

**Default Question Block**

**Please enter your name in the box below. Your participation in this project will be known only to me (Chelsea Batavia) and my advisor (Michael P. Nelson). All responses will be kept confidential according to IRB protocol, and your identity will not be reported in my thesis, at my defense, or in any publications that may come out of this work. I am keeping track of your individual responses only so that I can contact you for clarification purposes.**

**Ecological forestry represents a position about how forests ought to be managed. My intention is to more closely examine the nature of this position, as well as the arguments made for and against it. In this questionnaire I will present you with two tables. The first is a table of what I have identified as the fundamental claims of ecological forestry, based on my reading of the literature. These are claims that would be made of ecological forestry at any site or in any context. The second is a table of reasons for why people support or oppose ecological forestry. The reasons in this second table pertain specifically to the implementation of ecological forestry on O&C lands in western Oregon. I will ask for your input on both of these tables.**

**Below are what I believe to be the fundamental claims of ecological forestry.**

<b>Ecological forestry is based on the best available science.</b>
<b>Ecological forestry is a type of sustainable forest management.</b>
<b>Ecological forestry emulates the effects of natural disturbance within the historic range of variability.</b>
<b>Ecological forestry achieves multiple (social, economic, ecological) objectives.</b>

**Now I would like to ask for your feedback on this table. Please indicate below the extent to which you agree with my assessment that these claims are fundamental to ecological forestry, at any site or in**

any context (0 = I wholeheartedly disagree, 10 = I wholeheartedly agree).

	0	10
Ecological forestry is based on the best available science.		
Ecological forestry is a type of sustainable forest management.		
Ecological forestry emulates the effects of natural disturbance within the historic range of variability.		
Ecological forestry achieves multiple (social, economic, ecological) objectives.		

Would any of these claims be more accurately represented with different wording? Please make suggestions in the boxes below (if you have no suggestions, simply leave the box blank).

Ecological forestry is based on the best available science.

Ecological forestry is a type of sustainable forest management.

Ecological forestry emulates the effects of natural disturbance within the historic range of variability.

Ecological forestry achieves multiple (social, economic, ecological) objectives.

Are there fundamental claims that you think I have missed? Please make any suggestions in the box below. Again, please bear in mind that this question pertains to ecological forestry as a general strategy, not as a management plan for any specific site or context.

Although there are certain core principles of ecological forestry, more site-specific details emerge when it is applied to a particular context. For my project I am going to examine the applied example of ecological forestry in western Oregon. The O & C Land Grant Act is currently moving through Congress. Under the bill, regeneration harvests would occur in certain areas of the O&C lands, using ecological forestry as defined and described by Drs. Norm Johnson and Jerry Franklin. The bill has sparked lively debate among various social groups in Oregon.

There are numerous arguments made for and against the use of ecological forestry on the O&C lands. In the table below I have listed what I believe to be the main reasons advanced, i.e. those most central to the debate, both in the public discourse and in the scholarly literature. In this section I would like to ask for your feedback on the reasons I have identified.

To be clear, these are reasons given for and against the use of ecological forestry as proposed in the O&C Land Grant Act of 2013, *not* reasons for and against the bill itself. Thus, you will see that certain prominent arguments made for and against the bill, such as streamlining protocols to facilitate timber harvests (pro), or setting a precedent for loosening environmental regulations (con), are not in this table, and not under consideration in my analysis.

Pro EF on O&C lands	Con EF on O&C lands
Restoration of landscape heterogeneity by creating more complex early seral	Does not effectively create complex early seral
Supports biodiversity by creating more complex early seral habitat	There is no need for more early seral
Increases timber yields (financial stability/jobs)	Does not provide an adequate amount of revenue/jobs to rural communities
Threat of privatization if a socially acceptable management strategy can't be found to allow more than thinning on public lands	Variable retention harvests are analogous in effect to clearcuts
Conservation of old trees/old growth forests	Threatens conservation of old growth
Conservation of biodiversity (particularly threatened and endangered species)	Threatens conservation of biodiversity
Supports forest health and landscape resilience	Not enough certainty about consequences of ecological forestry treatments
	Negative outcomes (water, soil, carbon, wildlife, social acceptability)

How central is each reason to the position in favor of ecological forestry on O&C lands? Please assign each reason a number (0 = completely irrelevant, 10 = absolutely crucial). Please note, you are not

**ranking these reasons, i.e. you may assign the same degree of centrality to multiple reasons.**

	0	10
Restoration of landscape heterogeneity by creating more complex early seral		
Supports biodiversity by creating more complex early seral habitat		
Increases timber yields (financial stability/jobs)		
Threat of privatization if a socially acceptable management strategy can't be found to allow more than thinning on public lands		
Conservation of old trees/old growth forests		
Conservation of biodiversity (particularly threatened and endangered species)		
Supports forest health and landscape resilience		

**Would any of these reasons be more accurately represented with different wording? Please make suggestions below.**

Restoration of landscape heterogeneity by creating more complex early seral

Supports biodiversity by creating more complex early seral habitat

Increases timber yields (financial stability/jobs)

Threat of privatization if a socially acceptable management strategy can't be found to allow more than thinning on public lands

Conservation of old trees/old growth forests

Conservation of biodiversity (particularly threatened and endangered species)

Supports forest health and landscape resilience

**Have I missed any reasons that you believe are central to the position in favor of ecological forestry on O&C lands? Please make suggestions in the box below.**

**Now please do the same exercise from above with the reasons representing the position opposing ecological forestry on O&C lands (again, 1 = completely irrelevant, 10 = absolutely crucial).**

	0	10
Does not effectively create complex early seral		
There is no need for more early seral		
Does not provide an adequate amount of revenue/jobs to rural communities		
Variable retention harvests are analogous in effect to clearcuts		
Threatens conservation of old growth		
Threatens conservation of biodiversity		
Not enough certainty about consequences of ecological forestry treatments		
Negative outcomes (water, soil, carbon, wildlife, social acceptability)		

**Would any of these reasons be more accurately represented with different wording? Please make suggestions below.**

Doesn't effectively create complex early seral

There is no need for more early seral

Does not provide an adequate amount  
of revenue/jobs to rural communities

Variable retention harvests are  
analogous in effect to clearcuts

Threatens conservation of old growth

Threatens conservation of biodiversity

Not enough certainty about  
consequences of ecological forestry  
treatments

Negative outcomes (water, soil,  
carbon, wildlife, social acceptability)

**Have I missed any reasons that you believe are central to the position opposing ecological forestry on O&C lands? Please make suggestions in the box below.**

## Block 2

**If you have any additional comments, feedback, critiques, advice, or ideas, please write them in the box below.**

## Block 3