

WHITE PAPER



USDA Forest Service

Pacific Northwest Region

Umatilla National Forest

WHITE PAPER F14-SO-WP-SILV-53

Eastside Screens Chronology¹

David C. Powell; Forest Silviculturist
Supervisor's Office; Pendleton, OR

Initial Version: **JULY 2007**

Most Recent Revision: **APRIL 2013**

INTRODUCTION

In March 1993, the Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) petitioned the U.S. Forest Service (Pacific Northwest Region) to halt all timber harvest activity in old growth forest occurring on national forest lands located east of the Cascade Mountain crest in Oregon and Washington (this geographical area is also known as the Eastside).

A month later in April 1993, a group of university and U.S. Forest Service research scientists released an "Eastside Forest Ecosystem Health Assessment" in draft form; this assessment is known as the "Everett Report" because it was directed by Dr. Richard Everett, a scientist located at the Wenatchee Forestry Sciences Laboratory (Everett et al. 1994).

In response to both the NRDC petition and the Everett report, the Pacific Northwest Region of the U.S. Forest Service issued interim direction in August 1993 requiring that timber sales prepared and offered by Eastside national forests be evaluated to determine their potential impact on riparian habitat, historical vegetation patterns, and wildlife fragmentation and connectivity.

[Historical Note: the following account contained within brackets provides Paul Hessburg's perspective about the genesis and early history of the Eastside Screens (Paul is a research landscape ecologist stationed at the Wenatchee Forestry Sciences Labora-

¹ White papers are internal reports; they receive only limited review. Viewpoints expressed in this paper are those of the author – they may not represent positions of the USDA Forest Service.

tory): “In May of 1993, RF John Lowe was faced with a large number of legal appeals to awarded and pending timber sale contracts because projects included cutting units in remaining old forests. We (Richard Everett, Mark Jensen, Patric Bourgeron (then TNC), Bernard Bormann, me) had just completed the Eastside Forest Ecosystem Health Assessment and released our refereed draft reports. (These were later published as 25-30 PNW Station GTRs and Research Papers in 1994 and 1995).

One of the key findings of the EFEHA was that late successional and old forest area and connectivity had been hard hit by 20th century harvest of large trees, and the data showed that if managers wanted to maintain native species and processes that depended on these forests, future vegetation management should likely avoid harvesting large trees.

In response, John Lowe and his special assistant Tim Rogan asked us to craft an interim screening process for timber sales (planned and offered), and a consistent logic for excluding units with large trees in them. The logic should be motivated by the key findings of the EFEHA. We did that.

The screening process was intentionally designed to be a short term measure (12-18 months) that would shift the harvest emphasis away from large fire tolerant trees (21 inches was a negotiated settlement), and towards small and medium sized fire and insect intolerant trees that had filled in the forests during the era of fire exclusion. The EFEHA also called for adaptive management and collaboration with stakeholders to be the key mechanism for making forward progress with ecological and social system restoration.

We gave them a multi-step screening process that enabled them to quickly assess the historical area and connectivity of area of old forests within project areas. The process included 8 steps. Rogan threw away seven of them and recommended that they just screen out old forest harvest units.

The screening process asked District IDTs to assess what the pattern, abundance, and variability of all successional conditions would ordinarily be (for each potential vegetation type) for the watersheds in question, and others just like them. If the current abundance of old forests was significantly less than that amount, then projects would leave old forests alone. If the patterns and abundances of other successional stages were also out of whack, these factors would primarily shape veg mgmt projects.

Further, the screening process stated that more in-depth landscape evaluations should ultimately replace the screens in order to determine all key habitat departures wrt HRV (at this time, a consensus was still lacking on the centrality of climate change, and of the FRV). These key departures would form the basis of landscape prescriptions

that remedied key departures and moved landscape conditions a few steps closer to restored patterns and processes.

The conservation groups stood down from their lawsuits on the basis of this screening process and the RFs hint of a future landscape evaluation protocol. John Lowe later retired, and the incoming RF had no particular commitment to Lowe's prior agreements with the environmental community.

"They are wondering if you have some measure or approach to assess the effectiveness of Eastside screens." The screens worked. John Lowe got his sales offered, the environmental groups backed off, and we felt used. Eastside ecosystems and native species continued to take it on the chin because many other needs were not addressed. Simply halting/slowing the harvest of old forests did not restore dysfunctional landscape conditions, which is still the current need.

As we stated at the time we built the screens, if native species and processes are part of our ongoing management focus, we recommend replacing the screens with robust HRV (and now FRV) departure analyses for vegetation and habitat conditions, fish and streams. Terrestrial and aquatic landscapes throughout the eastside are still out of whack, and the central problems and causes vary from place to place. Landscape analysis would frame those key local departures to guide the ecological restoration component. These considerations can then be annealed with the important social and economic considerations. The intended outcome would be socio-ecological restoration.

Right now, the question of how do we keep the mills from going under appears to be prime. Landscape evaluations could focus the landscape needs and provide a sound ecological basis for harvest and burning Rxs. Refocusing Forest Plans would take time. Building the needed empirical and simulation data sets would take time. It would not likely happen with a high pressure approach.

Another key finding of the EFEHA was that many pine and larch forest have been overharvested by repeated prior entries. This amounts to spending the capital in a savings account. If restoring habitats and processes was going to frame a part of ongoing management decisions, it was likely that harvest expectations would need to be pared back for some time. That has happened, but current efforts are not shaped to restore fire and climate adapted conditions to landscapes, according to the local needs. That is the persistent ongoing need."]

Interim direction known as the Eastside Screens was used to amend Eastside forest plans when Regional Forester John Lowe signed a Decision Notice on May 20, 1994 to implement Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #1 (USDA Forest Service 1994).

Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #1 is amendment #8 to the Umatilla National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

A slightly revised version of the Eastside Screens was issued as Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #2 when Regional Forester John Lowe signed a Decision Notice on June 12, 1995 (USDA Forest Service 1995). Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #2 is amendment #11 to the Umatilla National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (decision notice approved on 6/12/1995).

The Eastside Screens consist of six items: three general items (items 1 to 3), a riparian standard (item 4), an ecosystem standard (item 5) and a wildlife standard (item 6). After the Eastside Screens were issued, the Pacific Northwest Regional Forester appointed an Eastside Screens Oversight Team (Norris 2005) and charged them with reviewing and monitoring Screens implementation. The team's objective is to ensure that the Eastside Screens are being applied consistently across all of the Eastside national forests.

The Oversight Team provides clarification and interpretation of the Eastside Screens by periodically reviewing timber sale projects on each national forest, producing a letter describing their findings, and then circulating the letter to other Eastside national forests as a 'lessons learned' communication tool. These letters, which are signed by the Regional Forester or the Director of Natural Resources, are not considered advisory because they are used as administrative direction for Eastside Screens implementation.

This white paper provides a chronological list of events involving the Eastside Screens, a Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment affecting every national forest located east of the Cascade Crest in Oregon and Washington. It also provides a succinct summary for each of the letters produced by the Eastside Screens Oversight Team.

Date	Event
March 30, 1993	<p>A petition was delivered by the Natural Resources Defense Council, representing 22 organizations, to John Lowe, Regional Forester of the Pacific Northwest Region of the US Forest Service. The petition sought to halt timber harvesting in old growth areas on the National Forests of eastern Oregon and eastern Washington; premise of the petition was that adequate habitat for certain wildlife species associated with old growth forests was not being provided by the Pacific Northwest Region.</p>
May 14, 1993	<p>The Regional Office issues a 1-page letter and 11 pages of enclosures announcing a workshop, scheduled for July 20-21, 1993 in Portland, to “give Forest teams the information needed to screen the remaining FY ’93 timber sales against ecosystem/old-growth conservation criteria.”</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 1900/2430 file designation memo dated May 14, 1993; subject: Ecosystem Screens for FY ’93 Timber Sales; To: Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests</p>
July 30, 1993	<p>Fred Hall, Senior Plant Ecologist for the Pacific Northwest Region of the US Forest Service, issues a 5-page report entitled “Structural Stages by Plant Association Group, Malheur and Ochoco N.F.” It defines four timbered plant association groups (PAGs), and characterizes them by using the structural stages defined in table 4 of the Regional Forester’s May 14, 1993 letter announcing a screening process for FY 1993 timber sales. A table at the end of the report summarizes these characteristics for each of the PAGs: tree size, stand age at end of the stage, number of years in the stage, and percentage of total stand age in the stage.</p>
August 9, 1993	<p>The Area Ecologist for the Blue Mountains issues a 4-page letter, and 8 pages of enclosures, providing sub-Regional direction about how certain aspects of the Eastside Screens process would be implemented for the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests. This letter documents results of an expert-panel process conducted during August 3-5, 1993, and involving participation by 50 employees of the three Blue Mountain National Forests. The expert-panel process was initiated after the July 1993 workshop in Portland.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> Wallowa-Whitman 2060 file designation memo dated Au-</p>

Date	Event
August 18, 1993	<p>gust 9, 1993; subject: Ecosystem Screens; To: Wallowa-Whitman, Umatilla, and Malheur Forest Supervisors</p> <p>The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter and enclosures establishing the Eastside Screens, and describing how this new direction would be implemented for all remaining fiscal year 1993 timber sales located on the Eastside national forests. Enclosure 1 (1 page) is a project screening decision tree; enclosure 2 (4 pages) is a screening procedure for timber sales where preparation work is substantially complete or in progress; enclosure 3 (8 pages) is a paper entitled "An ecologically-based screening process for FY '93-'94 eastside Oregon and Washington vegetation management projects" (dated July 8, 1993); and enclosure 4 (6 pages) is a wildlife screening procedure and direction for timber sales.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated August 18, 1993; subject: Interim Approach for Sale Preparation, Eastside Forests; To: Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests</p>
Sept. 1, 1993	<p>Regional Office issues a 9-page letter providing answers to questions raised during the first two weeks after release of the Eastside Screens procedure described in their memorandum dated August 18, 1993.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated September 1, 1993; subject: Questions and Answers in Regards to the Screening Process for Sale Preparation; To: Forest Supervisors: Colville, Okanogan, Umatilla, Ochoco, Wallowa-Whitman, Malheur, Deschutes, Winema, and Fremont NF's</p>
Sept. 19, 1993	<p><i>Prairie Wood Products v. Espy</i>, 936288 TC (D. Or.) (Judge Hogan) Plaintiffs – timber mills, individual guide, and timber industry association – file suit to challenge the "screening process". Complaint contends that the screening process was established in violation of NFMA and seeks an injunction against its use. Specific contentions are that the process is: 1) inconsistent with forest plans; 2) violates plan amendment requirements; 3) increases threat of fire, insects, and disease; 4) redesignates suitable timberlands without amending the existing Forest Plans; 5) violates riparian area regulations; 6) was developed without interdisciplinary analysis; 7) was developed without public participation; 8) disregarded specific vegetation and site conditions; 9) failed to</p>

Date	Event
Sept. 27, 1993	<p>comply with mandatory procedure for formulating standards; and 10) is an arbitrary and capricious agency action.</p> <p>Regional Office issues a 1-page letter and 11 pages of enclosures describing results of a review of Eastside Screens implementation issues; the review was conducted during September 9-13, 1993 by an Oversight Team consisting of Lisa Norris, Tom Atzet, and Dick Shaffer, all of whom were Regional Office employees. The enclosures provide the Oversight Team Report.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated September 27, 1993; subject: Interim Approach for Sale Preparation, Eastside Forests; To: Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests</p>
Dec. 27, 1993	<p><i>PWP v. Espy</i> Government filed brief opposing PI and supporting motion for summary judgment. Plaintiffs reply brief was filed on January 14, 1994; Government response to plaintiffs' brief was filed on January 28, 1994.</p>
January 10, 1994	<p><i>PWP v. Espy</i> Plaintiffs filed several discovery requests; court agreed that government could withhold certain documents.</p>
February 3, 1994	<p><i>PWP v. Espy</i> A hearing was held to address summary judgment issues only.</p>
May 20, 1994	<p>John Lowe signs the decision notice for the continuation of the <u>Interim Management Direction Establishing Riparian, Ecosystem and Wildlife Standards for Timber Sales</u>. This decision amended Land and Resource Management Plans for the Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema National Forests in Oregon and Washington to incorporate interim management direction as new standards and guidelines. The new management direction was the same procedure, in a slightly modified form, as was described in the Region's August 18, 1993 memorandum and its enclosures. This decision is also known as Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment No. 1.</p>
May-June, 1994	<p>Appeal of Regional Forester John Lowe's decision by Kettle Range Conservation Group (94-13-00-0033)</p> <p>Appeal of Regional Forester John Lowe's decision by Natural Resources Defense Council (94-13-00-0034)</p> <p>Appeal of Regional Forester John Lowe's decision by Malheur Timber Operators (94-13-00-0038)</p>

Date	Event
June 1, 1994	<i>PWP v. Espy</i> The government filed a Notice of Completion of Environmental Assessment, FONSI, and Decision Notice for continuation of a modified version of the “screening process through amendment to Forest Service.”
June 30, 1994	<i>PWP v. Espy</i> Supplemental briefs were filed by both parties in response to the court’s order for additional briefs about the potential impact of the EA and Forest Plan amendments on pending motions.
October 19, 1994	<i>PWP v. Espy</i> Court issues an order enjoining the Forest Service from applying the August 1993 interim screens to the remaining 1993 sales until it complies with Forest Plan amendment and public participation requirements.
October 1994	<p>John Lowe chartered a team to review implementation of the Eastside Screens interim direction. The review was designed to determine which timber sale projects were not being implemented due to the interim Forest Plan direction, and to determine steps to remedy this situation. Many of the concerns were related to an inability under current standards to harvest insect or disease impacted stands.</p> <p>As input for this process, the Regional Forester asked Forest Supervisors to estimate implementation effects of the Eastside Screens interim direction on the risk of losing late and old structure stands to insects, disease, and other forms of deterioration.</p>
February 8, 1995	The Regional Forester issues a 2-page letter and 17 pages of enclosures describing the results of implementation monitoring for Regional Forester’s Forest Plan Amendment No. 1, considering the 8-month period since its issuance by decision in May 1994. The 17-page enclosure is a Monitoring Report prepared by a team consisting of Jim Schuler, Lisa Norris, Ken Denton, Mike Hilbrunner, Mary Erickson, and Miles Hemstrom. The report describes the monitoring process and objectives, and it provides seven findings from the monitoring team. Interested publics were sent a copy of the monitoring report on February 10, 1995. The report concluded that the Regional Forester will take steps to modify the screens, primarily by concentrating on the development and use of the historical range of variability analytical technique, and silvi-

Date	Event
	<p>cultural activities to maintain health of old growth stands. <u>Source:</u> RO 1920 file designation memo dated February 8, 1995; subject: Monitoring Report for Eastside Interim Management Direction for Preparation of Timber Sales; To: Forest Supervisors, Okanogan, Colville, Wallowa-Whitman, Malheur, Ochoco, Deschutes, Fremont, Umatilla, and Winema NF's</p>
March 14, 1995	<p>An interdisciplinary team is assembled to analyze a revision of the Eastside Screens interim direction for timber sale preparation. The proposed action is to revise the stand structure classification used for the historical range of variability portion of the ecosystem standard, and to clarify certain aspects of the interim wildlife standard.</p>
April 7, 1995	<p>Scoping period for the revised version of the Eastside Screens interim direction is extended to April 20, 1995.</p>
June 12, 1995	<p>“Decision Notice for the Revised Continuation of Interim Management Direction Establishing Riparian, Ecosystem and Wildlife Standards for Timber Sales” is signed by Regional Forester John Lowe. This revised version of the Eastside Screens management direction changed the vegetative structural stages used with the interim ecosystem standard, and it clarified the interim wildlife standard. This decision is also known as Regional Forester’s Forest Plan Amendment No. 2.</p>
Sept. 25, 1995	<p>The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Ochoco National Forest, which occurred on August 28, 1995. The memo provides seven findings resulting from the Eastside Screens Oversight Team visit to the Ochoco NF: (1) Forest is generally implementing the intent of the Screens; (2) Forest could move quickly with Screens implementation due to their Viable Ecosystems process; (3) Amended Screens (RF Plan Amendment #2) allowed revised determinations of what qualifies as late-old structure; (4) Local definitions of ‘large trees’ and ‘common large trees’ provides flexibility for LOS determinations; (5) Ochoco NF is generally deficient in both types of LOS (single-story and multi-story); (6) Ochoco NF is interested in harvesting some trees > 21" dbh; and (7) green-tree replacements for snags are generally not a problem for ponderosa pine,</p>

Date	Event
October 6, 1995	<p>Douglas-fir, and grand fir stands on the Forest. <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated September 25, 1995; subject: Ochoco NF Screens Implementation Review; To: East-Side Forest Supervisors</p>
October 6, 1995	<p>The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Malheur National Forest, which occurred on September 22, 1995. This memo discusses issues related to snags, riparian management, and roadless areas in the context of the Eastside Screens. <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated October 6, 1995; subject: Regional Forester Amendment #2 Implementation – Malheur NF; To: Forest Supervisors, Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, Wenatchee, and Winema NFs</p>
Oct. 31, 1995	<p>The Regional Office issues a 3-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Fremont National Forest, which occurred on October 13, 1995. This memo discusses thinning projects in LOS stands, development of a local definition for LOS, snags, and other Screens implementation issues. <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated October 31, 1995; subject: Regional Forester Amendment #2 Implementation – Fremont NF; To: Forest Supervisors, Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs</p>
Nov. 14, 1995	<p>The Regional Office issues a 4-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Umatilla National Forest, which occurred on October 18, 1995. This memo presents findings related to use of salvage definitions, snags and down logs, use of group selection cutting, harvest of 21" or larger trees, salvage sales in relation to mapped old growth, and connectivity corridors. <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated November 14, 1995; subject: Regional Forester Amendment #2 Implementation – Umatilla NF Trip; To: Forest Supervisors, Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs</p>

Date	Event
Nov. 14, 1995	<p>The Regional Office issues a 3-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest, which occurred on October 17, 1995. It discusses timber sales falling under scenario A of the Wildlife Screen, developing a local definition for LOS, interactions between the Screens and allocated old growth, green-tree retention for future snags, connectivity corridors as wildlife habitat, and other Screens issues. <u>Source</u>: RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated November 14, 1995; subject: Regional Forester Amendment #2 Implementation – Wallowa-Whitman NF Trip; To: Forest Supervisors, Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs</p>
August 1, 1997	<p>The Regional Office issues a 1-page letter and 2-page enclosure describing review team findings as related to site-specific Forest Plan amendments, as implemented by the Ochoco National Forest, involving Regional Forester’s Forest Plan Amendment No. 2. The review, which occurred on July 9-10, 1997, “was to respond to concerns that the Ochoco National Forest was not following the intent of the eastside screens.” The enclosure to this letter is the Review Team’s findings, which are presented as four findings pertaining to the Ochoco National Forest, and two findings pertaining to the Regional Office. The letter required that an action plan be developed and submitted to the Regional Office by August 22, 1997. <u>Source</u>: RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated August 1, 1997; subject: Review of Forest Plan Amendments of the Regional Forester’s Amendment No. 2 for Eastside Forests; To: Forest Supervisor, Ochoco NF</p>
October 2, 1997	<p>The Regional Office issues a 1-page letter and 1-page enclosure describing a review of Forest Plan amendments involving the Eastside Screens (Regional Forester’s Forest Plan Amendment No. 2). This letter directs Eastside forests to only consider site-specific Forest Plan Amendments to scenario A of the interim wildlife standard when: (1) a clear and compelling case can be made for the biological or ecological urgency to cut large trees in the short term (i.e., next 5 years); and (2) the amendment is unique or uncommon and is not being commonly applied across landscapes</p>

Date	Event
	<p>(watershed and larger). <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated October 2, 1997; subject: Eastside Screens Amendments; To: Eastside Forest Supervisors <u>Note:</u> this memo was subsequently rescinded by a Regional Office memorandum of June 11, 2003.</p>
Dec. 23, 1997	<p>The Regional Office issues a 4-page letter and a 2-page enclosure describing their review of about 36 site-specific Forest Plan amendments to the Eastside Screens (Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment No. 2). The review team visited the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests. This letter describes eight circumstances or questions encountered by the review team, most of which pertain exclusively to scenario A of the interim wildlife standard, and it provides the team's response to each circumstance or question. <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated December 23, 1997; subject: Review of Forest Plan Amendments of the Regional Forester's Amendment No. 2 for Eastside Forests to Cut 21" Trees or do Regeneration Harvests in Scenario A; To: Forest Supervisors, Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, Wenatchee, and Winema NFs <u>Note:</u> this memo was subsequently rescinded by a Regional Office memorandum of June 11, 2003.</p>
August 27, 1998	<p>The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter and a 3-page enclosure describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Colville National Forest, which occurred on June 16-17, 1998. This letter describes criteria for evaluating new science, regeneration harvest issues for scenario A of the interim wildlife standard, whether HRV calculations should include private land, criteria for when beetle-infested trees could be considered dead and available for salvage harvest, and snags issues. <u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated August 27, 1998; subject: Screens Review, Colville NF; To: Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests</p>
Sept. 10, 1998	<p>The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter and a 3-page enclosure describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Winema and Fremont National Forests, which occurred on July</p>

Date	Event
	<p>21-23, 1998. This letter discusses that trees over 21 inches in diameter cannot be harvested to reduce intertree competition, fragmentation issues associated with scenario B of the interim wildlife standard, circumstances under which timber harvest activities could occur in LOS stands, criteria related to a professional determination of tree death (specifying a 5-year timeframe) for dying trees, and how hazard or danger trees can be handled for recreation areas and other situations with public safety concerns. <u>Source</u>: RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated September 10, 1998; subject: Screens Review, Winema and Fremont NF's; To: Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests</p>
Dec. 11, 1998	<p>The Umatilla National Forest Supervisor issues a 3-page letter and 5-page enclosure providing Forest-specific guidance about how the Eastside Screens structural stage classification will be used when conducting an Historical Range of Variability analysis for timber sale planning, as required by the Ecosystem Screen. This letter provides ranges of percentages, by structural stage and biophysical environment, which analysts were directed to use during an HRV analysis. It also describes how plant association groups or potential vegetation groups are used as biophysical environments for the Screens. <u>Source</u>: SO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated December 11, 1998; subject: Historical percentages for use with HRV analyses; To: District Rangers <u>Note</u>: this memo was subsequently rescinded by a Supervisor's Office memorandum dated October 5, 2010.</p>
February 2, 1999	<p>The Regional Office issues a 3-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation review for the Okanogan National Forest, which occurred on August 14, 1998. This memo discusses a wide range of Screens implementation issues by using a question-and-answer format; a total of 11 questions are answered in this letter. <u>Source</u>: RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated February 2, 1999; subject: Regional Forester Amendment #2 Implementation – Okanogan NF; To: Forest Supervisors, Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs</p>

Date	Event
June 11, 2003	<p>The Regional Office issues a 1-page letter and 2-page enclosure providing revised guidance for implementing the Eastside Screens. This letter summarizes science findings and practical experience occurring after the Regional Office had issued two memoranda in 1997 (their October 2 and December 23 letters). The 1997 letters had the intended effect of reducing amendments to the Eastside Screens. This June 11, 2003 letter concluded that the 1997 letters had gone too far: "I therefore encourage you to consider site-specific Forest Plan amendments where this will better meet LOS objectives by moving the landscape towards HRV, and providing LOS for the habitat needs of associated wildlife species." This letter specifically rescinds the RO letters of October 2 and December 23, 1997, and it provides five examples of situations where site-specific Forest Plan amendments may be appropriate.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated June 11, 2003; subject: Guidance for Implementing Eastside Screens; To: Forest Supervisors of the Colville, Deschutes, Malheur, Ochoco, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, Wenatchee-Okanogan, and Wine- ma-Fremont National Forests</p>
Sept. 5, 2003	<p>The Umatilla National Forest Supervisor issues a 2-page letter, and a 5-page enclosure, providing Forest-specific guidance about how the five examples from the Regional Office memo of June 11, 2003 might be implemented on the Umatilla National Forest.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> SO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated September 5, 2003; subject: Guidance for Implementing Eastside Screens; To: S.O. Staff and District Rangers</p>
Nov. 10, 2003	<p>The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter describing an Eastside Screens implementation and field review of the Mt. Emily Fuel Reduction and Tremble Aspen Restoration projects on the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. This letter, which examined several projects in light of the Region's June 2003 memo encouraging site-specific Forest Plan amendments to ease Eastside Screens implementation, provided advice about how the Wallowa-Whitman NF might want to proceed regarding fuels treatment and aspen restoration projects that would likely require Forest Plan amendments.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated November</p>

Date	Event
	10, 2003; subject: Eastside Screens Team Report, Field Review of Mt. Emily Fuel Reduction and Tremble Aspen Restoration Projects; To: Forest Silviculturist, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest
June 10, 2005	<p>Lisa Norris, one of the original authors of the Eastside Screens when she was working in the Regional Office as the Wildlife Program Manager, issues a 3-page letter providing her perspective on the intent of the wildlife portion of the Eastside Screens with respect to retention and management of dead and dying trees. Her letter, which reiterates that the Wildlife Screen was not intended to maintain large areas of dead and/or dying forest conditions, was prepared for the Malheur National Forest as they were working on salvage-sale projects following several wildfires occurring during 2002.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> SO 1900/2430 memo dated June 10, 2005 (Mount Hood National Forest Supervisor's Office); subject: Review of the Easy Fire Recovery Projects FEIS in relation to Eastside Screens direction; To: Forest Supervisor, Malheur National Forest</p>
July 1, 2005	<p>The Regional Office issues a 1-page letter, and a 17-page enclosure, providing guidance about how to define and determine conifer mortality. This letter was designed to address concerns about the assessment of insect-, disease- and fire-related mortality, or pending mortality, for Late and Old Structural (LOS) components; and for development of post-fire marking guides. The letter refers to Eastside Screens interpretation letters of August 27, 1998 and September 10, 1998, which described how criteria developed by Forest Pest Management (FPM) personnel could be used for tree mortality determinations. It also discussed the Scott Guidelines as a tool for making tree mortality determinations. The enclosure is a draft version of a paper called "Understanding and Defining Mortality in Western Conifers" (dated May 2005); it was published in the April 2007 issue of the Western Journal of Applied Forestry with this title: "Understanding and Defining Mortality in Western Conifer Forests" (Filip et al. 2007).</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2400 file designation memo dated July 1, 2005; subject: Defining Conifer Mortality; To: Forest Supervisors</p>
July 26, 2005	The Regional Office issues a 2-page letter providing answers to two questions raised during the planning process for the Lower

Date	Event
Oct. 5, 2010	<p>Sheep project on the Walla Walla Ranger District of the Umatilla National Forest. This memo addresses harvest of 21" trees in sky-line corridors for scenario A situations of the interim wildlife standard, and it provides a Regional Office response to a Ranger District document describing how the Lower Sheep project was consistent with the Eastside Screens plan amendment.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> RO 2430/2600 file designation memo dated July 26, 2005; subject: Screens Question on Lower Sheep Project; To: Forest Supervisor, Umatilla NF</p> <p>The Umatilla National Forest Supervisor issues a 6-page letter providing Forest-specific guidance about how species composition (forest cover types), forest structure (structural stages), and stand density (tree density classes) will be used when conducting a range of variation (RV) analysis for forest vegetation project planning. A structural stage RV analysis is a requirement of the Ecosystem Screen portion of the Eastside Screens amendment to the Umatilla Forest Plan. This letter provides ranges of percentages, by ecosystem component (composition, structure, density) and biophysical environment, which analysts were directed to use during an RV analysis for timber sales and other forest vegetation projects. It also provides considerations about the interaction between RV concepts and climate change, and it describes how RV analyses fit within a broader planning framework.</p> <p><u>Source:</u> SO 1920-2-1 file designation memo dated October 5, 2010; subject: Range of variation direction for forest vegetation project planning; To: S.O. Staff and District Rangers</p> <p><u>Note:</u> this memo specifically rescinds a Supervisor's Office memorandum dated December 11, 1998.</p>

APPENDIX 1: EASTSIDE SCREENS REFERENCES

This appendix includes references dealing with the Eastside Screens events described in this appendix. For Forest Service employees, these references are available in PDF format from an intranet website: [Screens Website](#)

- Blackwood, J.D. 1998 (December 11). Historical percentages for use with HRV analyses; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to District Rangers. Pendleton, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office. 8 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Blackwood, J.D. 2003 (September 5). Guidance for implementing Eastside Screens; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to S.O. Staff and District Rangers. Pendleton, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office. 7 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Devlin, R.J. 1998a (August 27). Screens review, Colville NF; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 5 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Devlin, R.J. 1998b (September 10). Screens review, Winema and Fremont NF's; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 5 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Filip, G.M.; Schmitt, C.L.; Scott, D.W.; Fitzgerald, S.A. 2007. Understanding and defining mortality in western conifer forests. *Western Journal of Applied Forestry*. 22(2): 105-115.
- Goodman, L. 2005 (July 1). Defining conifer mortality; file designation 2400 memorandum to Forest Supervisors. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 18 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Johnson, C.G. 1993 (August 9). Ecosystem screens; file designation 2060 memorandum to Wallowa-Whitman, Umatilla, and Malheur Forest Supervisors. Baker City, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. 4 p (and 6 exhibits). On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Joyner, C.N. 2005 (July 26). Screens question on Lower Sheep Project; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisor, Umatilla NF. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 2 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1993 (May 14). Interim ecosystem screens for FY '93 timber sales; file designation 1900/2430 memorandum to Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 12 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1993 (August 18). Interim approach for sale preparation, Eastside Forests; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests. Portland, OR:

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 21 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1993 (September 1). Questions and answers in regards to the screening process for sale preparation; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Okanogan, Umatilla, Ochoco, Wallowa-Whitman, Malheur, Deschutes, Winema, and Fremont NF's. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 9 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1993 (September 27). Interim approach for sale preparation, Eastside Forests; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors, Eastside Forests. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 12 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1995 (February 8). Monitoring report for Eastside interim management direction for preparation of timber sales; file designation 1920 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Okanogan, Colville, Wallowa-Whitman, Malheur, Ochoco, Deschutes, Fremont, Umatilla, and Winema NF's. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 19 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1995 (September 25). Ochoco NF screens implementation review; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to East-Side Forest Supervisors. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 2 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1995 (October 6). Regional Forester Amendment #2 implementation – Malheur NF; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 2 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1995 (October 31). Regional Forester Amendment #2 implementation – Fremont NF; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 3 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1995 (November 14). Regional Forester Amendment #2 implementation – Umatilla NF trip; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 4 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Lowe, J.E. 1995 (November 14). Regional Forester Amendment #2 implementation – Wallowa-Whitman NF; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 3 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pend-

- leton, OR 97801.
- Martin, K. 2010 (October 5). Range of variation direction for forest vegetation project planning; file designation 1920-2-1 memorandum to S.O. Staff and District Rangers. Pendleton, OR: USDA Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region, Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office. 6 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Norris, L.K. 2005 (June 10). Review of the Easy Fire Recovery Projects FEIS in relation to Eastside Screens direction; file designation 1900/2430 memorandum to Forest Supervisor, Malheur National Forest. Sandy, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Mt. Hood National Forest. 3 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Schmitt, C.L.; Filip, G.M. 2005. Understanding and defining mortality in western conifers. R6-FHP-1-05. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 17 p.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1994. Continuation of interim management direction establishing riparian, ecosystem and wildlife standards for timber sales; Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #1. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service. 1995. Revised interim direction establishing riparian, ecosystem and wildlife standards for timber sales; Regional Forester's Forest Plan Amendment #2. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 14 p.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service; U.S. Department of Interior, Bureau of Land Management. 1994. Environmental assessment for the implementation of interim strategies for managing anadromous fish-producing watersheds in eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and portions of California (PACFISH). Washington, DC. 68 p [plus 5 appendices, a biological evaluation, and a proposed finding of no significant impact].
- Williams, R.W. 1997 (August 1). Review of Forest Plan amendments of the Regional Forester's Amendment No. 2 for Eastside Forests; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisor, Ochoco NF. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 3 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Williams, R.W. 1997 (October 2). Eastside Screens amendments; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Eastside Forest Supervisors. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 1 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.
- Williams, R.W. 1997 (December 23). Review of Forest Plan amendments of the Regional Forester's Amendment No. 2 for Eastside Screens to cut 21" trees or do regeneration harvests in scenario A; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 6 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.

Williams, R.W. 1999 (February 2). Regional Forester Amendment #2 implementation – Okanogan NF; file designation 2430/2600 memorandum to Forest Supervisors: Colville, Deschutes, Fremont, Malheur, Ochoco, Okanogan, Umatilla, Wallowa-Whitman, and Winema NFs. Portland, OR: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Pacific Northwest Region. 3 p. On file with: Umatilla National Forest, Supervisor's Office, Pendleton, OR 97801.

APPENDIX 2: SILVICULTURE WHITE PAPERS

White papers are internal reports, and they are produced with a consistent formatting and numbering scheme – all papers dealing with Silviculture, for example, are placed in a silviculture series (Silv) and numbered sequentially. Generally, white papers receive only limited review and, in some instances pertaining to highly technical or narrowly focused topics, the papers may receive no technical peer review at all. For papers that receive no review, the viewpoints and perspectives expressed in the paper are those of the author only, and do not necessarily represent agency positions of the Umatilla National Forest or the USDA Forest Service.

Large or important papers, such as two papers discussing active management considerations for dry and moist forests (white papers Silv-4 and Silv-7, respectively), receive extensive review comparable to what would occur for a research station general technical report (but they don't receive blind peer review, a process often used for journal articles).

White papers are designed to address a variety of objectives:

- (1) They guide how a methodology, model, or procedure is used by practitioners on the Umatilla National Forest (to ensure consistency from one unit, or project, to another).
- (2) Papers are often prepared to address ongoing and recurring needs; some papers have existed for more than 20 years and still receive high use, indicating that the need (or issue) has long standing – an example is white paper #1 describing the Forest's big-tree program, which has operated continuously for 25 years.
- (3) Papers are sometimes prepared to address emerging or controversial issues, such as management of moist forests, elk thermal cover, or aspen forest in the Blue Mountains. These papers help establish a foundation of relevant literature, concepts, and principles that continuously evolve as an issue matures, and hence they may experience many iterations through time. [But also note that some papers have not changed since their initial development, in which case they reflect historical concepts or procedures.]
- (4) Papers synthesize science viewed as particularly relevant to geographical and management contexts for the Umatilla National Forest. This is considered to be the Forest's self-selected 'best available science' (BAS), realizing that non-agency commenters would generally have a different conception of what constitutes BAS – like beauty, BAS is in the eye of the beholder.
- (5) The objective of some papers is to locate and summarize the science germane to a particular topic or issue, including obscure sources such as master's theses or Ph.D. dissertations. In other instances, a paper may be designed to wade through an overwhelming amount of published science (dry-forest management), and then synthesize sources viewed as being most relevant to a local context.
- (6) White papers function as a citable literature source for methodologies, models, and procedures used during environmental analysis – by citing a white paper, specialist reports can include less verbiage describing analytical databases, techniques, and so forth, some of which change little (if at all) from one planning effort to another.
- (7) White papers are often used to describe how a map, database, or other product was developed. In this situation, the white paper functions as a 'user's guide' for the new product. Ex-

amples include papers dealing with historical products: (a) historical fire extents for the Tucannon watershed (WP Silv-21); (b) an 1880s map developed from General Land Office survey notes (WP Silv-41); and (c) a description of historical mapping sources (24 separate items) available from the Forest's history website (WP Silv-23).

The following papers are available from the Forest's website: [Silviculture White Papers](#)

Paper #	Title
1	Big tree program
2	Description of composite vegetation database
3	Range of variation recommendations for dry, moist, and cold forests
4	Active management of dry forests in the Blue Mountains: silvicultural considerations
5	Site productivity estimates for upland forest plant associations of the Blue and Ochoco Mountains
6	Fire regimes of the Blue Mountains
7	Active management of moist forests in the Blue Mountains: silvicultural considerations
8	Keys for identifying forest series and plant associations of the Blue and Ochoco Mountains
9	Is elk thermal cover ecologically sustainable?
10	A stage is a stage is a stage...or is it? Successional stages, structural stages, seral stages
11	Blue Mountains vegetation chronology
12	Calculated values of basal area and board-foot timber volume for existing (known) values of canopy cover
13	Created openings: direction from the Umatilla National Forest land and resource management plan
14	Description of EVG-PI database
15	Determining green-tree replacements for snags: a process paper
16	Douglas-fir tussock moth: a briefing paper
17	Fact sheet: Forest Service trust funds
18	Fire regime condition class queries
19	Forest health notes for an Interior Columbia Basin Ecosystem Management Project field trip on July 30, 1998 (handout)
20	Height-diameter equations for tree species of the Blue and Wallowa Mountains
21	Historical fires in the headwaters portion of the Tucannon River watershed
22	Range of variation recommendations for insect and disease susceptibility
23	Historical vegetation mapping
24	How to measure a big tree
25	Important insects and diseases of the Blue Mountains
26	Is this stand overstocked? An environmental education activity
27	Mechanized timber harvest: some ecosystem management considerations
28	Common plants of the south-central Blue Mountains (Malheur National Forest)

Paper #	Title
29	Potential natural vegetation of the Umatilla National Forest
30	Potential vegetation mapping chronology
31	Probability of tree mortality as related to fire-caused crown scorch
32	Review of the “Integrated scientific assessment for ecosystem management in the interior Columbia basin, and portions of the Klamath and Great basins” – forest vegetation
33	Silviculture facts
34	Silvicultural activities: description and terminology
35	Site potential tree height estimates for the Pomeroy and Walla Walla ranger districts
36	Tree density protocol for mid-scale assessments
37	Tree density thresholds as related to crown-fire susceptibility
38	Umatilla National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan: forestry direction
39	Updates of maximum stand density index and site index for the Blue Mountains variant of the Forest Vegetation Simulator
40	Competing vegetation analysis for the southern portion of the Tower Fire area
41	Using General Land Office survey notes to characterize historical vegetation conditions for the Umatilla National Forest
42	Life history traits for common conifer trees of the Blue Mountains
43	Timber volume reductions associated with green-tree snag replacements
44	Density management field exercise
45	Climate change and carbon sequestration: vegetation management considerations
46	The Knutson-Vandenberg (K-V) program
47	Active management of quaking aspen plant communities in the northern Blue Mountains: regeneration ecology and silvicultural considerations
48	The Tower Fire...then and now. Using camera points to monitor postfire recovery
49	How to prepare a silvicultural prescription for uneven-aged management
50	Stand density conditions for the Umatilla National Forest: a range of variation analysis
51	Restoration opportunities for upland forest environments of the Umatilla National Forest
52	New perspectives in riparian management: Why might we want to consider active management for certain portions of riparian habitat conservation areas?
53	Eastside Screens chronology
54	Using mathematics in forestry: an environmental education activity
55	Silviculture certification: tips, tools, and trip-ups
56	Vegetation polygon mapping and classification standards: Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman national forests
57	The state of vegetation databases on the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman national forests

REVISION HISTORY

April 2013: Formatting changes were made throughout the document to bring it in line with the Forest's new white paper template. Text was added providing Paul Hessburg's perspective on the origin and history of the Eastside Screens (Paul is a research landscape ecologist stationed at the Wenatchee Forestry Sciences Laboratory).