



Attachment H - Technical Expert Review Group

Justin Butteris, State Forests Policy Analyst

October 19, 2015

The State Forests Division has convened a working group with the support of three stakeholder groups: the Council of Forest Trust Lands, the Oregon Forest Industries Council, and the North Coast State Forests Coalition for the purpose of evaluating the data and modeling methods the Division is using to model the revised forest management plan. The group, known as the Technical Expert Review Group, consists of three forest modeling experts and Division modeling staff.

This group is tasked with providing a third-party assessment of the data and modeling techniques, and providing feedback to the Division, the sponsors, and the Board of Forestry on the adequacy and sufficiency of the modeling effort. The group has met several times to discuss the data and modeling. At each of these meetings the experts have made requests for information which the Division has provided or is working on providing.

The experts are working to provide answers to the following study questions:

1. The harvest scheduler currently uses a list of assumptions and rules that constrain the model spatially and temporally. **Are the rules and assumptions reasonable? If there are any gaps, what are the suggested additions (or subtractions) to the set of rules and assumptions currently used in the harvest scheduler?**
2. The harvest scheduler currently uses 3 primary input datasets: (1) Inventory database with an associated set of growth & yield projections, (2) GIS database with current spatial constraints, including current T&E locations, and (3) Revenue and cost projections, based on historic values for ODF State Forests. **Are these datasets sufficient for State Forests when using this model for strategic planning? If not, what are suggested additions or modifications to input data?**
3. The harvest scheduler currently has a list of GIS and HTML reports (charts/tables) that are output to determine whether a scenario (a) follows the assumptions and rules from question 1, (b) uses the correct data from question 2, and (c) meets Board of Forestry requirements (e.g. financial viability and improved conservation outcomes, Greatest Permanent Value). **Are the current outputs (including GIS and tables) sufficient in meeting these requirements? If not, what additional outputs would improve model validation and/or scenario evaluation?**
4. There are evaluations that must be dealt with outside of the model. Examples: (a) Stream buffer widths can be implemented in the model, but stream function is outside the scope of the model. A functional evaluation must be made separately; (b) T&E species habitat in the model is limited to current known locations, and does not consider currently unknown locations or future locations. A separate analysis is required to determine future harvest limitations due to T&E. **Are there specific recommendations in dealing with model limitations?**
5. The Technical Expert Review Group is tasked with reporting back to stakeholders on the harvest schedule modeling the Division is undertaking. **Is the model development process documented appropriately? Is there confidence in the sufficiency and appropriateness of the model?**

The experts involved in this group will co-author a report, which then will be submitted to the Board to assist with the Board's decision-making. In addition to the responses to the study questions, the report

will also contain a record of the modifications the Division has made to its modeling as a result of the groups work. The group has been meeting approximately every two weeks and this schedule is expected to continue for the immediate future.

In an effort to provide the experts with the information they need, while adhering to the timelines established, the Division has providing the expert group with the model output data at the same time as it was provided to the Districts for field review. While it would be more ideal to provide the information to the experts following District review, this will allow the experts to weigh-in and inform the process prior to the results going to the subcommittee.
