

# Community Workshop Notes

## April 13, 2005

### Enterprise, Oregon



**Meeting Facilitator:** Susan Hayman  
**Meeting Recorder:** Tami Paulsen  
**Meeting Participants:** 22 participants signed in

**Co-Convenor:** Mike Hayward, Wallowa County Commissioner  
**Forest Service Official:** Mary De Aguero, Eagle Cap District Ranger /Hells Canyon NRA Ranger  
**Team Members:** Trish Callaghan, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Dave Schmitt, and Dee McConnell.

**Handouts to Each Participant:** Meeting Agenda, Worksheet for Management Categories, Worksheet for Areas with Wilderness Potential, Worksheet for Wild and Scenic Rivers, Management Categories & Subcategories, Inventory and Evaluation Process for Areas with Wilderness Potential, and Inventory and Evaluation Process for Wild and Scenic Rivers.

#### **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; The 2004 Planning Rule, How to Contact Us.

##### **Table – Inventory of Areas with Wilderness Potential and Wild and Scenic Rivers**

**Handouts:** About Areas with Wilderness Potential and About Wild and Scenic Rivers.

##### **Table – Management Categories**

**Handouts:** None

##### **Table – Suitability**

**Handouts:** None

#### **Meeting Summary/Objectives:**

This was Round Three in the Community Collaborative Workshop series. The beginning of the workshop was an open house format with displays for one-on-one discussions as people arrived. The purpose of the workshops was to summarize the Forest Service's 2005 Planning Rule, introduce Proposed Management Categories for use in the Revised Forest Plan to display management guidance, and to present updated inventories for both Areas with Wilderness Potential and potential Wild and Scenic Rivers.

The Wilderness and the Wild and Scenic River presentations were focused on the inventory phase of the process; no decisions or proposals were being made. This step was only to identify what areas and rivers QUALIFIED to be considered for designation. Time was provided for questions to clarify the inventory criteria and to gain additional information from the public on current uses and conditions of specific areas and rivers. Discussions on these topics were intended to provide the public with information so they could comment on whether they thought the areas and rivers met the criteria. The Revision Team asked that additional comments be sent in by June 30, 2005.

#### **The 2005 Planning Rule:**

Team Leader Dave Schmitt gave a PowerPoint presentation about the 2005 Planning Rule.  
*There were no questions.*

#### **Management Categories:**

The Revisions Team's Vegetation Specialist, Bruce Countryman, presented a PowerPoint describing a preliminary set of Management Categories that may be used to display management guidelines on the three Blue Mountain national forests and asked the participants to comment on the concept and suggest additional categories and subcategories they would like to be used. **The team asked that additional comments be received by June 30, 2005.**

### Flipchart Comments

- Need transitional areas along the wilderness boundary; especially when you have two categories next to each other that are very different.
- Want more flexibility in determining lines.
- Need a map of all designated areas (hard lines).
- Category 3 needs to be further refined and described.
- Coloring areas on a map could be detrimental because of differences within area.
- Could have categories that are broadly described and then have numerous desired conditions within.
- Category 3 should be broken into 2 categories: Backcountry-related and wildlife habitat/fish — these are more specific to location.
- The lines on the map will limit management flexibility.
- Need to know what the land is capable of producing before drawing lines.

### Questions and Answers

**Q.** How do categories account for seasonality of use? Like snowmobile in winter vs. something else in summer. Elk winter range not there in summer.

**A.** Direction in the forest plan can address seasonal use in the desired condition or the design criteria. Suitable use maps/overlays is another way to handle uses that currently cross management category boundaries.

**Q.** Regarding the differences between Category 1 and 2, there is too much lumping of areas of ecological importance. Is there ecological data that indicates their importance? Do they adequately capture rare and unique ecological sites?

**A.** Rare and unique sites will be considered when we look at the adequacy of currently mapped special areas. We are working with botany specialists to look at the need for additional areas. If you know of specific sites, please identify them for us.

**Q.** Once the lines are drawn and included within the final forest plan, are they hard lines?

**A.** They are hard lines but can be modified after site-specific analysis and completion of a forest plan amendment.

**Q.** Why not use biophysical provinces versus having lines?

**A.** We are considering the biophysical provinces concept and will likely use them as we move ahead in deciding how and where to redraw the lines.

### **Wild and Scenic Rivers and Areas with Wilderness Potential:**

Trish Callaghan, Recreation Specialist for the Revision Team, made two presentations: one on the requirements and process for inventory and review of Wild and Scenic Rivers and one on the process for updating the inventory of Areas with Wilderness Potential. Participants were given time to ask questions about the criteria process used and to review maps and identify rivers and areas that should be added or removed from the inventories. **The team asked that additional comments be received by June 30, 2005.**

### Flipchart Comments - Wild and Scenic Rivers

- Need to know what the evaluation criteria were.
- Look at segments of currently designated rivers that were not designated.
- Little Sheep Creek segments affected by hydrologic events (man-caused) shouldn't be included.
- Acknowledge different perspectives...what people are used to (where people live – their frame of reference)
- Include county boundaries on the maps when identifying streams to eliminate confusion.

### Questions and Answers – Wild and Scenic Rivers

**Q.** Did we review existing designated rivers for expansion potential?

**A.** We reviewed the perennial streams on each unit, but did not necessarily focus on streams that were already designated.

**Q.** Why designate wild and scenic rivers in wilderness? Isn't this pointless? Why do rivers within wilderness area need further designation?

**A.** There are special provisions in Section 4 of the Wilderness Act that allows the President to authorize construction of water resource developments inside wilderness when it is desirable. The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act is a more restrictive law protecting rivers from water resources development, once they are designated.

- Q.** What is the Imnaha River designated as with so many recreation uses and roads?  
**A.** The Imnaha River has several distinctly different segments with each of the 3 classifications represented. The developed segment with “recreation” classification is 53 miles long. The other two classifications are also represented on this river.

Flipchart Comments – Areas with Wilderness Potential

- Add in how many acres in system are on national forest
- “Substantially altered by development”...we need to know more about what this means to determine if criteria were applied fairly.
- Can’t effectively comment on potential wilderness if we do not know or understand the criteria.
- Only looked at areas identified within existing forest plans.
- Need to know who will use the areas. Use this during the evaluation process.
- There are permitted outfitter guides and campsites within potential areas with wilderness potential.
- Concerns about cutting areas off from access given our population demographics.

Questions and Answers – Areas with Wilderness Potential

- Q.** Regarding the issue of compelling social needs, what is the scope?  
**A.** The scope would be adjoining states and our planning area, we would look at nearby population centers and relevant changes.
- Q.** What about airstrips?  
**A.** There are currently airstrips in existing wilderness areas. They might also be included in areas that are to be evaluated for wilderness potential. There are more detailed descriptions about the definitions of the “development” concept in the Forest Service Handbook, and a copy is available.
- Q.** What is the procedure for defining a road—how does it compare to 1986 procedure? Have rules about this changed? Did this go thru public review? Has it really been updated since 1993?  
**A.** We are using the road definition from the Forest Service Handbook (FSH1909.12 Chapter 7) which states that roads which are “maintained as suitable for travel by a passenger car” are not contained within areas inventoried for potential wilderness. Therefore, roads that are not designated for this maintenance level may occur in the areas with wilderness potential.
- Q.** Another step in the process is to prioritize the potential areas. Would this be open to the public?  
**A.** Yes, all of the steps to this process are open to public participation.
- Q.** Did Forest Service consider areas outside of 1990 inventoried roadless areas?  
**A.** Since we are revising the current Forest Plans, it makes sense to start with what is in those plans, such as the Appendix C Inventoried Roadless Areas. If someone suggests an area outside the 1990 inventoried roadless areas, we would review it to see if it meets the criteria.
- Q.** Hurricane Creek – has paved road and campgrounds in portion to be added as having potential so doesn’t meet criteria. Have the maps been updated since 1990?  
**A.** Yes, the maps have been updated, and we used our most recent inventory of roads to do the work that updated these areas. Based on your comment, we will review that area.
- Q.** How are affected people contacted about this and when? Local ranger district staff should make additional contacts.  
**A.** As part of the forest plan revision outreach process for these Community Collaborative Workshops, we have used our website, newspapers, radio, and phone calls to let people know about these meetings. We think that this gives us the best chance to reach all affected people. We have also asked local staff to contact people they know who may be interested and/or affected.

**Overall Evaluation**

Group Critique of the Meeting:

**What worked well-**

(No comments)

**What could be improved-**

- Problems getting stuff off web

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 what management categories are and how they will be used in the Forest Plan.	1.8
I understand the process for Wild and Scenic River Inventory, and ways I can contribute to it.	3.0
I understand the process used to inventory the areas with wilderness potential and ways I can contribute to it.	2.4

I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people I didn't know tonight.	4.0
I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people who held different viewpoints tonight.	4.0
The workshop format was appropriate for what we needed to do tonight	2.8
I am comfortable using maps to enhance my understanding of the discussion topics tonight.	3.6
I receive useful information and meaningful opportunities to engage in forest plan revision through this collaborative process.	3.8

Participants were also asked:

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

- Hot coffee and treats, coordinated by local stakeholders would improve the social mood.

**Is there anything that you would like to know more about?**

- At site-specific "local" meetings such as this, please provide more specific information on criteria and sites.

**Do you have any other comments about the workshop?**