Community Workshop Notes
April 26, 2005
John Day, Oregon

Meeting Facilitator: Susan Hayman
Meeting Recorder: Tami Paulsen
Meeting Participants: 65 participants signed in

County Representative: Boyd Britton, Grant County Commissioner
Forest Service Official: Roger Williams, Malheur National Forest Supervisor
Team Members: Trish Callaghan, Bob Mason, Bruce Countryman, Tami Paulsen, Elaine Kohrman, 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.

Flipchart Comments
- Need a broad-based look at science — there are other scientists outside of Forest Service

Questions and Answers

Q. Ecological, Economic, Social – are they equals?

A. In essence, yes. All three aspects are important; I cannot say one is more important than another and affects on all three will be considered in defining desired conditions. Trade offs will have to be made in each area. Those decisions will be made through the collaborative process.

Q. Why should we care about the tribes?

A. They are users of the forest like the rest of us. In addition, the U.S. Government has treaties and agreements with many tribes in which we have agreed to provide for specific uses on lands administered by the federal government. We need to be sure we honor those obligations**.**

Q. Will the forest plan revision replace environmental-leaning judges?

A. The forest plan revision process will have no impact on the judicial system.

Q. Will Roger Williams get overturned by Washington DC?

A. Each Forest Supervisor is the deciding official for their respective forest plan.

Q. Will Environmental Management System be a separate document for the Forest Plan?

A. Yes. It will be done in conjunction with the plan but will be a separate document.

Q. New directives are out – are we using them before the current is completed?

A. The Forest Service directives out at this time are draft, and the Forest Service is taking comments on them. The final directives will be issued at some time in the future and we will do what is necessary to be in conformance with them.

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

- Lines are needed – management areas.
- Need flexibility in management—the five categories look like what we have now.
- Public can't be specific with comments unless they know where Forest Service is.
- Subcategory in Category 4 is needed (inventoried roadless area needs to be addressed).
- Need to narrow the scope of Desired Future Condition. Visualize where the area is at.
- Minimal impact logging within roadless areas.
- Less management areas may mean more restrictions on management activities.
- "Warm/dry" is pretty vague. The narrower we make the scope, the better it will be. Need to know where these areas are on the ground. Needs to be more specific.
- Believe there needs to be a subcategory for roadless where logging is allowed, so they are not "pseudo-wilderness".

Questions and Answers

Q. Will management categories allow more flexibility?

A. We intend them to allow more flexibility. With fewer defined areas, we hope the project specific planning will be able to adapt to conditions on the ground in designing projects to move toward the desired conditions.

Q. Will we stop cutting small trees; they're our children's future? This stopped our money coming in.

A. We can't say. The activities that will take place will be designed to move an area toward the desired conditions. That may or may not involve cutting of small trees.

Q. When we make fewer areas, it makes it easier to understand. Will we still do the subcategories? Need specific subcategory with definition. Need the ability to do management. Will there be flexibility within those categories?

A. We intend them to allow more flexibility. With fewer defined areas, we hope the project specific planning will be able to adapt to conditions on the ground in designing projects to move toward the desired conditions. Subcategories will be determined based on comments received. We will include them as necessary to portray management direction.

Q. Will Revised Forest Plans stop cutting smaller (less than 20" diameter at breast height) trees? Need to cut big trees.

A. The "21-inch rule" will be analyzed during this planning effort as a part of determining the appropriate direction to be included in the forest plans. Specific project analysis will determine

the mix of species and sizes of trees that need to be harvested to move the landscape towards the desired condition. This may or may not include cutting 21" trees.

Q. Will reducing the number of management categories reduce the types of management that will occur? Want clear, flexible management categories.

A. Reducing the number of categories will not reduce the types of activities that could occur and should help clarify management direction. Reducing the number of categories will increase the flexibility in where the activities occur.

Q. Is the timeline for determining the Desired Conditions out of balance with timeline for determining management categories?

A. Both of these topics will continue to evolve together. One of them does not need to be finished before the other is developed.

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

- "Protecting" them is actually destroying them.
- There are many "new listings on the map that don't meet the "criteria" like Camp Creek. Puts them under a microscope. Just asking for more litigation.
- Important to not draw a line on the map without field verification on the ground.
- There's too much water running to the ocean—we need it.

Questions and Answers – Wild and Scenic Rivers

Q. Is there any thought given to fuel loads and all that silt that goes down after a fire? And the effects downstream?

A. River management plans that are developed after designation outline how an area should be managed. If siltation is a significant impact on the river, appropriate measures can be taken to limit that impact.

Q. Effects of things such as weeds in wild and scenic rivers occur because we lose management ability. How much destruction are we going to accept with these designations? If we take away all our tools, every river in this county is affected this way.

A. Management actions that protect the outstandingly remarkable values for which the river was designated can be taken. Designation does not stop all activities from occurring, just those that detract from the outstandingly remarkable values.

Q. What's the boundary we are using?

A. When a river is recommended, the management area boundary is defined as ¼ mile on either side of the river from high water mark. At the time of designation or when a management plan is approved, it would be redefined on a case-by-case basis to accommodate management of the river to protect the outstandingly remarkable values.

Q. What's the river corridor—how wide?

A. The corridor of a designated river is the width that is necessary to protect values. When a river is recommended, the management area boundary is defined as ¼ mile on either side of the river from high water mark. At the time of designation or when a management plan is approved, it would be redefined on a case-by-case basis to accommodate management of the river to protect the outstandingly remarkable values.

Q. Is grazing a suitable use?

A. Maybe. It is not specifically excluded. Allowing grazing, as with any other activity, would depend on how it impacted the outstandingly remarkable values.

Q. Do we restrict grazing in wild and scenic rivers?

A. Not necessarily, it would depend on the river management plan created after a river is designated.

Q. A number of the "new listings" don't meet the criteria.

A. If you have information on a specific area that indicates we did not apply the criteria correctly, please let us know. We will reconsider our call.

Q. Who manages suitability and when?

A. The Revised Forest Plans will not do the suitability portion of the Wild and Scenic Rivers process. That will happen on a site-specific basis by the individual administrative units some time after the forest plan revision is completed.

Q. When did Forest Service start answering to the Department of Interior?

A. We don't answer to the Department of Interior; but one way that rivers are designated is through the Department of the Interior.

Q. What is the goal of making these "wild and scenic"?

A. The goal of this process is to identify rivers that meet the criteria for wild and scenic river status and make a decision on whether that designation should be made. This is one determination we are required to make during forest plan revision by the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The purpose of designation is to protect the outstandingly remarkable values for the enjoyment of the American people. Whether we make any designations, is up to the Forest Supervisors.

Q. If most people say "no more wilderness", what will you do?

A. We complete our inventory and let the Forest Supervisors decide what rivers, if any, they want to recommend.

Flipchart Comments – Areas with Wilderness Potential

- Can't walk or ride horses through most of the wilderness and areas being studied – Forest Service should manage to increase access.
- Need to improve the water up here.
- The intent of Forest Service is to supply timber and water and designating wilderness is contrary to the Forest Service mission.
- Permittees are being completely left out of the loop.
- Don't need to keep changing the criteria for wilderness. Forest Service is changing criteria regarding roads. Standards for roads need to be applied consistently and fairly.
- Concern about maintaining trails in current wilderness area.
- Need another designation for "unique" but still manage with flexibility.
- Criteria for wilderness can't even walk through it. Fires in the Strawberry Mountains Wilderness have destroyed it. Let the loggers take care of existing and potential areas, this effects tourism potential.
- Trails are not maintained in the Strawberries so why create more?
- Where are the log trucks in the poster?
- Big jump between roadless and wilderness—need an in-between category.
- Original intent of Congress was to supply nation's needs. Wilderness loses due to fire. Contrary to the intent.
- These things have been set aside for many years – Wilderness Study Areas.

Questions and Answers – Areas with Wilderness Potential

Q. RAREII was supposed to be the end. In the 1970s, RAREII made tradeoffs, then the 1990 Forest Plan did more. Is there no end to this?

A. The National Forest Management Act requires the Forest Service to go through the process of inventorying and evaluating areas with wilderness potential each time a forest plan is revised. The 1990 Forest Plans evaluated the RARE I and RARE II lands, but did not recommend any lands for wilderness designation. Whether areas are recommended for wilderness during this revision effort is up to the Forest Supervisors.

Q. Should there be action taken on "wilderness study areas"?

A. The Forest Service does not have "wilderness study areas" that is a Bureau of Land Management designation.

Q. Were the areas with wilderness potential defined by the Revision Team or by each forest?

A. The Revision Team worked with local ranger district employees who did the actual work to update the inventory. Local district rangers were encouraged to be a part of that process.

Q. What about the money to maintain roads? Will we take that into account? These roads haven't been maintained, so forces them into wilderness.

A. Objective of the inventory is to look at categories of roads as they are currently classified, not at the level to which they are actually maintained. It is unlikely that a lack-of-funds would be a reason to designate an area as wilderness.

Q. Are "teal-colored" areas on the map suitable to be wilderness?

A. The teal-colored areas are the "areas with wilderness potential". They are the areas identified in Appendix C of the 1990 Forest Plans (inventoried roadless areas) as areas that meet the

inventory criteria for areas with wilderness potential. These areas are the starting point for updating the inventory.

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.	2.9
I understand the process for Wild and Scenic River Inventory, and ways I can contribute to it.	3.2
I understand the process used to inventory the areas with wilderness potential and ways I can contribute to it.	2.9
I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people I didn't know tonight.	3.5
I was comfortable discussing public land issues with people who held different viewpoints tonight.	3.2
The workshop format was appropriate for what we needed to do tonight	3.0
I am comfortable using maps to enhance my understanding of the discussion topics tonight.	3.7
I receive useful information and meaningful opportunities to engage in forest plan revision through this collaborative process.	3.5

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?

- Process was planned to help the Forest Service achieve a pre-decided agenda. Meeting left people feeling frustrated and again disappointed with the process.
- Too much talk from forestry narrators.
- Not enough [time] for our comments.
- Too much time for forestry comments not enough for listeners.
- Waste of time and dollars.
- I think this was the first of the public meetings that crossed the line and felt intimidating to folks who do not support increased timber or grazing production. Tough crowd—I don't know how you can address it, but I think we will lose participation by some of these folks.
- I hope you feel our frustration.
- Truly hope something will be done—tired of talking.
- Lip service
- Supplement your wall graphic with a timeline—where are we today?
- Where are we in the decision process?
- Round Three – was perhaps too much in too little time.