

Community Workshop Notes

October 27, 2004

Pendleton, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean

Meeting Participants: 20 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: Hulette Johnson, Umatilla County Economic Development Director.

Forest Service Officials: Mary Gibson, District Ranger Walla Walla Ranger District, David Hatfield, Forest Planner, Umatilla National Forest

Team Members: Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bob Gecy, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Dee McConnell, and Dave Schmitt.

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 1.1.3: Learning and Adaptive

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes, agree with Desired Condition

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ We are moving toward with collaboration

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Distrust on publics' part on this approach to planning; past practices have not been held accountable
- ♦ Outlaws, law breakers; need law enforcement to enforce rules
- ♦ Be careful about what the Forest Service promises

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.6: Access and Use

Group 1

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Agree, but add timely "and inclusive"

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Current condition is not close to desired

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Inconsistent application of rules
- ♦ Budget cutbacks limit maintenance
- ♦ Back log of maintenance needs

Group 2

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes – mostly agree, but add the word "developed" along with maintenance

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Yes – we're not close
- ♦ Especially non-motorized and having loop systems

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Limited budgets, keeping up with maintenance
- ♦ Staffing for recreation and law enforcement is low to non-existent
- ♦ Re-evaluate site-specific regulations
- ♦ Need to be ready to meet changes in user needs
- ♦ Consistency across administrative boundaries

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.7: Recreation

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree – moving toward the Desired Condition
- ♦ Have concerns about timing of use

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Inconsistent application of rules
- ♦ Having adequate enforcement
- ♦ Unforeseen new uses and technology
- ♦ Forest Service's limited ability to respond to change

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.2: Hydrological Function

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ General agreement with Desired Condition (needs more simple wording)
- ♦ Need more off-channel storage to assist in flood control and irrigation
- ♦ Need to maintain stream flows for fish
- ♦ Healthy riparian areas act as a sponge
- ♦ Need more description of human uses; distinguish between and describe both human and natural disturbance

- ♦ Links to water quality and disturbance

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agreement on status and trend with some exceptions

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Need to maintain overall watershed health, reduce road density, and more time & money
- ♦ More efficient use of water

Desired Condition for Indicator 3.1.2: Built Infrastructure

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes – access and road system described well

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Fuel conditions are far from desirable
- ♦ Road and facilities maintenance is not where it should be
- ♦ Need to deal with environmental concerns of roads in riparian areas

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Increase enforcement presence – may be difficult given budget constraints
- ♦ Prioritize roads for maintenance by use and close low use roads
- ♦ Organize public user groups to apply peer pressure

Desired Condition for Indicator 3.2.1: Production of Market Goods and Services

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes, agree with it except need to define "sustainable flow"

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Depends on what "flows" we are talking about

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Define "flows," example – size of timber
- ♦ Deciding what can we "sustain" considering social, ecological, and economic elements

Group Critique of the Meeting:

What worked and what we learned-

- ♦ Small groups were good, we had opinions on both sides and showed respect
- ♦ Room
- ♦ Staff & Team

What could be changed?

- ♦ First half hour, help people to get up to speed

(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.	(4.0)
I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area.	(3.9)
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.	(3.6)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints.	(3.6)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more).	(3.3)
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.	(4.2)

Participants were also asked:

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

- ◆ Small group – great work with different views at table; need more time to maybe switch groups or topics – time to explore more than one issue
- ◆ When reporting back to the larger group, should maybe allow larger group to add comments/dialogue
- ◆ Facilitation – great job Martha and Team
- ◆ Public presenting criteria evaluation results

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

- ◆ More help initially with indicators
- ◆ Specifics about the process
- ◆ Longer snowmobile season
- ◆ How will current Forest Plans be incorporated (i.e., management allocations)
- ◆ Will new Forest Plan contain anything from the old Forest Plan (i.e., standards and guides)?
- ◆ What else we can do?
- ◆ Management of fuels

Any other comments about the workshop?

- ◆ Should start a glossary of terms as a handout
- ◆ It was relaxed and comfortable – easy to talk
- ◆ About 20 people attended – 11 were snowmobilers
- ◆ Too bad environmental groups and extreme utilization advocates not here
- ◆ Keep up the good work