

# Community Workshop Notes

## April 14, 2005

### Baker City, Oregon



**Meeting Facilitator:** Susan Hayman  
**Meeting Recorder:** Tami Paulsen  
**Meeting Participants:** 17 participants signed in

**Co-Convenor:** Tim Kerns, Baker County Commissioner  
**Forest Service Official:** Steve Ellis, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest Supervisor  
**Team Members:** Trish Callaghan, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Dave Schmitt, Elaine Kohrman, Bob Gecy, 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**

- ◆ Discussion of how weeds are addressed is important.
- ◆ Noxious weeds issue needs to be elevated at the management category level
- ◆ Need a general recreation category (hunting access, motorized winter/summer, non-motorized)
- ◆ Motorized use subcategory is needed and access for hunters
- ◆ Winter vs. summer motorized use needs to be distinguished.

### **Questions and Answers**

**Q.** Minerals – will this area be designated? Mineral deposits could be everywhere. Concerned about a designation.

**A.** Minerals will not be a separate management category (unless it is a large activity currently in place such as a quarry) but may be displayed as a suitable use map.

**Q.** How to map management categories that “blend”. Will they accommodate multiple uses?

**A.** Many current categories have multiple activities that are allowed and this blending or overlap will continue with the new proposed categories.

**Q.** Need to consider historical sites or areas like Rock Creek Power Plant – should this be a special area?

**A.** Significant historic sites could be considered for mapping as a special area. We will look into how this area is designated.

### **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**

- Process is unfair because I thought issue was resolved before
- Process looks fair – good collaboration
- Designation constrains mining
- Concerns about tying up our resources – particularly grazing
- Vinegar Creek, Middle Fork John Day (study rivers) are highly mineralized

### **Questions and Answers – Wild and Scenic Rivers**

**Q.** I was an intervener in the Pacific River appeal, a miner. There were only 3 streams identified on the Umatilla—not 14.”

**A.** We will follow-up on this and see what the appeal resolution included.

**Q.** Are economics of suitability determinations considered?

**A.** Yes, during the suitability part of the process.

**Q.** How do we determine need? We really don't need more wild and scenic rivers.

**A.** We will address need during the suitability phase.

**Q.** What will go into the suitability analysis – particularly economics? What do the planning regulations say about determining suitability?

**A.** When planning for the suitability of a wild and scenic river, economics of the area and of current uses are closely examined and considered.

**Q.** What's the difference between evaluation and designation?

**A.** Evaluation happens as part of the suitability determination. What we have done is to determine preliminary eligibility of these streams based on the potential presence of the outstandingly remarkable values and the free-flowing nature of the streams. We have also considered the current level of development and access in our assessment of the appropriate potential classification level of the

streams. If the Forest Service decides to recommend a river for wild and scenic river status, the U.S. Congress would then consider designation. Only Congress can designate a river wild and scenic.

Filpchart Comments – Areas with Wilderness Potential

- John Day Wilderness Area had a minerals survey done. A lot of mineral value – this is not considered...Bureau of Mines completed this report.
- Greenhorn Mountain is now open to snowmobiles, very popular area, as are Little Eagle and Twin Lakes, but wouldn't be if designated.
- Wilderness designation is bad for local economy.
- Too much input from those who haven't seen the areas – area supervisors need to consider this.
- It's a never ending process.
- Look at historical resources in Greenhorn area (Ternski fern fossils, Principality of Greenhorn).
- When in evaluation step, information on mineral resources needs to be considered.

Questions and Answers – Areas with Wilderness Potential

**Q.** Are we following congressional guidelines? The roadless areas have become buffers, which Congress said we wouldn't have.

**A.** Yes, we are following the Wilderness Act, the 1984 Wilderness Act, and our Forest Service Handbook direction.

**Q.** Is the Forest Service really going to recommend more wilderness?

**A.** We don't know; we haven't gotten that far into the process. Wilderness is one of the options for land management designation. That determination will occur at the end of this review process.

**Overall Evaluation**

Group Critique of the Meeting:

**What worked well-**

- Good speakers

**What could be improved-**

- Poster and hand-out of criteria needed

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.                                       | 4.1            |
| I understand the process for Wild and Scenic River Inventory, and ways I can contribute to it.                                  | 3.8            |
| I understand the process used to inventory the areas with wilderness potential and ways I can contribute to it.                 | 3.6            |
| I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people I didn't know tonight.                                              | 4.1            |
| 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. | 4.3            |

Participants were also asked:

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

- Great facilitation, thank you.
- This workshop seemed better than past ones.
- Hard to have small groups exercises with polar opposite viewpoints, better facilitation.
- Well spoken, informed presenters.
- Good collaboration of us/them.
- Well facilitated.

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

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

- Still think it may be more show than substance re: public involvement—not really a collaborative decision-making process, but useful information and appreciate attempt to involve the public.