODF not always/usually informed on improvement projects (stewardship forester) from other federally/private agencies. - Need to clarify this performance measure (what are we trying to measure and how). | This proposed measure has been deleted. |
| NW Oregon Area | 31 | PCF | Performance Measures | 34 | 629-2: Should be oriented more to gauging the resource damage component than to simple administrative reporting. The point is that there will be compliance problems in any operation, but the qualitative resource damage will be very low. That’s what we should be concerned about. | No change recommended. |
| George Ponte ODF | 6 | PCF | Performance Measures | 34 | Several performance measures are based on FACTS/FANS data. There is a lot riding on this data and I question its reliability because FACTS continues to be inefficient and difficult to use. We should be moving toward portable data collection technologies that are easier and more efficient and will result in better data collection. | Programs will be responsible for maintaining data quality for the selected performance measures. |
| Russ Anderson ODF | 1 | PCF | Strategic Emphasis Area 1 | 45 | Use a mix of personal contact, education, technical assistance, incentives, and regulation to achieve science-based BMPs on private and community forests in support of landowner objectives and public policy. | Text has been revised. |
| John Seward ODF | 1 | PCF | Strategy D, Trend 3 | 40 | Alternate language: “Natural landslides continue to be a significant geomorphic process with effects on water quality, aquatic habitat, soil and built structures.” | Text has been modified. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 5 | PCF | Strategy G | 25 | Not clear/written with environmental slant? | No change recommended. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 6 | PCF | Strategy G | 25 | Provide education to ODF (districts) on carbon storage concepts (Jim Cathcart). | Text has been added. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 7 | PCF | Strategy G | 25 | Use appropriate terminology for group being addressed. Example: Amount of carbon stored instead of board feet. | No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 8 | PFF | 1.1.1 | 51 | Budget Note 3 Bullet: Develop a statewide strategy for forest fuels and hazard abatement; and Section 1.1.2 are duplicated. | No change recommended. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 9 | PFF | 1.1.1 | 51 | What is the Role of Prescribed fire - *Avoid or Use? Use? Promote? | Both. Will be addressed in results of 3.1.3 to 3.1.5. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 10 | PFF | 1.1.4 | 51 | Clarity & Intent. | "Audit" changed to "assess". |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 11 | PFF | 2.1.1 | 51 | How, who, by when. | No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 12 | PFF | 2.1.2 | 51 | Identify SB 360 | Text has been revised. |
| Jeffrey Raymond McClain University of Oregon | 3 | PFF | 3.1.3 | 52 | You plan on finding alternatives for prescribed burns and supporting them. You should state what your prescribed burning plan is, besides simply looking for alternatives. Prescribed burning, if not without costs, has been shown to maintain healthy forests as well as reduce the risk of "catastrophic" wildfires. This section implies a move away from using them. | The alternatives are part of the broader elements of the Smoke Management Plan. The current prescribed burn plan is on the web and is being reviewed now and will be reviewed again during this strategic plan period. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 13 | PFF | 3.2.1 | 52 | Fed's role in prescribed fire. - How ODF relates to Fed. Burning. – Supportive Role - Cooperation/Communication link. | That role is and will continue to be described and implemented through the Smoke Management Plan. (3.1.5) |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 14 | PFF | 4.1.1 | 52 | Directly or <u>indirectly</u> support fire suppression operations. | No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 15 | PFF | 4.1.1 | 52 | "Strengthen the requirement" use encourage, incentives. | No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 16 | PFF | 4.2.1 | 53 | *Remove barriers for all ODF, cooperators, etc. - Action plan on how to develop people. - Specific action plan that explains & puts into action "intensify expectations." - Streamline process UAS for fire position development must be clear to employees. | No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 17 | PFF | 5.1 | 53 | Quick payment on obligations for services. | Text has been revised. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 18 | PFF | 6.1 | 53 | Ensure adequate IT support to: - District Manager - All programs | No change recommended. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| Jeffrey Raymond McClain University of Oregon | 4 | PFF | 6.1.2 | 53 | The desire to find technology that is more economically efficient and that promotes worker safety is expressed. It should also be a priority in procuring new technologies that decreasing the environmental impact be a goal. | No change recommended. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 19 | PFF | 6.1.2 | 53 | (Correct) "reduce cost efficiency" - "reduce inefficiency" | Text has been revised. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 20 | PFF | 6.1.2 | 53 | Add IT support (technical support). | No change recommended. |
| George Ponte ODF | 4 | PFF | 6.1.3 | 53 | Change "reduce costs efficiency" to "increase costs efficiency." | No change recommended. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 5 | PFF | BOF F.1.i & j | 22 | Doesn't fit with the sub-strategy and should be moved somewhere else. | No change recommended. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 6 | PFF | BOF F.1.o | 23 | I am not sure what this means. Are we talking about analysis on owning our own fleet of helicopters? | No change recommended. |
| Steve Mealey Boise Cascade | 2 | PFF | BOF F.2 | 23 | First, in hindsight, it seems unfortunate that BOF F. 2 is not a KEY ACTION. In applying the above-recommended test of necessity and sufficiency to all of the ODF "vital few actions" listed under BOF F. 2, we find all in your list necessary , but when taken as a whole, insufficient to assure that the BOF action will be met in a way consistent with a stated core business function of the Department of Forestry. Simply, we believe that alone, your ODF a., b, and c., under BOF F. 2 will not be sufficient to start a process resulting in change in forest condition class from CC3 to CC2 or less on more than 10 million acres of Oregon's dry forests. We offer two additional "vital few actions" for BOF F.2, for your consideration to address this apparent insufficiency. | Key actions were designated by the Board of Forestry, outside of the scope of this plan. Also see responses below. |
| Steve Mealey Boise Cascade | 3 | PFF | BOF F2.d | 23 | New: The department will lead a collaborative process with its state (ODF&W), federal (USFS and BLM) county (OAC) and private (OFIC) partners, resulting in the timely assessment of the economic, ecological and cultural consequences of not effectively restoring eastern and southwestern Oregon's CC3 forests to CC2 or less in a timely manner. | No change recommended. Partially addressed by BOF B.8. a, F.2.b, and G.5.a. |
| Steve Mealey Boise Cascade | 4 | PFF | BOF F2.e | 23 | New: The department will lead a collaborative process with its state (ODF&W), federal (USFS, BLM, USFWS, and NOAA-Fisheries) county (OAC) and private (OFIC) partners, resulting in the timely assessment and balancing of impacts to eastern and southwestern Oregon's CC3 forests of the short-and-long-term effects of forest restoration, against the short-and-long-term effects of management inaction. | No change recommended. Partially addressed by BOF B.8. a, F.2.b, and G.5.a. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| George Ponte ODF | 2 | PFF | Emphasis Area 3 | 52 | We are receiving an increasing number of requests to assist with burning projects for fuel reduction/forest health. A suggested key action is to clarify department policies/directives for providing or facilitating rx burning on private land. Also – do something with SB 225 or work to amend it. | No change recommended. |
| George Ponte ODF | 3 | PFF | Emphasis Area 4 | 52 | Emphasis Area 4: Add as a vital action; "Assess the use of incentives to recruit/maintain workforce." | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 23 | PFF | F.1 | 22 | Individual items a. through p. either misstate the actual committee recommendations, are stated in multiple locations, or lack specific intent/description. For example: bullet 4 is a component of item j. Also, it appears that those developing the document have not consulted with those developing actual recommendations. Specifically F.1.a, bullet 4, "...will <i>complete</i> a coordinated statewide system of structural and wildland protection;" It is our understanding that those proclamations are being intentionally avoided in the Fire Program Review. Similarly, in Item F.1.c "... will secure legislation that will <i>revamp</i> the OFLPF." The committee is recommending minor changes and never intended anything more than minor adjustments. We also noted that nothing in the existing Strategy addresses or mentions the prevention aspects of a fire program. We must develop a dedication and commitment to advocate for effective prevention <i>and</i> suppression. | No committee recommendations have been listed. Item a. is a synopsis of the Fire Program Review goals. Text has been revised in F.1.a bullet 4 and in F.1.c. A prevention bullet has been added to F.1. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 11 | PFF | F.1, a | 22 | Add the workforce capacity component to the bulleted list. | Additional text has been added. |
| John Poppino Lazy RB Tree Farm, Inc. | 4 | PFF | F.1, h | 22 | I think it would be appropriate to describe what SB 360 is and does. | The text has been revised to refer to the "Oregon Forestland-Urban Interface Fire Protection Act of 1997". |
| Dan Shults ODF | 12 | PFF | F.1, j | 22 | Too broad. The focus should be on underprotected land with a direct impact on our protection. We don't much care about the level of protection in southeast Oregon, for example. | No change recommended. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 13 | PFF | F.1, l | 22 | We want to increase the use of local landowner and operator <i>resources</i> as well as overhead. | The text has been revised. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 14 | PFF | F.1, n | 23 | Will only fully implement if the "bugs" are worked out. | No change recommended. |

ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|-------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| Dan Shults ODF | 15 | PFF | F.1, o | 23 | Isn't this really saying we will look at the potential for use of FEPP aircraft? Why mince words? | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 24 | PFF | F.1.a. | 22 | Bullet 4: Replace "complete" with "evaluate the opportunities of." Items b., d., e., f., l., and p. are all part of the Fire Program Review being addressed by the Workforce Capacity Committee. While they all have unique focus they are all included in this work group | "Complete" replaced with "consider." |
| OFIC | 25 | PFF | F.1.b | 22 | Delete this as a specific item. Incorporate into F.1.a. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 26 | PFF | F.1.c | 22 | As previously mentioned, the word "revamp" needs replacing. Also, consider incorporating into F.1.a. | "Revamp" replaced with "update". |
| OFIC | 27 | PFF | F.1.d | 22 | Delete. Idea should be incorporated into F.1.a. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 28 | PFF | F.1.e | 22 | Same. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 29 | PFF | F.1.f | 22 | Same. Also, it seems like the timeframe is too long. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 30 | PFF | F.1.g | 22 | This item needs significant clarification. What are you replacing, adding, developing and at what cost, paid by whom? | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 31 | PFF | F.1.h | 22 | Is the time estimate consistent with the expectation of the legislature, community planners? | No change recommended. The question is a good one. The cited time is the maximum allowed in this plan. |
| OFIC | 32 | PFF | F.1.i | 22 | Delete. The concept should be addressed in F.1.a, bullet 3. If incorporated into that bullet, consider adding the word <i>coordination</i> in front of development. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 33 | PFF | F.1.j | 22 | Delete, already addressed in F.1.a, bullet 4. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 34 | PFF | F.1.k | 22 | What is fire intelligence? And to whom would it be provided? | It is the assessment of fuels and weather conditions to determine fire potential and severity. Information would be provided internally and externally. |
| OFIC | 35 | PFF | F.1.l | 22 | Delete | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 36 | PFF | F.1.m | 23 | If the Department seeks to revise this directive, input from landowners would be appropriate. This is not implied with the language used. | No change recommended. Department directives are typically not developed through public involvement processes |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| OFIC | 37 | PFF | F.1.n | 23 | Have adequate changes to ROSS been developed, tested and ensured? Oregon should not be drawn into a federal program and forced to leave proven and effective tools and strategies behind. | Text has been revised. |
| OFIC | 38 | PFF | F.1.o | 23 | Delete. Idea should be incorporated into F.1.a. | No change recommended. |
| OFIC | 39 | PFF | F.4.a | 23 | This item and F.4.c say the same thing. | Will delete c. |
| OFIC | 22 | PFF | F.4.b | 24 | Burning is appropriate in many instances. The Department shouldn't encourage landowners to always look for an alternative. | We'd be looking at feasible alternatives, per F.4.b, not eliminating appropriate burning. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 21 | PFF | Other | | Bridge Communication GAP between Districts info sharing and facilitate learning from others. | No change recommended. |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 12 | RP | Actions | | The BOF FPFO strategies result in ODF actions that are primarily policy development work and/or assessment related work that will fall heavily to RP and PCF staff- I don't think we are currently staffed to complete the promised work products or results. | The strategic planning process is intended to provide the priorities for future budgeting. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 46 | SF | 1.1 | 54 | Add a 1.1.5, "Complete construction of the Forest Center and implement operation of facilities." | The following statement will be added: <i>"Complete construction and begin operating the Tillamook Forest Center."</i> |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 1 | SF | 1.1.1 | 55 | Since it affects all state forests I would amend this section or add an item to Emphasis area # 3 (Improve and maintain effective and efficient planning processes (FMPs, etc). Include an examination of the current timing between AOP approval and first quarter sales. Although Astoria is limiting such sale prep to non-controversial sales, we need to learn from the tactic employed against the Mt. Hood NF (and perhaps the Acey Line Sale at Tillamook). On the Mt. Hood, the opponents of the timber program took on the Eagle Creek Sale because it was the BEST designed. They counted on a domino effect if they could take down the best sale. | This is a good suggestion, and encourage the Unit to bring it to the annual review of the Annual Operating Plan process for resolution. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 2 | SF | 1.1.4 | 54 | It is unclear on how detailed the transportation plans for all NW and SW districts that are to be completed by 2011. | Specificity is more appropriately located in the work plan associated with this action, not in the agency's strategic plan document. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|------------------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 47 | SF | 1.2.4 & 1.2.5 | 54 | Seem too specific as to be considered a "Vital Few." | These actions provide foundational data for use in evaluating and adjusting management of state lands, the adaptive management approach articulated in the Forest Management Plans. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 48 | SF | 2.1.1 | 54 | Seems inconsistent with H&H process as stated (what is the driver for establishing volume and revenue outputs?). Suggest something like "Based on results of the H&H model outputs, identify clear financial goals...." | Basing such an analysis on only the Harvest and Habitat too narrowly focuses the program on but one assessment and planning tool. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 3 | SF | 4.1.1 | 55 | We need a way to utilize the skills of a large cadre of entry-level second-forestry-career people when it comes to filling higher-level vacancies. These people do not offer the 25-30 years of remaining career time that many of the people have who are being selected for promotion. However, they could help bridge the gap we now face with the mass retirement of long-term ODF employees. This would "harvest" some of the training provided by non-ODF forestry employers while allowing the newly hired employees a chance to gain experience before promoting. | This is a very good idea, however one that might best be addressed through succession management planning within an entire agency perspective. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 6 | SF | 4.1.2 | 55 | Updating KSA's for use on similar positions would be very helpful so that employees seeking to move are not faced with a fresh set for every vacancy announcement. | This is another good suggestion, but again, one that is better addressed by Human Resources, and or succession management planning. |
| Jewell Unit ODF | 7 | SF | 5.1.1 & 5.1.2 | 55 | The Board of Forestry should examine the benefits of federal legislation or executive action to return the responsibility for ESA compliance to the land managing agencies and away from agencies which default to the no-action alternative to protect species. | The suggestion is a broad policy issue that State Forests Program will not be focusing on as a vital action over the next two years. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|---|
| Jewell Unit ODF | 8 | SF | 6.1.1 | 55 | This area of the plan talks about developing public opinion surveys for the program. Are there any steps being taken to inform the broad voting public about the positive effects (both environmentally and economically) of the Forest Management. | The State Forests Program has a communications plan in place that focuses on activities to connect with ten target publics over the next two years. One of those key publics is the news media, which will convey key messages to the public and possibly take editorial positions. We believe the work we do with the other targeted publics also will filter through to the public and help shape public opinion. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 49 | SF | 6.1.6 | 56 | Should include other forests and districts (Sun Pass, Elliot, WO, WL) SEA 3 and Strategies: No "Vital Few" actions? Additional action statements would be useful to clarify detail of strategy statements. | Good catch. Detail has been added to all strategies, including #3 and #7; "7.1.1: <i>Coordinate with Information Technology Program regarding the development and implementation of an enhanced, integrated business analytical system;</i> " and 7.1.2: "Develop and implement an enhanced, comprehensive information system." |
| Dan Shults ODF | 8 | SF | A.8, i | 12 | Not sure we should be in the business of conducting public opinion surveys. Contractors do that. Is that the intent? | The action only identifies the public opinion surveys will be done, not how; this provides the program flexibility in choosing the appropriate mechanism for achieving the action. |
| Dan Shults ODF | 9 | SF | A.8, j | 12 | Not sure what a State Forests communications and marketing plan is. | The State Forests Program has a communications plan in place that focuses on activities to connect with ten target publics over the next two years. The plan will convey key messages aimed at helping to shape public opinion. The use of the term marketing within this vital few action statement is confusing and will be removed. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| John Barnes ODF | 1 | SF | A.8, n | 12 | Why are we limiting the engagement of stakeholders in recreation planning to the Tillamook, Clatsop, and Santiam? Every District has the potential to provide some level of recreation opportunity on State Forest lands. ODF should be engaging with recreation "stakeholders" wherever there is an interest. I suggest the statement reads: "The Department will engage a diversity of stakeholders in recreation planning on State Forest lands assisting in the prioritization and implementation of projects." | Good catch. Statement edited as suggested! |
| OFIC | 15 | SF | A.8.i | 12 | I wouldn't commit to anything, like this or A.8.j, and A.8.k. As noted above, the Department should seriously consider what it commits to do and what it can actually accomplish. Similar commitments are made at C.2.b, D.1.b, and E.4.a-f. | <p>A.8.j – The State Forests Program's communication plan will convey to ten target publics key messages aimed at helping to shape public opinion. The term "marketing" will be removed from the vital few action statement because it is confusing terminology.</p> <p>A.8.k – This action responds to OAR 629-035-0080 and a Forest Management Plan commitment.</p> <p>C.2.b – This action responds to OAR 629-035-0020 and a Forest Management Plan commitment.</p> <p>D.1.b – This action is an important information/data gathering component of the adaptive management approach within the Forest Management Plans.</p> <p>E.4.a-f – actions relate to the Private and Community Forests Program.</p> |
| Mike Bordelon ODF | 9 | SF | A.8.j | 12 | Delete and marketing from the reference about state forests communication plan. | The use of the term marketing within this vital few action statement is confusing and will be removed. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|---|--|
| John Barnes ODF | 2 | SF | B.10, a | 15 | The State Forest Program and Protection from Fire also have responsibilities for protection of cultural resource sites. | Yes, and the State Forests Program has recognized this by instituting procedures associated with assessing presence and protecting those found as a 'doing business' activity. |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 8 | SF | BOF F.2 | 23 | I think we need something here for State Forest. How will it be implemented on State Forest? | The State Forests Program has tried to focus on strategic plan actions that are considered "vital" and has tried not to include those action considered to be a part of "doing business." |
| Rick Rogers ODF | 9 | SF | BOF F.3 | 23 | I think we need a statement on State Forest management of invasive species. | The State Forests Program has tried to focus on strategic plan actions that are considered "vital" and has tried not to include those action considered to be a part of "doing business." |
| NW Oregon Area | 11 | SF | Core Business | 7 | Core business functions. What happened to State Forests? The other business functions have some more discretionary language. "Manage state-owned forest resources" seems a bit too simplified and focuses on the product, not on the outcome. How about "manage State-owned forest resources to provide sustainable levels of forest resources and values, including fish and wildlife habitat; timber revenues and jobs; recreation, scenic and cultural values." | The text has been revised to state, "Manage state-owned forest resources consistent with statutory, Board of Forestry, and State Land Board direction." |
| Carolyn Eady | 1 | SF | E.4.d | 21 | States the department will implement the State Forests "Monitoring Program Strategic Plan" and, at a minimum, report results biennially. Is this the same as the "Monitoring Implementation Plan for the NW and SW Oregon State Forests Management Plans", dated June 1, 2001? Pages 30-31 of this latter document describe reporting including monitoring reports being developed on an annual basis. Have any reports of this type been made available to the public to date? | Addressed comment in a phone conversation, and have edited the statement to say: "Implement the State Forests Monitoring Program Strategic Plan, and develop an annual report during the Forest Management Plan's initial ten-year implementation period." All available monitoring reports were emailed to Ms Eady. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------------------|--------|--|---|
| Carolyn Eady | 2 | SF | E.4.d | 21 | Page 41 of the cited Monitoring document has an explicit statement of linkage to the FPFO. Assuming that the results of the expensive and time-consuming research sponsored by the department is intended to benefit <u>all</u> forests in Oregon, not just state forests, it seems to me that there should be an explicit statement in the draft strategic plan linking it to the Monitoring Implementation Plan. | Addressed comment in a phone conversation; clarified that research conducted on state forest lands is focused toward our management needs, but that all could access the results and use as they deemed appropriate. |
| Carolyn Eady | 3 | SF | F.3.a & b | 23 | Relate to efforts to prevent and mitigate invasive species and Sudden Oak Death on private and community forests. Why doesn't this also include state forests? Likewise, shouldn't Strategy G (carbon storage) have some reference to state forests? | Addressed comment in a phone conversation; State Forests responds when needed as a part of 'doing business' and does not call this type of situation a vital action within our strategic plan. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 8 | SF | General | 54 | Overall for State Forests: need to recognize we have a different role on SLB (working for State Land Board vs. BOF). Include appropriate language recognizing Common School Fund mandate, etc. | The State Forests Program's strategic plan recognizes these different roles in the mission statement, with each Forest Management Plan then articulating these unique differences. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 21 | SF | Performance Measure | 34 | Possible measures for State Forests - Wood growing per acre/year and cost/unit (credit for wood grown but not harvested). | State Forests Program intends to conduct a program-wide performance measurement effort to redefine how we measure our performance under the current Forest Management Plans. This suggestion can be considered within that process. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 20 | SF | Performance Measure 629-4 | 34 | - What is baseline, what if timber values are down. Tie to board feet? Net \$/acre/year as measure? - Need more detail on this measure. | MBF is currently used. |
| NW Oregon Area | 28 | SF | Performance Measures | 34 | Please include performance measures for state forests beyond revenue, such as young-growth management accomplishments, or a recreation-related performance measure, which could be correlated to implementation of recreation action plans. Utilize existing reporting mechanisms to drive performance measures. | The State Forests Program intends to conduct a program-wide performance measurement effort to redefine how we measure our performance under the current Forest Management Plans. |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|--------------------|------------------|----------------|--------------------------|---------------|---|---|
| Walt Schutt ODF | 19 | SF | Program Mission | 54 | I assume that last sentence of mission applies equally to both (i) BOF lands, and to (ii) SLB lands? Suggest that there are three thoughts going on here that allow "openings" for further debates as we look to the future. The possible message "pick-up", is that the State of Oregon has embraced two levels of management and that if certification conversations were again to emerge, we would "find" a disparity in sustainable management practices. | The State Forests Program will not be re-writing its mission statement at this time, but will consider issues such as this when the program revisits its strategic plan. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 9 | SF | SF 1.1.2 | 54 | Plan on ramping up the 10-year review in the 07-09 biennium instead of the 09-11 biennium. Waiting until 09-11 to start will be too late. Most of the work can be done and completed in 09-11, but need to get the planning going in 07-09. | You are correct to recognize that preliminary work will occur prior to 09-11, but we retain our commitment to initiate the process to this biennium. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 10 | SF | SF 1.2.1 | 55 | Monitoring on state lands: For a "vital few action", don't see that much monitoring activity occurring in field. | The Coos District develops an annual monitoring report under the terms of the existing Habitat Conservation Plan; a new monitoring plan will be developed under the revised Forest Management Plan/Habitat Conservation Plan. |
| Coos Bay ODF | 11 | SF | SF 3.1.1 | 55 | (Suggested new action) Document lessons learned from FMP/HCP processes and develop guide lines for future planning efforts. | A good suggestion, however, the State Forests Program has tried to focus on strategic plan actions that are considered "vital" and has tried not to include those action considered to be a part of "doing business." This assessment should be routinely incorporated into every planning process with the idea of "learning from the last process." |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------|----------------------|--------|--|---|
| Coos Bay ODF | 12 | SF | SF 3.1.2 | 55 | (Suggested new action) Assess organization and staffing needs for future planning efforts (FMP/HCP). | A good suggestion, however, the State Forests Program has tried to focus on strategic plan actions considered “vital” and has tried not to include those considered to be a part of “doing business.” This assessment should be routinely incorporated into every planning process with the idea of “learning from the last process.” |
| Coos Bay ODF | 13 | SF | SF 5.2 | 55 | Insert : “and landowners (SLB & BOF).” | The word “beneficiaries” is intended to refer to the State Land Board and Board of Forestry, as well as the Trust Land Counties. |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 50 | SF | Strategic Emphasis 4 | 55 | Change to statement to “Maintain and enhance aligned and empowered workforce.” | Good suggestion, it will be edited. |
| Walt Schutt ODF | 20 | SF | Strategies | 54 | The question as to the (or a) “forest product” objective in management planning needs a statement that this issue will be “kept under surveillance.” Re: I’m referring to the issues that surfaced during the OSU Intensive Plantation Symposium .. Also, what are we growing and for whom? | The State Forests Program has tried to focus on strategic plan actions considered “vital” and has tried not to include those considered to be a part of “doing business.” The Forest Management Plans articulate “what are we growing and for whom.” |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|--|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 42 | SF | Strategy 1.1 | 54 | Need to provide more recognizable and direct link to employee's jobs. Help achieve this by including more detail in Strategy statement by listing key recognizable management activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Education and Interpretation - Recreation Management - Timber Sales (Harvest) and Stand Management (Habitat) - Roads and Engineering - Reforestation and Young Stand Management | Statement will be edited as follows: <i>Continue to implement district plans for NW and SW Oregon State Forests, which include the following key functional areas: Education and Interpretation; Recreation Management; Stand Management, including Harvest; Roads and Engineering; Fish and Wildlife Management; and Reforestation and Young Stand Management.</i> |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 43 | SF | Strategy 3.2 | 55 | Consider combining 3.2 with 6.1 | Action 3.2 refers to a specific ongoing activity of "planning" that directly supports 'business functions' while Action 6.1 focuses more on activity that will be taken externally to build understanding, acceptance, and support; the strategic emphasis statement has been edited slightly. The State Forests Program strategic plan added statement 3.3.1 to create a link between these two vital actions: "See 6.1.3 – 6.1.6." |
| Forest Grove District ODF | 44 | SF | Strategy 4.2 | 55 | Develop Vital Few statement for strategy that provides example opportunities for collaboration: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - State Forest Conference - Year End Review - Intra-District/Staff Meetings and Tours | Good suggestion! The following statement has been added: <i>"Utilize area staff meetings, year-end review meetings, and other forums identified as appropriate to brief employees on current events or issues affecting the program."</i> |

**ODF Strategic Plan
May 27, 2004 Draft Comments Matrix – Sept. 1, 2004**

| Name | Comment # | Program | Element Addressed | Page # | Comment | Draft Staff Recommendation |
|---|-----------|---------|-------------------|--------|--|---|
| Forest Grove District ODF | 45 | SF | Strategy 6.2 | 56 | Add a 6.2 Strategy and Associated Action(s) focused on (and recognizing) Education and Interpretation program role in achieving the SEA goal. | The following statement has been added: Vital Few 1.1.5 – <i>“Complete construction and begin operating the Tillamook Forest Center;”</i> and 6.1.7 <i>“Engage the public through education and interpretation activities at the Tillamook Forest Center.”</i> |
| Michael Carrier Parks and Rec. Dept. | 8 | SF | Strategy B | | Strategy B places insufficient emphasis on the role state forests serve in providing outdoor recreation and landscape aesthetics. Related to this is a significant absence of strategies and actions related to outdoor recreation and aesthetics. While BOF B.5 and B.7 both mention recreation, it is only in passing. How would the department justify the considerable effort it puts into managing for recreation and education/interpretation using this strategic plan? | Strategy B has been established by the <i>Forestry Program for Oregon</i> and is not subject to revision in this document. The State Forests Program has included additional vital few action statements to further articulate its priority activities related to recreation (see comment 45 above). More detailed descriptions of the recreational activities can be found in the Forest Management Plans. |
| Carolyn Eady | 4 | SF | Strategy D | 18 | The Monitoring Implementation Plan states that “ODF will coordinate with local watershed councils to conduct watershed assessments to collect needed information at both watershed and site-specific levels.” (p. 7) Shouldn’t the department’s intention to work with local watershed councils be stated more clearly under Strategy D? (pp. 18-19) | Addressed comment in a phone conversation; State Forests considers this type activity a part of ‘doing business’ and does not call this type of situation a vital action within our strategic plan. The watershed assessment program has included coordinating with watershed councils and others as a procedural step in their assessment process. |