

Community Workshop Notes

October 20, 2004

La Grande, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean

Meeting Participants: 23 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: Colleen McLeod, Union County Commissioner

Forest Service Officials: Kurt Wiedenmann, La Grande District Ranger.

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 Criteria 1.4.1: Hunting & Gathering

Group 1-

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ In general, yes
- ◆ Need to look at last sentence
- ◆ One person did not think there should it be there (hunting & gathering)

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Yes, existing and desired conditions are close.

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Lack of enforcement by Forest Service
- ◆ Consistency of regulations (or lack of regulations)
- ◆ Clear regulations needed – easily identified markers
- ◆ Paying fees without seeing benefits (trail maintenance)

Group 2 -

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ (No comment recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Inadequate law enforcement

Desired Condition for Criteria 1.4.6: Access & Use

Group 1-

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Basically, yes
- ◆ Should change wording to add non-motorized to desired condition

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Yes, Not close – but for a lot of different reasons:
 - 1) Road density areas (concentrated use),
 - 2) Shared use vs. exclusive use

Group 2 -

Agree with Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agree with desired condition in terms of range of recreation opportunities
- ◆ Disagree with designated x-country travel areas
- ◆ Like managed capacities in wilderness (but manage through access/portal design)
- ◆ Don't agree with permit systems on off-highway vehicle (OHV) high use areas

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Disagree – group feels that the diversity of the current situation favors motorized uses
- ◆ Don't like high density OHV areas – like cross-country travel

What challenges so you see?

- ◆ Further land lock-ups (roadless designation and national OHV policy)
- ◆ Better access seems to increase use in certain areas where it is not desirable
- ◆ Not enough enforcement
- ◆ Non-OHV designated roads being used because can't access designated routes

Desired Condition for Criteria 1.4.7: Recreation

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Agree that developed areas are moving toward

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Lack of adequate law enforcement

Desired Condition for Criteria 2.1.1: Disturbances

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Agree with "not close"

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Education
- ◆ Staffing
- ◆ Regulations
- ◆ Big issue and very frustrating

Desired Condition for Criteria 3.2.1: Production of Market Goods/Services

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ No; not moving toward
- ◆ Need to be reducing fire risk

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Lawsuits hindering actions
- ◆ Lack of timely decisions
- ◆ Rules that hinder actions
- ◆ Processes takes too long

Desired Condition for Criteria 3.3.2: Income & Employment

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agree with intent
- ◆ "1854" restoration and stewardship too broad an interpretation; what do they really mean?
- ◆ Do not exclude active management

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ No

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Need more local active management
- ◆ Broader definitions
- ◆ Need more flexibility across landscape
- ◆ Too many restrictions
- ◆ Not everything in Forest Service's power

(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?

- ◆ Stayed on schedule
- ◆ Getting information at meeting with orientation good process
- ◆ Very informative

What could be changed?

- ◆ Get the word out more
- ◆ Get materials in advance

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 (3.9)
I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area.	(4.0)
It is important that the public is involved at this early stage of Forest Plan revision.	(5.0)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know.	(4.0)
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). (3.7)
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. (4.3)

Participants were also asked:

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

- ◆ Nice to be involved in the initial stages
- ◆ Liked small breakout groups
- ◆ Staying on schedule, group participation

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

- ◆ Nuts and bolts to follow will be very interesting and far more active
- ◆ Who's going to make the final decisions?
- ◆ Current plan and how new plan is changing over old one
- ◆ Road closed issues, proposed (new) wilderness act
- ◆ Need to get the word out better about these meetings; I think the radio is the best way

Any other comments about the workshop?

- ◆ In some of the categories, it would be nice to have the fish/wildlife personnel available for questions.