

Community Workshop Notes

October 28, 2004

Heppner, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean

Meeting Participants: 10 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: none

Forest Service Officials: Al Scott, Acting Heppner District Ranger, David Hatfield, Forest Planner

Team Members: 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 the Revision 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 1.2.1: Community Resiliency

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Is it the FS role to see that local communities are resilient & adaptive? Should this be in the Forest Plans?

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ If it's "highly variable", what is the range (for example: to what level does the NF contribute to community resiliency?)

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Not sure communities are capable of change (don't have capacity, people moving out, lack of jobs, residents who are active and/or interested in communities are decreasing)
- ♦ FS is not connecting with communities – people aren't attending meetings

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.2.2: Institutional Adequacy

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ This might need to be broken down – need sub-headings
- ♦ Number of cooperative agreements might not be correct measure – what about quality of agreements?

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ (No comments recorded)

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Districts do things differently
- ♦ How to measure consistency
- ♦ Try to have more cooperative agreements.

Desired Condition for Criteria 1.4: Hunting & Gathering

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Should we be using the word "subsistence"? That might have legal implications
- ♦ Last sentence is more definition than Desired Condition – does this clarification belong in the desired condition description?

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree in general, but that's not the case for mushrooms
- ♦ Question about the quality of hunting and gathering opportunities the USFS provides

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Public compliance
- ♦ Consistency amongst areas (non-commercial vs. commercial)
- ♦ Resistance – need more law enforcement and education
- ♦ Conflicts between use and impacts on ecological elements

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.6: Access & Use

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Should say "motorized" and "non-motorized" in the same breath.
- ♦ Expand more motorized use; the biggest conflict is with motorized use
- ♦ Explain difference between permitted and non-permitted

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree – we are not close
- ♦ Some people think we have too much, others too little

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ The three Forests have different plans – inconsistent rationales
- ♦ Such a broad diversity of desires
- ♦ Need better public relations to explain why uses are or are not allowed
- ♦ FS doesn't know how to get public input when access proposals are being proposed; need to have people understand and participate
- ♦ Fighting manufacturers who are promoting using high-tech vehicles in pristine areas

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.1: Disturbance Processes

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Yes, agree with the statement

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Yes

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Tremendously expensive to treat noxious weeds – the longer we take to get it treated, the higher the cost
- ◆ FS is slow to respond
- ◆ Need to work on prevention/education components

Desired Condition for Indicator 3.1.2: Built Infrastructure

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agree

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Disagree, not even close – moving away from it
- ◆ Maintenance backlog is increasing

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Inadequate funding – not high profile like a National Recreation Area
- ◆ Public believes the forest is theirs to use for free – reluctance to pay fees
- ◆ Turn the roads over to the counties
- ◆ FS regulations

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

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Agree, but assuming a positive cash flow for both the FS and the communities
- ◆ The statement needs to reflect the interconnectedness – how the trading trickles down through the communities

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Agree we are moving toward; although it is highly variable

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Not being promoted or recognized; need better public relations on how important local resources are to a community
- ◆ Lack of willingness of people to buy locally – lack of commitment to communities
- ◆ Wood products are decreasing market for the size of material available
- ◆ Need to continue to pursue how to better utilize smaller material even though it's risky
- ◆ Could guarantee longer contracts

Desired Condition for Indicator 3.3.2: Employment & Income

Agree with the proposed Desired Condition?

- ◆ Why specify “off-season months” for recreation? There really aren't any here

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ◆ Yes

What challenges do you see?

- ◆ Laws and regulations
- ◆ Declining harvest of timber
- ◆ Stewardship contracting is an opportunity we need to continue to take advantage of

(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):

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.	(4.1)
It is important that the public is involved at this early stage of Forest Plan revision.	(3.9)

- The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know. (3.8)
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). (3.4)
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. (4.1)

Participants were also asked:

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

- ◆ Confusing to have two outlines for the meetings (worksheets and narrative)
- ◆ Attendance was a bummer (very low)
- ◆ Cookies were great!

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

- ◆ No comments

Any other comments about the workshop?

- ◆ Keep up the good work!