

Multi-Party Monitoring Meeting Notes, 10/4/02, Meeting # 1

Attended by: BB, GM, CM, KM, GB, L&K G, BF, MK, CG

Rationale- How did we get the pilot authority and what does this mean?

The Sisters RD requested to get the pilot authority in 2001 because of the issue of marginal value/deficit timber sales, and interest in trying new contracting methods as separating the log from the logger. There are 16 pilots in Or, N. Ca, Wa, and Ak; 84 pilots nationwide.

The pilot authority gives us the ability to use special authorities in contracting to accomplish land management objectives. These special authorities include; best value contracting, goods for services, retention of receipts, designation by description/Rx, less than free and open competition, sole source purchasing, and non-USDA administration of timber sales. The charter of the pilot program is essentially to do ecosystem management with more collaboration with the public, keeping in mind the needs of rural communities. Multi-party monitoring/annual reporting is required.

Organization of Multi-Party Monitoring Team (MPMT)-What work will be done and by whom?

The Multi-Party Monitoring Team will be composed of stakeholders that represent broad interests and perspectives on the Metolius Stewardship Project. The team will derive the monitoring questions that will check the work progress to insure that the tests of authorities occur and that information is gathered, analyzed, and evaluated to help facilitate "adaptive management" (applying "lessons learned") to increase the overall learning and success of the effort. The team needs to be diverse; names of people were given to followup on for joining the group.

Goals FY 03- What does the team hope to accomplish by October 2003?

As long as the progress of the EIS is not stalled, implementation could begin in early Fall 03. The Forest Service and the MPMT will need to be clear about project design; we will need to determine what the desirable end results are and what the outcome of the monitoring effort will be. So by the end of FY 03, we hope to have identified the contracting methods to use including the number, size, and types of contracts, and perhaps to the point of awarding some contracts. We will also have identified the monitoring questions to be tested on the ground.

Priorities on the Goals- What are the priorities for this year?

The first priority is to gather a wide range of stakeholders to comprise the MPMT. Then this team will learn about the task at hand by gaining perspective from other local MPMTs (Chemult RD of the Winema NF and the McKenzie RD of the Willamette NF). The FS implementation team will work with our group to develop an implementation strategy. Simultaneously, the MPMT will derive the monitoring questions. Marcus Kauffman, from the Watershed Research Center will guide our group through this process. Cindy Glick, from the Forest Service, is the contact person who is responsible for the monitoring work accomplishment and for writing the annual report.

How will we measure objectives? What is the accountability in the feedback loop?

The intention is for the monitoring information to be put into the adaptive management loop. The fruit of this effort is to distill down to what works and what doesn't, understand why, record the observations, share this information in a forum, and apply it to improve work on the ground. The bottom line is that this effort is based on "good faith collaboration" and Cindy Glick is accountable for the success of the monitoring effort.

How much funding/ time is needed by monitoring team members?

There is \$1,000 available from the Watershed Research Center to help defray costs for the MPMT work. The Forest Service also has set aside \$15,000 to assist with costs involved in this effort. Team members can be compensated for travel, lodging, and meal costs. Other expenses could include meeting room costs, supplies, photos/slide development, etc. The monitoring effort will occur until the end of 2006, as designated by the legislation governing this work.

There is a time commitment and expectation for MPMT members to attend meetings locally and far away, visit the forest, and help as necessary with events and tasks. Once the team derives the questions that will define the monitoring work, other groups as contractors, graduate students, and local teachers can help to gather the specified data.

Will the participants have any special authority?

No.

Who are the current Monitoring Team Members?

Scott Aycock, Central Oregon Partnership for Wildfire Risk Reduction (COPWRR) through the
Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council (COIC)

Geoff Babb, The Nature Conservancy

Bruce Berryhill, Sisters Resident

Phil Blatt, alternate representative for the Friends of the Metolius

Jerry Cordova, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Dwight Detwiler, All American Timber Co. in La Pine

Elke Dortmund, main representative from Friends of the Metolius

Bob Flores, Natural Resources Team Leader, Sisters RD

Cindy Glick, Deschutes NF Headquarters

Marcus Kauffman, Watershed Research and Training Center

Kris Martinson, Community Relations Team Leader Sisters Ranger District

Gregory McClarren, Clean Air Committee

Cal Mukamoto, Warm Springs Forest Products Industry

Rick Pay, Black Butte Ranch

Pete Schay, alternate representative from the Friends of the Metolius