



### Opportunities for improvement

- 1 Despite improvements in site selection methods, NIPF landowners are still underrepresented in the sample. New methods of detecting harvest sites may be needed.
- 2 Some measurement methods used in the field may not adequately characterize guideline intent and implementation.
- 3 Some data collected in the field is not summarized in reports. Some questions that might provide valuable insight are not asked.
- 4 Staffing levels, training, changes delay analyses and report writing.

### Opportunities for improvement (cont.)

- 5 Current efforts for database construction and field data recorders will greatly facilitate data handling and report writing.
- 6 Clear goals that specify acceptable rates of implementation would give direction to the program.
- 7 Tailoring reports to specific audiences would improve communications and promote forest interests.

From *Implementation Goals for Timber Harvest and Forest Management Guidelines*, December 1998 (SI 1298)

The MFRC is required to establish guideline implementation goals for each of the state's major forest land ownership categories...

- 1) organizational support for the guidelines;
- 2) user awareness and understanding of the guidelines;
- 3) user commitment to applying the guidelines; and
- 4) actual application of specific practices set forth by the guidelines.

From *The Timber Harvest and Forest Management Guideline Implementation Goals for 2000: A Progress Report*, March 2001 (ME-0301)

...MFRC will specify goals for the application of the guidelines by forest landowner category, landscape region, and/or groups of practices.

The MFRC has begun to contemplate this question and will work to consider goal selection and criteria based on the results from the baseline monitoring assessment.

### Other opportunities for improvement

- Increasing accountability
- Input to effectiveness monitoring
- Combining efforts to satisfy common information need

### Timeline

- Additional information gathering during April
- Final report by May 1?

### Questions?

Forest Industry	2004		2005		2006		Total
	Monitored	%	Monitored	%	Monitored	%	
Owner A					1		1
Owner B	4	2			1		7
Owner C	1	1	3				5
Owner D					3		3
Owner E	2	5	5		4		16
Owner F		1					1
<b>Total</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>8</b>		<b>9</b>		<b>33</b>

Forest Capital Partners, Boise, Ainsworth Engineered, Potlatch, Rajala, Blandin

Harvest and Monitoring by Ownership Category (based on a 2004 estimate of harvest)

	2004		2005		2006		%
	Percent	Sites/yr	Monitored	%	Monitored	%	
NIPF*	47%	3760	24	1%	26	1%	29
State	20%	1600	33	2%	23	1%	26
County	19%	1520	22	1%	24	2%	22
Forest Industry	9%	720	16	2%	8	1%	9
USFS	5%	400	4	1%	8	2%	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>8000</b>	<b>99</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>1%</b>	<b>90</b>

\*(Includes Tribal, municipal, & non-forest industry)