

# Community Workshop Notes

## November 4, 2004

### Portland, Oregon



**Meeting Facilitator:** Martha Bean

**Meeting Participants:** 45 participants signed in

**Co-Convenors:** none.

**Forest Service Officials:** Jeff Blackwood, Umatilla Forest Supervisor

**Team Members:** Elaine Kohrman, Trish Callaghan, Bob Gecy, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Dave Schmitt, and Kathy Campbell.

**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 1.1.1: Participating & Engaging***

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Basically agreed with Desired Condition
- ◆ Need more action words re: role of USFS

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Yes

**What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Get past the way projects are developed now; need more collaboration
- ◆ Can't rush collaboration
- ◆ Funding
- ◆ Personnel
- ◆ Lack of trust

***Desired Condition for Criteria 1.2: Institutional & Community Capacity***

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Desired Condition is 1-sided; not an interdependency between USFS and communities
- ◆ Want more action words; USFS needs to help people anticipate, not just respond

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Not sure

**What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Defining for communities and USFS what this means on the ground
- ◆ USFS employees need to work within agency to understand their roles in communities
- ◆ Inadequate funding

***Desired Condition for Criteria 1.3: Social Equity***

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Disagree; needs to better reflect local communities' interests
- ◆ "Public safety" are wrong words to use
- ◆ Include community well-being and economic health

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ◆ Don't like the Desired Condition statement, so can't answer. If wording was changed to include community well-being, then we're not even close

**What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Environmental policies
- ◆ Inadequate funding
- ◆ Inadequate staffing
- ◆ National policy shifts; there is a lag time when these shifts occur while the agency catches up
- ◆ Lawsuits
- ◆ Social equity isn't valued as highly as other factors

***Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.5: Specially Designated Areas - Wilderness***

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Don't like term "managed" – feels like it's restricting access – keeping people out
- ◆ "Unconfined" feels like a restriction to people under 50 – can't access with a wheelchair

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ◆ No comments recorded

**What challenges do you see?**

- ◆ Increased number of visitors in wilderness
- ◆ Possible solution: more organized volunteer groups to help Forest Service

***Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.6: Access and Use***

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ◆ Desired condition – agree in general but remove term "high use," clarify meaning of "use"
- ◆ Clarify "ecologically sustainable"

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ♦ Agree that it is not close

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ Lack of enforcement
- ♦ Lack of adequate budget
- ♦ Conflicts between user groups
- ♦ Lack of education – why are areas closed
- ♦ Inconsistency in regulations or enforcement
- ♦ Forest is underused – example: weekend hunting
- ♦ Aware of conflicts between motorized and nonmotorized use
- ♦ Keep snowmobile use defined as over snow – not restricted to roads
- ♦ Undeveloped areas aren't utilized
- ♦ Need Forest Service coordinator to work with volunteer groups

***Desired Condition for Indicator 1.4.7: Recreation*****Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ General agreement with Desired Condition
- ♦ Need to include whole list of recreation activities

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ♦ Group did not agree with "unknown in less developed areas;" change to "limited knowledge" about current conditions

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ Integration of so many recreation needs
- ♦ Need more education
- ♦ Visitor management choices can cause problems

***Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.2: Hydrologic Function*****Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ Need to clarify terms for improved public understanding
- ♦ Simplify language
- ♦ Use ICBEMP model (road density analysis) for watershed condition
- ♦ If downstream is in bad shape and out of "our" control – why make upstream restoration a priority? + converse
- ♦ When setting goals, recognize that Mother Nature is unpredictable (variability in precip.) and this affects watersheds!

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ♦ Need to specify where you're talking about (e.g., Malheur and Umatilla are dry)

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ Vegetative condition (big trees vs. dog hair)
- ♦ Need more prescribed burning and forest management
- ♦ Vegetation conditions influences challenges to reforestation
- ♦ Mining (past and present)
- ♦ Need good maps and photos to work with
- ♦ Partnerships to improve watersheds

***Desired Condition for Indicator 2.1.4: Population Sustainability*****Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ Desired condition should reflect habitat effectiveness

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ♦ Some felt conditions are not close to desired condition
- ♦ Need to address abundance, road density, etc.

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ No comments recorded

**Desired Condition for Indicator 2.2.1: Disturbance Processes**

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ Clarify natural -vs- human caused disturbance
- ♦ Allow some natural processes to occur (e.g., wildland fire)
- ♦ Clarify terms (e.g., HRV and geomorphology)

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ♦ No comments recorded

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ No comments recorded

**Desired Condition for Indicator 3.1.1: Natural Capital**

**Agree with proposed Desired Condition?**

- ♦ Generally agree living off the interest is a very good thing
- ♦ Except, difficulty in defining asset and interest; example: old-growth – timber/social value, pros/cons of reserving assets or managing assets

**Agree with Team's assessment?**

- ♦ No
- ♦ We are moving in right direction is a value judgment
- ♦ Market may be saying we are not going in right direction

**What challenges do you see?**

- ♦ Prioritize – high/low risk – define over time
- ♦ Having clear goals and objectives – local adaptive – site-specific
- ♦ Building trust

(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-**

- ♦ Small groups
- ♦ Having examples
- ♦ Ideas came up on website

**What could be changed?**

- ♦ Bigger room, participants felt crowded
- ♦ Use a microphone
- ♦ May need to address additional issues, in the small group discussions
- ♦ Need more diversity in groups
- ♦ Increase younger demographics
- ♦ Look at using university facilities to attract younger participants
- ♦ Make it potluck style, please

**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>(4.3)</b>
I plan to attend most or all of the Blue Mountains Community Collaborative Workshops in my area.	<b>(4.0)</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>(3.9)</b>
I am comfortable contributing to discussions in a small group setting (6 to 8 people).	<b>(4.5)</b>
I am comfortable using maps to enhance the group discussions about concerns regarding the area.	<b>(4.6)</b>

Participants were also asked:

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

- ♦ Selection of date of workshop was not very sensitive (election time) and resulted in fewer key publics participating

- ◆ I thought the workshop was well planned and particularly like the opportunity to write my thoughts to you at a later time. I hope that all comments will be better evaluated and heard using this method. I am concerned that the vision is so broad as to be somewhat lacking at this point.
- ◆ Forums at universities rather than hotels
- ◆ Having meetings take place at a university campus would bring more young participants was a very good suggestion. It could save money and get more participation from the Portland area.
- ◆ Have booths at trade workshops and recreational shows
- ◆ It was difficult to hear (on occasion); a larger room might have mitigated the noise issue, particularly for the elderly
- ◆ Appreciate the patience of USFS folks; frustrated that many participants couldn't seem to understand the process.
- ◆ Small groups
- ◆ Not enough time
- ◆ They were very informative, good facilitation, especially Bob Gecy on hydrologic functions
- ◆ I liked smaller discussions and encouragement to go to groups with people who may have different perspectives
- ◆ I didn't like how vague the "sustainability framework" seemed
- ◆ Three hours is a bit long at the end of the day
- ◆ Good to have so many FS employees so far from home
- ◆ Difficult to hear some questions from groups, small group okay
- ◆ Microphone needed
- ◆ I liked that there was more discussion, even if it was only in small groups
- ◆ Too specific, I wanted more time on a variety of subjects
- ◆ Due to volume of subject matter, would it be better to meet several nights each time.
- ◆ Need tables to complete discussion groups ideas and or comments.
- ◆ Lot's of different subjects/ideas!!!

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

- ◆ Tons. I'll read more on your website
- ◆ There are a lot of words that I would like to have more clearly defined
- ◆ Future budgets/appropriations for carrying out the work plan outline
- ◆ Forest health of trees and taking out diseased trees
- ◆ More education
- ◆ It's time to get more site specific, it would be great to have GIS maps with overlays to compare/contrast areas with different criteria (such as roadless, old growth, young stands, fire class, wildland/urban interface, water quality, limited invasive species, grazing allotments, off-highway vehicle areas, deer/elk winter and summer range and calving areas)
- ◆ How to have better garbage control in our forest
- ◆ How can members of the public help the FS in its next steps?
- ◆ Self-inform
- ◆ I'd like to know more about how the collaborators will be turned into specific "nuts and bolts" of actual forest management plans
- ◆ What other workshops already said
- ◆ All of USFS's current stands and policies on forest management
- ◆ Management direction for existing road system, would like the Forest Service to adopt a back country definition for roadless areas

**Any other comments about the workshop?**

- ◆ Better selection of a venue could encourage more and different participants
- ◆ Good
- ◆ Workshops are needed so public can be involved
- ◆ Interesting
- ◆ Bigger room and microphone
- ◆ E-mail addresses of the team members
- ◆ Opportunity for more presentation, perhaps adjustment of hours could provide more time