

Community Workshop Notes

October 19, 2004

Enterprise, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean

Meeting Participants: 23 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: Bruce Dunn representing Mike Hayward, Wallowa County Commissioner

Forest Service Officials: Dee Hines, Acting Wallowa Valley/Hells Canyon National Recreation Area Manager.

Team Members: Dave Schmitt, Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen

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. Team Leader Dave Schmitt 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 1.4.6: Access & Use

Group 1 -

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Need to include motorized and nonmotorized use

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ (No comments recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Not having a stable agency contact person
- ◆ Have more local user meetings
- ◆ Use the budget to help reduce the gap between conditions
- ◆ Use better planning to help reduce the gap between conditions

Group 2 -

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Generally yes
- ◆ Need to include more than motorized use
- ◆ Measures don't have to be quantitative for social issues – need meaningful qualitative measures

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Long way off from meeting desired condition
- ◆ Closer in meeting desired condition for non-motorized than motorized

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Difficulty of measuring a soft issue
- ◆ May see greater resistance to closing roads in future due to increase in sedentary public

Group 3-

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Need to include guidance for efforts to manage dispersed use
- ◆ Need to better define what is the appropriate capacity

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ (No comments recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Determining how we will resolve conflicts
- ◆ Integrated management plan
- ◆ Need more education & flexible solutions

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.7: Recreation

Group 1 -

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Need to add concept of opportunities to activities
- ◆ Good tie with positive economic effects

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ No comments (recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Reactive management may be one of the challenges (need to be proactive)
- ◆ Education the public contact folks about opportunities

Group 2-

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ (No comments recorded)

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Disagree with Revision Team's call (specifically water & trails)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Constrained by budgets
- ◆ Elimination of Northwest Forest Pass
- ◆ Need to rely on more partnerships.

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.1: Disturbance Processes

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ No major changes on Desired Conditions
- ◆ Some changes needed at measures level

- ◆ Need clarification on natural –vs- human disturbance

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ It is highly variable

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Low budget
- ◆ Declining personnel
- ◆ Litigation

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.2.2: Institutional Adequacy

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ A lot of desired conditions could be moved to measures
- ◆ Too long, liked the first sentence

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Two agreed that we're not close
- ◆ Two felt we're moving toward but have a long way to go

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Changing politics, budgets, and people
- ◆ Agency regulations and policies
- ◆ Different agency management/conflicting policies
- ◆ Broader, more programmatic plans should ease limitations

Desired Condition for Criteria 3.1: Capital & Wealth

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agree with desired condition and its linkage of human capital with ecological sustainability
- ◆ Would add:
 - Levels of economic connection need to be defined
 - Forest Service employee value in communities
 - Location of employment and effects on families
 - People's love for the land

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ No, may be moving away from Desired Condition

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Bulky internal processes
- ◆ Transfer traditional Forest Service role to others
- ◆ Allow innovative approaches to resource management to proceed
- ◆ How to measure conditions

(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-

- Don't need a workshop to get to the obvious
- Expectations – be aware of what you "set up" for these

What could be changed?

- ◆ Need to provide materials ahead of time (two weeks prior).
- ◆ More time needed
- ◆ More meetings...less intense – address fewer things
- ◆ May have larger group discussions
- ◆ Team members go to community meetings

Comments from the Critique Forms:

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

I understand how developing a vision and desired conditions fits into the revised Forest Plans.	Average (3.5)
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. (4.9)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know. (3.9)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints. (3.9)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more). (3.4)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a small group setting (6 to 8 people). (4.3)
I am comfortable using maps to enhance the group discussions about concerns regarding the area. (4.6)

Participants were also asked:

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

- ◆ To intense for a small time allotted
- ◆ Need more time to prepare
- ◆ There is so much information here I think this could be a 1-3 day event
- ◆ Time to think about Desired Conditions would have helped facilitate discussions
- ◆ Make papers available in advance so folks can read the information
- ◆ I appreciate the efforts of the team to make situation comfortable
- ◆ Everyone has specific interests that were brought out but they were only focused on those points
- ◆ Facilitator had written section we worked on and was somewhat defensive responding to comments; might have steered discussion too much
- ◆ Shorten the time before the small group workshop; summarize then get to the meat
- ◆ Great facilitation
- ◆ Thanks for staying on schedule
- ◆ Overall, very nice job
- ◆ Holding more meetings whether formal or informal will improve quality of input
- ◆ I am glad I came

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

- ◆ Yes – ODFW mitigating road closures
- ◆ How Desired Conditions like Institutional Adequacy will ultimately influence restrictive strategies