

Community Workshop Notes

October 14, 2004

John Day, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean

Meeting Participants: 42 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: Judge Dennis Reynolds, Grant County

Forest Service Officials: Bill Supulski, Planning Staff Officer & Roger Williams, Forest Supervisor; 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 Participant: 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 1.1.2: Decision-making

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Basically agree, but it lacks definition of a good decision is (ecological, economical, social)

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ (No comment recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Support is not broad based enough
- ◆ Litigation

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.2.3: Land Ownership

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Desired Condition in narrative was better than on worksheet
- ◆ Need to define "optimum" & "efficient"; may result in decreased collaboration

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ (No comment recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Lack of respectful communication
- ◆ Lack of cooperation
- ◆ Need to use facilitators

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.2.4: Trust Responsibilities

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agree with in general, but need more communication
- ◆ Use treaty language, don't generalize, each tribe is different

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Not meeting Desired Condition on Malheur with Warm Springs Tribe

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Communication is non-existent
- ◆ Staff shortages
- ◆ Personnel turnover
- ◆ Need standardization in how USFS deals with tribes on projects

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.1: Disturbance Processes

Group 1 -

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Add 'timing' to desired condition – frequency/intensity/timing

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Not close to Desired Condition

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Need dialogue/discuss disturbance – recognize benefits (role) of disturbance
- ◆ Need more consistent management between forests and policies
- ◆ Fewer 'cookie cutter' policies – one size fits all; recognize diversity and variable conditions

Group 2-

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ (No comment recorded)

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Generally agree – disturbance regimes not close; moving towards slowly

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Recognize role of disturbance
- ◆ More consistent management
- ◆ Eliminate 'one size fits all' edicts
- ◆ Add timing to desired condition

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.2.2: Institutional Adequacy

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Basically agree

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ We are not even close to Desired Condition!

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ No agency or public interaction
- ◆ Need better efficiency
- ◆ Need better communication/hands on
- ◆ Improve responsiveness

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.1: Hunting and Gathering

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Still have quality hunting opportunities, but some forest practices (thinning) are not leaving enough escape cover or winter feed
- ◆ Quality hunting areas are getting smaller
- ◆ Cougars reducing deer population

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ On the larger scale (tri-forest), group would agree with the Revision Team's assessment

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Need to better coordinate vegetation management tools with what game species need

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.7: Recreation

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agreed in general
- ◆ Should be linked to hunting and access

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Yes, we are "moving towards" but maybe too slow (specifically on condition of facilities and trails)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Work closely with partners and potential partners; 4X4 activity should not be concentrated
- ◆ Trails need maintenance; signs missing or vandalized
- ◆ Lifestyles and culture (Indicator 1.4.8) should always be considered in planning efforts

Desired Condition for Criteria 3.1: Capital and Wealth

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Group comfortable with Desired Condition statements
- ◆ Maintain ecosystem of the natural assets to provide social and economic conditions

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ The group felt we were far from Desired Condition

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Speed up planning process and project implementation
- ◆ Efficiency needs to be considered for private land as well as public land
- ◆ Non-implementation of projects on public lands causes more problems for private lands
- ◆ Need to maintain the industrial installed capacity in local communities

Desired Condition for Indicators 3.2.1 & 3.2.2: Production of Market & Non Market Goods/Services

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Generally agree with Desired Condition
- ◆ It needs added emphasis on sustained flow

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Did not agree with "moving toward"

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Need to focus on a "can do" attitude
- ◆ Actively manage forests to prevent fires and insect/disease spread before they have an opportunity to arise
- ◆ We need the ability to get on top of problems quickly
- ◆ Identify markets for smaller wood and supply the market with this wood
- ◆ Need more emphasis on flexibility (unlike screens, "21" rule", etc.)

- ♦ Management will keep all resources (including water, fish, wildlife, etc.) intact. Wildfire reduces all resources
- ♦ Management needs to keep up with growth (not keeping up with fuels build-up)
- ♦ Adequate personnel to run forests
- ♦ All of the above while maintaining water quality, fish and wildlife

Group Critique of the Meeting:

What worked and what we learned-

- ♦ Different answers to different problems in the group discussions
- ♦ Well organized and well-facilitated

What could be changed?

- ♦ Hand out narrative with worksheet
- ♦ Smaller groups
- ♦ Spread groups out/around

(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).

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.	(3.6)
I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area.	(4.3)
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.	(4.1)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints.	(3.8)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more).	(3.6)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a small group setting (6 to 8 people).	(4.2)
I am comfortable using maps to enhance the group discussions about concerns regarding the area.	(4.4)

Participants were also asked:

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

- ♦ Being given the opportunity to provide input
- ♦ Would like a better-defined vision of how this will be incorporated into final product
- ♦ The wording in some of the items was very confusing
- ♦ Some facilitators are close to the issues and therefore impose their opinions on the public
- ♦ Some speakers at the large group discussion used too much time
- ♦ Several made no bones about melding old personal agendas and the groups agreed on points
- ♦ It seemed to move too slow, too basic
- ♦ Need better guidelines for small group discussions
- ♦ Good people

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

- ♦ Contact info (email, name, phone #) in case of later questions
- ♦ What/where is meant by "sustainable/sustainability?"
- ♦ Control feral horses