

Community Workshop Notes

October 13, 2004

Burns, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean
Meeting Recorder: Kathy Campbell
Meeting Participants: 24 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: Steve Grasty, Harney County Judge
Forest Service Officials: Bill Supulski, Planning Staff Officer and Margaret Bailey, District Ranger, Malheur National Forest
Team Members: Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bob Gecy, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Dee McConnell, and Kathy Campbell

Handouts to Each Participants: Meeting Agenda, Draft Sustainability Framework, and Worksheet: Desired Conditions and Need for Change.

Meeting Summary/Objectives:

The team and the co-conveners held Round Two in the Community Collaborative Workshop series. The purpose of the workshops was to review and discuss the draft desired conditions that were developed using, in part, the Round One vision exercise which identified what participants “wanted the Blue Mountains National Forests for”. Other factors used in developing draft desired conditions included recent science, professional knowledge and experience of team members, and the current Forest Plans. The beginning of the session was held in an open house format with displays and time to review and become familiar with the worksheet that was used later in the workshop exercise. Bill Supulski, Malheur Forest Planner, gave a PowerPoint presentation about the forest plan revision process and the sustainability framework, followed by a brief presentation about how the Round One input was used to draft the desired condition statements. The second half of the workshop consisted of small groups discussing what participants thought about the draft desired conditions for the Blue Mountains national forests. The purpose of the activity was to focus on a few conditions that the groups wanted to discuss and to become familiar with the desired conditions materials so people can submit comments on the worksheet at a later date if they wish to. **The team asked that additional comments be received by January 14, 2005.**

Display tables during the open house portion:

Table – Forest Planning Process:

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

Table – The Sustainability Framework:

Handouts: Overview of Draft Sustainability Framework

Table – Round One Workshop Results:

Handouts: Binders of the Vision Statement submitted during the Round One Workshops from the database sorted by location and criteria.

Table – Vision/Desired Conditions:

Handouts: Draft Desired Condition Narrative, Draft Current Management Situation Report.

Desired Condition Exercise: In the small groups, the worksheet was used to select the desired condition to be discussed, and guide the discussion to answer three questions:

1. Do you agree with the desired condition statement? If not, what would you like it to be?
2. Do you agree with Team's assessment of where we are today in relation to the desired condition?
3. What challenges do you see in reaching the desired condition?

The following summary of small group discussions on the draft desired condition statements were captured on flip charts by each small group and presented to the larger group:

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.2.2: Institutional Adequacy

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Intent of "desired condition" is good
- ♦ Streamline process
- ♦ Involve all the partners

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree that we are not close to the "desired condition"

What challenges so you see?

- ♦ Need a rating system for time-critical decision prioritizing
- ♦ Consistent standards that are consistently measured

Desired Condition for Criteria 1.4: Social & Cultural Values

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ (No comments recorded)

Do you agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ (No comments recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Need common sense and multiple-use with active management
- ♦ Need more flexibility to achieve goals (grazing management and logging)
- ♦ Need thinning for community economic benefit and to open grassy areas for wildlife use, grazing for livestock, and recreation (hunting, hiking, snowmobiling)
- ♦ Need blowdown and old downed trees burned or harvested

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.6: Access and Use

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Paragraph is okay, some concern with wording
- ♦ Need to fit use to area without broad brush
- ♦ Limit some use – close areas where they are not appropriate
- ♦ Need to have more than motorized/non-motorized categories
- ♦ Access for fire is important
- ♦ Related to Indicator 3.1.2.

Do you agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Close to Desired Condition for amount of use locally

What challenges so you see?

- ♦ No comments recorded

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.8: Culture and Customs

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Paragraph is okay

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree that more information is needed

What challenges so you see?

- ♦ Need to define the culture – what things identify this culture
- ♦ Cultural anthropologist might be able to write about why this culture is unique

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.2: Hydrologic Function

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ General agreement – need to add some words about beaver and historic importance

Do you agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ (No comments recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ (No comments recorded)

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.3: Productive Capacity

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ (No comments recorded)

Do you agree with Revision Team’s assessment?

- ◆ (No comments recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Don't make the same mistake as we did in the existing Forest Plans

(Note: These summaries do not represent all of the documentation for the workshops; completed forms for each small group discussion have been placed in the project files).

Group Critique of the Meeting:

What worked and what we learned-

- ◆ Small group worked well
- ◆ Rotation of places
- ◆ Attendance was better than first meeting

What could be changed?

- ◆ Keeping focused on where we are in the process
- ◆ Better definition of terms
- ◆ Strongly encourage folks to get here early to digest information
- ◆ Get information out ahead of time

Comments from the Critique Forms:

Participants answered the following questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree):

	Average
I understand how developing a vision and desired conditions fits into the revised Forest Plans.	(3.7)
I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area.	(4.1)
It is important that the public is involved at this early stage of Forest Plan revision.	(4.5)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know.	(4.3)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints.	(4.3)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more).	(3.2)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a small group setting (6 to 8 people).	(4.1)
I am comfortable using maps to enhance the group discussions about concerns regarding the area.	(4.1)

Participants were also asked:

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

- ◆ Dislike small groups
- ◆ Yes – liked small groups discussions
- ◆ Seems like we didn't accomplish much; proposed desired condition vocabulary is excessive and in some cases largely unattainable – (i.e., people feel respected, empowered)
- ◆ More emphasis on prework reading material
- ◆ I like the common sense approach
- ◆ It was good to hear other people's viewpoints in small group discussions. I felt more productive with "private" comments in the first round however. I will be filling out the worksheet
- ◆ Went well
- ◆ It's good to see a strong desire to getting back to the management of the three forests
- ◆ Understanding process and structure of planning team

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

- ◆ Still do not know what the final plan is going to be like

Any other comments about the workshop?

- ◆ Good to do if it heads off litigation and improves efficiency of the agency