

Community Workshop Notes

April 26, 2005

Burns, Oregon



Meeting Facilitator: Susan Hayman
Meeting Recorder: Tami Paulsen
Meeting Participants: 10 participants signed in

Co-Convenor: Steve Grasty, Harney County Commissioner
Forest Service Official: Roger Williams, Malheur National Forest Supervisor
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 2005 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 and answered questions.

Flipchart Comments

- Struggled with no Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement for the forest plans

- Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife and redband trout

Questions and Answers

- Q.** Can counties get together with Forest Service and discuss the new planning rule?
- A.** Yes. We will be meeting with the counties to do that in a few weeks and other meetings can be set up if the counties desire.
- Q.** Will the plan do away with the '21" rule'?
- A.** Maybe. The forest plan revision will look at the current forest plans and bring forward those parts that are desirable. The prohibition on cutting trees 21" and over will be considered during that process.

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

- Wilderness shouldn't be depicted as green on maps. Pick different colors that don't make associations for people.
- Numbering of categories looks like placing emphasis.
- Need to capture broader multiple uses—need to see logging and grazing
- Looks complicated to manage
- Encourage partnerships between the Forest Service and others who oppose the Forest Service. Partnerships with environmental groups for stewardship contracts.
- Implies only active management is in Category 4.
- Fewer categories is good.
- ♦ We need to use the word "logging". Just say "timber harvesting" and "logging"

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 & Scenic Rivers

- Designating rivers brings more people into those areas.
- The Forest Service isn't interested in taking care of creeks; they're doing a required paperwork process - just satisfying Congress.
- Forest Service should somehow limit number of rivers that would be looked at in this process.
- None of rivers on the inventory should be there—we don't need anymore.
- The forest is being adequately protected, so why designate? We have enough regulations for riparian values.

Questions and Answers – Wild and Scenic Rivers

- Q.** Are rivers unable to be "managed" once designated?
- A.** Once designated, a river management plan is written to specifically address what is needed to protect the river's outstandingly remarkable values and development scale. Management will be allowed if it helps maintain or protect the values for which the river was designated.
- Q.** Counties think they are part of this decision-making collaborative process...are they?
- A.** Counties do not have a part in the decision; decisions related to the Revised Forest Plan will be made by the Forest Supervisors. They are currently involved in the forest plan revision process and we hope that will continue.

- Q.** What would happen if the Forest Service said there was no need for change?
A. If there was no need for change, the forest plans would remain as they are. We have, however, already identified that there is a need for change and we are proceeding to determine what that change should be.
- Q.** Is the Forest Service revisiting what's already been done? What would've changed to affect eligibility?
A. Yes, we did review work that has already been done. However, there was very little involvement outside of the Forest Service in the study river processes following the decisions made in the current forest plans. We updated the work to reflect changed conditions and are giving time for public review and comment before management designations are made.
- Q.** How will the Forest Service handle input about eligibility from outside groups? They should consult with Bureau of Land Management (BLM) on this.
A. We will consider any input we receive. We are talking with the BLM.

Flipchart Comments – Areas with Wilderness Potential

- Some areas may meet criteria but don't seem to make sense—decision on evaluation is subjective.
- Native people have been managing the land for many, many years. This is “left out” when considering whether areas have been influenced by humans (inventory review criteria).
- Areas are too small.

Questions and Answers – Areas with Wilderness Potential

- Q.** Will restoration management activities lead to evaluation of additional wilderness areas?
A. Maybe. If activities change the conditions on the ground so that an area meets the criteria for wilderness, they may be considered.

Overall Evaluation

Comments from the Critique Forms:

Participants answered the following questions on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

	Average
I understand what management categories are and how they will be used in the Forest Plan.	2.8
I understand the process for Wild and Scenic River Inventory, and ways I can contribute to it.	3.5
I understand the process used to inventory the areas with wilderness potential and ways I can contribute to it..	3.0
I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people I didn't know tonight.	4.8
I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people who held different viewpoints tonight.	5.0
The workshop format was appropriate for what we needed to do tonight.	4.3
I am comfortable using maps to enhance my understanding of the discussion topics tonight.	5.0
I receive useful information and meaningful opportunities to engage in forest plan revision through this collaborative process.	4.3

Group Critique of the Meeting:

Participants were also asked:

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

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

Do you have any other comments about the workshop?

- I think there is enough wilderness areas and roadless areas
- Let people find their own recreational activities. Why do we have to designate everything?