

Community Workshop Notes

November 3, 2004

Pasco, Washington



Meeting Facilitator: Martha Bean

Meeting Participants: 21 participants signed in

Co-Convenors: none.

Forest Service Officials: Craig Dixon, North Fork John Day District Ranger and David Hatfield, Forest Planner, Umatilla National Forest

Team Members: Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bob Gecy, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Kathy Campbell, 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 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 1.4.2: Scenic Quality

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Agree, want intact forest
- ♦ No clearcuts, no more roads – want more trails

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Yes

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Having established system of trails would lead to better scenery
- ♦ Logging without re-planting
- ♦ Mining reclamation needed
- ♦ Need better education

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.6: Access and Use

Group 1

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Agree – apply to winter recreation too

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Regulations
- ♦ Oregon trail systems better organized than Washington
- ♦ More signs and better maps
- ♦ Maintenance

Group 2

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ General agreement with Desired Conditions
- ♦ Need stronger definition of cross-country travel
- ♦ Want to address interconnection of uses – trails to campgrounds for example – to address conflicts
- ♦ Need to address uses as interlocked – example: bikes and horses and seasons of use

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agreed with Team - not close to desired

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Need more constructive participation now and after plan
- ♦ Use volunteers more efficiently to help get the work done
- ♦ Forest Service folks need to be able when groups are available for volunteer work

Group 3

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Generally, yes
- ♦ Need to include motorized and non-motorized use
- ♦ Identify user or use conflicts

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Agree with determination of "Not Close"

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Include regulatory agencies
- ♦ Inconsistencies between administrative boundaries
- ♦ Users and agency managers may have different visions of desired conditions
- ♦ Identify what social and ecological capacities are and who determines

Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.7: Recreation

Group 1

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes
- ♦ Not sure about use numbers

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Yes

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Lack of facilities
- ♦ Need more education
- ♦ Inadequate law enforcement & education
- ♦ Increase numbers of users (Increase in ATVs)
- ♦ Etiquette – Don't leave toilet paper!
- ♦ Funding shortages
- ♦ Opportunities off-forest are needed to disperse use

Group 2

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Yes with moving toward in developed, less in dispersed

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Not enough money
- ♦ Different accounting
- ♦ Need better guidelines on dollars spent and accountability

Group 3

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Yes

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Recreation opportunities and experiences change as opportunities for access change
- ♦ Increased use may be positive for local businesses, but not necessarily local residents

Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.4: Population Sustainability

Agree with proposed Desired Condition?

- ♦ Yes

Agree with Revision Team's assessment?

- ♦ Yes.

What challenges do you see?

- ♦ Lack of funding.
- ♦ Balance habitat with social/ecological considerations

(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-

- ♦ Great close to home
- ♦ Liked small discussions; more people participate
- ♦ Liked ratio of Forest Service to rest of group

What could be changed?

- ♦ Know more about what specifics will/should be changed (from Forest Service district people)
- ♦ Diverse groups here
- ♦ More time – maybe

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.	(3.9)
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.	(4.3)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people I don't know.	(3.7)
The workshop format made it comfortable to discuss public land issues with people who hold different viewpoints.	(3.7)
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a large group setting (15 people or more).	(3.5)
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?

- ◆ Discussions were good
- ◆ I would like to see more opportunity for input from the public
- ◆ Close to home
- ◆ Small groups good
- ◆ I liked going over one item in order to know what was wanted when filling out questionnaire
- ◆ I enjoy working with good USFS people– very nice and helpful people
- ◆ Need more time but really don't want to stay too late
- ◆ Thanks for the snacks
- ◆ Good interaction and ratio of forest professionals and users in group
- ◆ Well organized!

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

- ◆ How to get more diversified groups
- ◆ How does this workshop compare to other workshop discussions for this plan and how other Forest Districts/Regions in the U.S. accomplish this activity

Any other comments about the workshop?

- ◆ Glad for the participation
- ◆ Snacks were nice