

# Community Workshop Notes

## June 16, 2004

### Dayton, Washington



**Meeting Facilitator:** Martha Bean  
**Meeting Recorder:** Kathy Campbell  
**Meeting Participants:** 39 participants signed in

**Co-Convenors:** Butch Aiken, Public Works Department, Asotin County

**Forest Service Officials:** Mary Gibson and Monte Fujishin, District Rangers, Umatilla National Forest and David Hatfield, Umatilla National Forest, Planning Staff Officer

**Team Members:** Dave Schmitt, Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bob Gecy, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Dee McConnell, and Kathy Campbell

**Meeting Summary/Objectives:** The team and the co-convenors held a series of community workshops to introduce the forest plan revision process to the public and invite them to help define a vision and desired condition for the Blue Mountains. The beginning of the session was held in an open house format with each team specialist providing a display and discussion on the Current Management Situation and a sign-up sheet to have a copy of the Current Management Situation Report mailed to anyone interested when it is ready. Team Leader Dave Schmitt gave a PowerPoint presentation about the process, followed by a short question and answer session. The second half of the workshop consisted of the neutral facilitator leading the participants through an exercise to identify what participants “want their forests for” to create a vision and desired conditions for the Blue Mountains national forests.

#### **Q & A Sessions:**

**Q:** How is the neutral facilitator being funded?

**A:** *We have an agreement with the U.S. Institute for Environmental Conflict Resolution (a separate agency from the Forest Service) to provide facilitation services for the revision effort. They maintain a roster of experts in facilitation and mediation for projects such as ours. We pay the Institute and they hire and pay Martha.*

**Q:** Why were no meetings scheduled in Walla Walla and Clarkston since they are the largest population centers in the Blues?

**A:** *We worked with the co-convenors to determine when and where to hold the Community Workshops. Recognizing that we have a limited capacity (9 team members, a finite budget and timeline, and a 5.3 million acre planning area) we tried to select meeting places that are reasonably accessible to as many folks in the Blue Mountains communities as possible. We have other avenues for those who cannot participate in the Collaborative Workshops to be involved in the process; phone calls, email, the U.S. mail, and our website.*

**Q:** Will these plans provide for consistency in guidelines, methods, and rules across the three forests?

**A:** *Yes. Having consistent management across the three forests is one of the reasons we are doing all three plans under the same effort. There may be some slight differences in the final plans, but we expect the three Plans will be 80-90% similar. The differences will reflect the difference in the desired conditions that the communities develop through the collaborative process.*

**Q:** Will there be a review of the Interim directions such as PACFISH (*Interim Strategies for Managing Anadromous Fish-producing Watersheds in eastern Oregon and Washington, Idaho, and portions of California – 1995*), INFISH (*Inland Native Fish Strategy – 1995*), and the Eastside Screens?

**A:** *PACFISH, INFISH, and the Eastside Screens will be reviewed as we revised the plans and the appropriate parts will be incorporated into the new plan direction.*

**Q:** Who will make the “local decisions” you keep referring to and when can we talk with them?

**A:** *Under the current regulations, the Regional Forester is the responsible official who will make the final decision on the revised plan. For decisions of this nature (those directly affecting the forest), the Regional Forester depends heavily on their input. The three Forest Supervisors will work very closely with the revision team and be a part of every aspect of the process. The three Forest Supervisors will be attending workshops as time allows and are available then. The Revision Team is sharing the outcomes of the Community Workshops with them and will keep them informed throughout the process. To talk with them directly, you should call their office.*

**Q:** How current or how old is the data you will be using? Is it new since the last plans? Will the data be peer reviewed?

**A:** *We have been collecting data for a long time and there are various levels of "current." Much data has been collected since the current plans by the Forest Service and other agencies and groups. We will be using the best data available. The Region is working with the Pacific Northwest Lab to determine where we need scientific review and how to accomplish that.*

**Q:** Who is the Revision Team collaborating with?

**A:** *The Revision Team wants to work with everyone who is interested in the revision and who will be affected by it. Everyone is welcome and encouraged to participate in the Collaborative Workshops.*

**Q:** Why are the tribes represented in the flow chart at the very end of the collaboration process?

**A:** *The tribes have been invited to participate in the Collaborative Workshops and we have met with them several times to share information about what we are doing. The FS shares in the federal government's overall trust responsibility to Indian Tribes where treaty or other legally defined rights apply to National Forest System (NFS) lands. In redeeming this shared responsibility, the agency carries out the intent of treaties and any subsequent case law or amendments by operating in a just and responsive way and making efforts to adjust the management of NFS lands in favor of the concerns of the respective Indian Tribe(s) as far as practicable, while still maintaining a responsibility to all the people – the general public. These actions and adjustments need to be carried out through consultation with tribal officials or their designees, on a government-to-government basis. The Road Map illustration intended only to show the tribes as a participant in the process, not that they would only be involved at the end.*

**Q:** How much input will people outside of the area have in the process?

**A:** *The Revision Team wants to work with everyone who is interested in the revision and who will be affected by it. We anticipate hearing from many people both within and outside the planning area. Each and every viewpoint will receive equal consideration regardless of where it comes from or how many times it is expressed.*

**Q:** What percent of the Blue Mountains in Washington State is wilderness?

**A:** *(While we did not have figures to answer this question at the time; Monte Fujishin (Pomeroy District Ranger) and Trish Callaghan speculated that about 40-50% was in Wilderness status. Trish has since found out that the area of the Umatilla National Forest in Washington is about 311,197 acres, and the Washington portion of the Wehanna-Tucannon Wilderness is about 34% (about 111,048 acres) of that).*

#### **Questions/Issues/Concerns shared by people at display tables during the open house portion:**

**Handouts:** The Forest Plan Revision Team; Components of a Forest Plan; What a Plan Does and Does Not Do; Workshop Schedule; PowerPoint Presentation; How to Contact Us.

#### **Table - Social and Economics /Criteria and Indicators:**

**Handouts:** Draft Criteria and Indicators

- ♦ Economic impacts to communities are a concern in this area because Dayton is natural resource based and relies on this.
- ♦ Numbers for per capita income are skewed based on a few well to do wheat farmers and overlook the impacts to others in the county.
- ♦ Columbia County has one of the highest levels of poverty in the state.

#### **Table - Recreation & Access:**

**Handouts:** Inventoried Roadless Areas & Wilderness

- ♦ Attendance seems to be the result of word of mouth and NOT from media notices.
- ♦ Some people are concerned regarding the "NO" in response to the question as to whether wilderness would be considered this round of forest planning. (*Comment: We will consider wilderness in the revision, recommendations on additional wilderness areas will be based on need.*)
- ♦ Wilderness "locks folks out"
- ♦ Motorized use and non-motorized use seem to be big issues.

#### **Table - Hydrology/Watersheds:**

- ♦ What is the most important water quality concern?

#### **Table - Vegetation Management:**

- ♦ Concern for wildfire in the Tucannon River near the private/national forest interface. The landowner wanted options for fuel treatment of private and public lands.
- ♦ Concern for fire risk and options to reduce the flashy shrub component that might contribute to fire danger.

- ◆ Concerns that we may further limit off-road ATV use.
- ◆ Concerns for any further limits on snowmobile use.
- ◆ Desire to use chainsaws for a short period of time in the spring to clear trails.

#### **Table - Biological Sciences:**

- ◆ What will the Aquatic Strategy be?—PACFISH or something different.
- ◆ Wilderness Areas are important refugia to fish and wildlife.
- ◆ All forms of ATVs are important uses of the National Forests.
- ◆ What are the Endangered Species Act listed species within the revision area?
- ◆ Why are we addressing Candidate Species?
- ◆ What are sensitive species?
- ◆ What is an open road?
- ◆ We need to maintain our Western lifestyle.

**Vision Exercise:** These were comments made during the open discussion time on visions people wanted for the Blue Mountains.

- ◆ Equal opportunities in the forest for all
- ◆ Fewer wilderness areas – more management to keep areas open and accessible
- ◆ There is a balance for users that want “quiet” experiences and those with other interests
- ◆ Manage forests to sustain economies and quality of life for communities
- ◆ Adequate funding for trail maintenance for all users
- ◆ Management for healthy (green, pretty, thinned-out) forests – manage salvage material quickly
- ◆ Sustainable, useable forests
- ◆ Multi-use for all motorized vehicles so that our lifestyle can continue to use the forest
- ◆ Consistency in law enforcement
- ◆ More wilderness areas for recreation
- ◆ What currently exists in wilderness needs to remain the same and managed
- ◆ Open to the public for various purposes, accessible to all user groups
- ◆ Managed to sustain wildlife for hunting
- ◆ Manage to sustain fisheries
- ◆ Allow forest employees to use motorized equipment for trail maintenance in the wilderness
- ◆ Put livestock back in the mountains to help keep down the underbrush
- ◆ Public lands are not open to the public when wildernesses are designated
- ◆ Wilderness takes away from many people
- ◆ Need some places that are quiet for solitude, and for peace of mind
- ◆ I'd like to see the forest managed so we have forage for wildlife
- ◆ Local communities need natural resource activities to sustain their quality of life
- ◆ Local governments need money from these activities to sustain schools and roads
- ◆ My vision includes opportunities to use power equipment to clear trails in the wilderness
- ◆ Put livestock back into areas to help manage the fuel loads
- ◆ We have a lifestyle we want to maintain
- ◆ We need equal opportunities for access
- ◆ We want some areas open, some should be closed

#### **Group Critique of the meeting:**

##### **What worked and what we learned -**

- ◆ Location was good
- ◆ Input method was good – no intimidation or pressure

##### **What could be changed –**

- ◆ Need to have meeting in a location closer to Lewiston or Clarkston
- ◆ Need to have better advertising
- ◆ Provide handouts of the PowerPoint presentation

#### **Comments from the Critique Forms:**

Workshop participants answered the following eight questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree):  
I understand what a Forest Plan is, and the revision process that was described to me tonight. **(Average 4)**

I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area. **(3.74)**

It is important that the public is involved at this early stage of Forest Plan revision. **(4.77)**

The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know. **(3.94)**

The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints. **(3.64)**

I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more). **(3.65)**

I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a small group setting (6 to 8 people). **(4.15)**

I am comfortable using maps to enhance the group discussions about concerns regarding the area. **(4.24)**

They were also asked:

**Is there anything in particular that you liked or didn't like about the workshop?**

- ◆ Lots of difference
- ◆ We didn't introduce ourselves, so no new contacts, relations, or networking was easily accomplished
- ◆ Very good for early meeting
- ◆ Location – so far from home/work
- ◆ Communication lacking for meeting
- ◆ Better marketing/advertising about meetings in more populous areas

**Was the information presented helpful to you? Is there anything that you would like to know more about?**

- ◆ Yes - lots
- ◆ More or less – not now, but I'm sure I will
- ◆ Printed data of presentation would be good
- ◆ Yes, not at this point in time
- ◆ Good job
- ◆ Yes, more details on uses groups and criteria for piddy (?) usage areas
- ◆ Too much time to wander around in the beginning

**Was the information presented helpful to you? Is there anything that you would like to know more about?**

- ◆ Have a five-minute break for socializing and bathroom;
- ◆ Print out the PowerPoint presentation;
- ◆ Big plan only, locale for our area, uniformity for 3 forests