DRAFT Interagency Mapping & Assessment Project User Group Charter
Version 3.3, June 7, 2007

Sponsors	Policy Oversight Group Co-chairs	Kick Off Date	Committee Type Sunset Date
USFS/BLM/ODF/ OSU/WDNR/WDFW	*Shawne Mohoric– Federal Agency* *Steve Hobbs - Oregon BOF* *(alternate with WA rep yearly)*	*October 13, 2006*	*Ad Hoc* January, 1, 2011

Vision	That the Interagency Mapping and Assessment Project (IMAP) meets agency partner and users objectives, is appropriately staffed and funded, and that its work is in line with the goals, policies, and legal mandates of participating agencies and will be of significant value to users for policy and technical analyses. The IMAP project will produce consistent, landscape-wide vegetation mapping across Oregon and Washington. The project will also produce a series of land use and other needed maps, and land use, vegetation, wildlife, and socioeconomic models that can be used to assess current conditions and trends and implications of alternative policies and management actions. This effort will be ongoing, adapting to changing agency planning and assessment needs.
Goals	- To achieve the vision by ensuring that landscape level, multi-owner, data and integrated analysis tools are available for use by agency staffs, policy makers, and other potential users. The IMAP User Group will serve as a review body for program development and implementation to help insure that IMAP delivers credible, consistent vegetation data, and associated models and tools to allow public agency managers and other users to assess environmental consequences of policies and potential management actions in a consistent fashion across ownerships and large landscapes. - To ensure technical review and quality control of all IMAP products. The User Group will refer technical-related matters to a Technical Team. The IMAP Technical Team is an interagency group of scientists that will coordinate and review IMAP technical work to ensure that IMAP produces scientifically credible and cost-effective data, modeling tools, and analysis. It will serve as a technical sounding board for a variety of data, mapping, and modeling issues related to IMAP and will help integrate IMAP with Coastal Landscape Analysis and Modeling Study and other assessment work. The User Group will provide input for the Technical Team, including input necessary to insure that products are of the highest quality and meet agency and user needs.
Background Drivers	- State and Federal agencies are currently updating forest plans and assessments, which need to be landscape-level, multi-resource, and multi-owner. - Policy makers and the managers who implement policy objectives need tools to both evaluate alternatives and to display potential outcomes, while accurately accounting for the wide variety of values people expect from both public and private lands. The most helpful tools are easy to use and provide a robust representation of the social, economic and environmental implications of vegetative succession, management, and natural disturbances. - Agency resources for assessment and planning are limited, shrinking, and unlikely to significantly increase in the future. - Over 21 million acres of Oregon's forestlands are overstocked, in Fire Condition Class II or III, and subject to catastrophic wildfire, drought stress, and insect and disease outbreaks, which impact forest productivity, air quality, and the safety of rural communities. - Washington faces similar issues, but with one major difference. Washington State Forests constitute a much larger proportion of the forested landscape than do Oregon State Forests. - Forest industry infrastructure, needed to help treat unhealthy forests and provide economic and social stability for rural communities, is in danger of disappearing in

	eastern Oregon and Washington. • Federal, state, and local initiatives could result in on-going, long-term forest health and fuel reduction projects, benefiting local, state and national constituencies. • Oregon policy makers are currently reviewing Oregon's land use laws and their effectiveness in meeting Oregonian's needs.
Success Indicators	1. Robust tools are developed in a timely manner for State and Federal agencies and other partners to use in forest planning and forest policy development. 2. Research and modeling results are distributed to policy makers and interested publics through printed and web-based reports and through forums. 3. Databases, maps, models, and other tools developed are used in forest planning, forest and land use policy development, and in other analyses. 4. Institutional capacity is developed to continue to develop and improve landscape-level, multi-ownership databases, models and other assessment and monitoring tools.
Milestones & Deliverables (bold)	2006 • October: Review draft **Charter & MOU** developed by User Group • October: Review objectives, resources needed, and **budget** requirements 2007 • February: Continue discussion of IMAP work to date and User Group Charter • July: Finalize **CHARTER** • July: Strategic issues and indicators identified, "**critical path**" developed • July: Identify **needed analyses** and **indicators** and **alternatives** to model • July: Continue **resource discussions** • July: Review projects 2008 • February: Update and publish **study plan** drafted by staff • February: Finalize **MOU** • February: Planning and resources • July: Review projects 2009 • February: Planning and resources • July: Review projects 2010 • February: Planning and resources • July: Review projects • October: Public **symposium** and publish **Assessment of Oregon's Forests**

Commitment	A first meeting was held on October 13, 2006 at which progress-to-date was reviewed and this charter, a draft Memorandum of Understanding, and budgets were reviewed. The User Group will meet semi-annually or as needed to help resolve issues and provide review for IMAP goals, objectives, staffing, funding, timelines and similar issues. The first meeting of any calendar year would focus on project review and direction; the second meeting of any calendar year will emphasize planning and resources. The User Group will refer technical issues to the Technical Team, which will meet as necessary to review these issues and submit recommendations to the User Group. The User Group accepts responsibility to: Keep stakeholders, policy makers, and technical partners informed and engaged when appropriate. Work to ensure that IMAP has sufficient resources to successfully complete goals and objectives. Facilitate decisions at the appropriate level on a timely basis to address key barriers and to facilitate taking advantage of promising opportunities. Monitor, inform, and coordinate with the others working on local, statewide, regional, and national indicators and assessments. Make decisions on recommendations from the Technical Team. The Technical Team accepts responsibility to: Review technical issues referred by the User Group in a timely fashion and submit recommendations to the User Group for approaches to solve technical issues. Suggest any additional technical issues that may arise during Technical Team meetings to the User Group for review and discussion. The User Group and Technical Team will comply with federal law with the intent of conducting an interagency process that will not trigger the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act.
Stakeholders	Forest Landowners State Agencies Forest Products Industry Federal Agencies Consultants Tribal Governments Power Companies The Governors' Offices Local Governments/Districts The Legislatures Environmental and NGO groups Universities and research centers Community groups Citizens Congressional staff
Decision Making Process and Decision Communication	The User Group will strive to make decisions and recommendations by consensus. Failure to participate will not be grounds for blocking consensus. If consensus cannot be attained, the co-chairs may elect to use other decision-making methods. Communication is through meetings, meeting summaries, in published documents and by email. Meeting frequency will be biannually; additional meetings will be set by the group as needed. User Group and Technical Team meetings will be open to the public and members of the public will have opportunities to provide comments to the User Group and Technical Team. Only User Group members designated though this charter will participate in decision-making. The co-chairs may appoint subcommittees and direct technical analyses for specific aspects of the group's work. The User Group will appoint membership to the Technical Team.
Selection of Co-chairs	One co-chair shall be a Federal agency User Group member annually appointed by the federal agency members. One co-chair shall be a User Group member representing the State agencies and selected by the User Group annually.
Membership	User Group Members Jaime Barbour – USFS PNW Research Station Jerry Beatty – Western Wildland Environmental Threat Assessment Center Angus Brodie – Washington Dept. Natural Resources

	Steve Hobbs – Oregon Board of Forestry/OSU College of Forestry
	Ted Lorensen – Oregon Dept. Forestry
	Shawne Mohoric – USFS Region 6
	John Pierce – Washington Dept. Fish & Wildlife
	Kim Titus – Bureau of Land Management
	Cindi West -- USFS PNW Research Station
	Rod Krahmer -- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife
	Tribal Representative to be determined
	    Committee Staff – David Morman, Oregon Department of Forestry
	    Technical Support – Miles Hemstrom, USFS PNW; Melinda Moeur, USFS R6; Jim Alegria, BLM; Gary Lettman, ODF