

# Community Workshop Notes

## October 21, 2004

### Baker City, Oregon



**Meeting Facilitator:** Martha Bean

**Meeting Participants:** 28 participants signed in

**Co-Convenors:** Tim Kerns, Baker County Commissioner.

**Forest Service Officials:** Katie Countryman, Forest Planner, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest

**Team Members:** Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Bob Mason

**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-convenors 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. Katie Countryman, Wallowa-Whitman 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?

These were comments made during the group discussion on the draft desired condition statements discussed at this meeting:

### ***Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.6: Access & Use***

Group 1-

#### **Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Need to include better definition of "ecological sustainable" – who will define, who will monitor?
- ◆ How will we balance with social and economic?

#### **Agree with Revision Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Close, don't need to change conditions too much – maintain what we have

#### **What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Implementing multiple-use principles, creating a balance
- ◆ Can't concentrate use – keep diverse opportunities
- ◆ Need lots of access/roads
- ◆ Create new partnerships
- ◆ Re-evaluate user fee and permit systems

Group 2-

#### **Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Mostly agreed with Desired Condition, but it may be too broad
- ◆ Some terms are too subjective, need to clarified "timely" and "social and ecological" capacity
- ◆ Over snow and non-motorized should be added to Desired Conditions

#### **Agree with Revision Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Agreed with assessment of not close
- ◆ There are some places, however, where current condition is equal to Desired Condition

#### **What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Enforcement
- ◆ Education needs
- ◆ Developing partnerships
- ◆ Increased use – more people but no more land
- ◆ Some similar to Indicator 1.4.7

### ***Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.7: Recreation***

#### **Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Need to add "increased number of developed recreation sites and activities"
- ◆ Add in possible economic contribution

#### **Agree with Revision Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Current condition not moving closer because of decreasing access
- ◆ Maintenance of developed sites is declining

#### **What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Enforcement/collaboration, education/communication with partners and permittees

### ***Desired Condition for Criteria 2.1: Ecological Function***

#### **Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Drop last sentence
- ◆ Clarify where legal requirements fit

### ***Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.1: Disturbance Process***

#### **Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Need to clarify last sentence (historic range of variability (HRV)) and resiliency
- ◆ Need to decide whether to include human disturbance with natural

#### **Agree with Revision Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Agree on the call of not close for existing conditions.

#### **What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Laws and internal regulations – litigation.
- ◆ Lack of funding
- ◆ More rapid response to disturbances (can't move very fast in large post fire restoration efforts)
- ◆ Small decision space
- ◆ Social acceptance to some disturbance

**Desired Condition for Criteria 3.1: Capital & Wealth**

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ It is ok

**Agree with Revision Team's assessment?**

- ♦ Not Close – should be producing more renewable resources and still be sustainable

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ Laws and lawsuits

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

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ Yes, except need to define products and services and how to measure

**Agree with Revision Team's assessment?**

- ♦ Generally agreed that it's highly variable

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ Determining areas available and suitable for timber, grazing, mining, biomass, recreation, etc.
- ♦ Determine accessible and non accessible areas
- ♦ Need insight - multiple ideas about how we define value

**Group Critique of the Meeting:**

**What worked and what we learned-**

- ♦ Snacks, drinks
- ♦ Having district (local) helpers
- ♦ Got answers
- ♦ Provided understanding of process

**What could be changed?**

- ♦ Lots of discussion of laws and litigation instead of what's in the forest plan; need to explain the distinction
- ♦ Heat control in the room
- ♦ More time for small groups to write out results
- ♦ Talk about how desired condition changes (response to recommendations) will be made
- ♦ Numbers coming in over the top of good group processes
- ♦ More local decisions

**Comments/Observations-**

- ♦ Lots of local decisions get appealed
- ♦ Ecological words seem more prominent/have more emphasis... 1/3 of whole!!
- ♦ Laws/litigation – streamline/clarify – alleviating appeals means being engaged now at the beginning

**Comments from the Critique Forms:**

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

	<b>Average</b>
I understand how developing a vision and desired conditions fits into the revised Forest Plans.	<b>(4.2)</b>
I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area.	<b>(3.7)</b>
It is important that the public is involved at this early stage of Forest Plan revision.	<b>(4.8)</b>
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know.	<b>(4.3)</b>
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints.	<b>(4.3)</b>
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more).	<b>(3.4)</b>
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a small group setting (6 to 8 people).	<b>(4.1)</b>
I am comfortable using maps to enhance the group discussions about concerns regarding the area.	<b>(4.3)</b>

Participants were also asked:

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

- ◆ How do you define the word ecological definitions?
- ◆ Liked team member's explanations
- ◆ There are too many things to discuss for three hours.
- ◆ It's great that it was facilitated – wouldn't work otherwise
- ◆ Group had trouble getting their motor started – need more on the relevance of vision to the next steps
- ◆ Discussing with others without conflict
- ◆ Address plan rather than laws and litigation would be more positive
- ◆ Not enough dollars and cents equations
- ◆ Had a good leader

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

- ◆ All of it
- ◆ It is very interesting and there is a lot to learn!
- ◆ Impaction of oversnow vehicles on the environment, especially in the Anthony Lakes area
- ◆ Some users not represented. Watershed, fish & wildlife concerns did not surface in discussions; group was biased as a whole; local concerns well represented
- ◆ More exact numbers and data

**Any other comments about the workshop?**

- ◆ The Forest Team is doing something very positive by including the public; however, I think you should advertise this more and advertise that input is welcome and people can get the worksheets and have input without attending a workshop
- ◆ Is the input received really going to be in the end result or is this an exercise in futility? Does this really end up being what is wanted and practical!
- ◆ This was very enlightening and worthwhile!
- ◆ Good work Team!