Socioeconomic Monitoring, Adaptive Management, and the Northwest Forest Plan

Socioeconomic Monitoring 1990s

Monitoring Development, Pilot Protocol

Northwest Forest Plan Goals Revisited

Relevance for Adaptive Management

Future Directions for Monitoring

Have we improved our knowledge?

Is our new knowledge useful?

Where do we go from here?

Socioeconomic Monitoring 1990s No accepted model of local relationships County-level analysis Few precedents No protocol

Monitoring Development

Phase I

Phase II

Peer review 2002: Need to improve knowledge

Have we improved our knowledge?

I. Produce a predictable and sustainable supply of timber sales, non-timber forest resources, and recreation opportunities

II. Maintain the stability of local and regional economies on a predictable, long-term basis

III. Where timber sales cannot proceed, assist with long-term economic development and diversification to minimize adverse impacts associated with job loss

IV. Protect forest values and environmental qualities associated with late-successional, old-growth, and aquatic ecosystems.

V. Promote interagency collaboration and agency-citizen collaboration in forest management

Is our new knowledge useful?

Agency Goals

Contribute to local community well-being

Contribute to long-term economic diversification and development

Improve collaboration

Goal: Contribute to community well-being
Problem: Little control over external influences
Monitoring results: Other important influences are more under agency control

Implications:

Shift focus to influences more under agency control

Broaden focus to include a mix of manageable influences

Goal: Contribute to community well-being
Problem: Conditions change over plan duration
Monitoring results: Community and institutional capacity together enhance adaptability

Implications:

Shift focus to increasing local institutional capacity

Continue focus on contributing to local community capacity

Goal: Assist with long-term economic development and diversification
Problem: NEAI funding ended for FS
Monitoring results: Need still exists

 Implication:
Focus on providing local job development through growth areas in agency budgets

Goal: Improve agency-community collaboration Problem: Collaboration is increasingly needed to achieve stewardship goals Monitoring results: Disconnect between communities and local forests Mixed and changing ability of local units and local communities to participate Adaptive Management Areas have not gone beyond "business as usual" PACs have had some successes Community members motivated to participate

Goal: Improve agency-community collaboration (cont.)

Implications:

- Strengthen community and local unit capacity to collaborate
- Provide new commitment to Adaptive Management Areas
 - Deliver funding and facilitate decision-making at the local level
- Study models of success
- Continue to give communities a voice

Where do we go from here?

Future Directions for Monitoring

Refine monitoring for ongoing use Continue case studies Provide models of success Refine current understanding Collaborate with local communities and involve them in multi-party monitoring Integrate with unit-level planning Coordinate with other monitoring efforts Focus future monitoring on manageable factors that support socioeconomic well-being

