

Meeting Notes
Roseburg District Collaborative Forestry Initiative
Wednesday, February 24, 2010
6:30 pm to 8:30 pm
Roseburg BLM District Office, 777 NW Garden Valley Blvd

Attendees

Members of the Public Attending:

DD Bixby, Tim Moore, Art LeVasseur, John J. Patrick, Doug Heiken, Jim Allen, Mike Barkhuff, Ashley Bryson, Stanley Petrowski, Michael Kaech, Dick Hanlin, Andrew Duclos, Paul Christian, Rick Sparks, Jeffrey Bodony, Glenn Lahti, Francis Eatherington, Anita Yager, Dan Lines, Ron Yockim, Chuck Schnautz, Thomas McGregor, Stan Martindale, Robert G. Lathrop, Scott Aycock, Lori Wilkins, Collin Hill, Anne Dorsey, Jake Ritter, Ken Carloni, Cindy Haws, Ray Jensen, Richard M. Chasm, Maxwell Wightman, Grant Ruhlman, Elizabeth Matteson, Megan Harper, Mike Anderson, Kathey Linn, Patrick Starnes, Chris Frizzell

BLM Employees Attending:

Jay Carlson, Crag Kintop, Meagan Conry, Jake Winn, Lisa Renan, Abe Wheeler, Liz Gayner, Scott Lightcap, Rex McGraw, Ward Fong, Ariel Hiller, Jonas Parker, Kristen Thompson

Facilitator

Karen Bolda

Welcome and Introductions—Jay Carlson

Jay Carlson welcomed the attendees and introduced the members of the BLM team.

Meeting Ground Rules—Karen Bolda

Karen explained her role as a neutral third-party facilitator with the goal of making the meetings fair and efficient.

Karen asked for and received four volunteers for later in the meeting.

Karen worked with the attendees and established the following list of meeting agreements:

- Cell phones silent or turned off
- Raise hands before speaking

- Limit side conversations
- Keep questions and comments brief
- Address the issue and not the person

Karen closed with the following quote, “You’re not really listening unless you’re prepared to be changed.”

Overview of what we are Proposing—Jay Carlson

Jay presented an overview of the collaborative forestry initiative, including the motivation to initiate it, its purpose, and potential treatments. For more details see a copy of his presentation (available on request; it is too large to e-mail).

Questions

Attendees asked Jay the following questions:

Q. What Standards and Guides [from the Northwest Forest Plan] would not be met?

A. We can’t manage according to the Land Use Allocations of the Northwest Forest Plan because of requirement resulting from consultation [as required by the Endangered Species Act].

Q. How many entries [into an individual forest stand] would occur?

A. That would vary from one to several and would be driven by the [management] objectives for the stand.

Q. (1) Who would be doing this work? (2) How does this initiative interrelate to with work on private lands?

A. (1) The work would be carried out by the same people working on our regular [outside of this initiative] timber sales and would occur through our normal timber sale process. (2) This initiative is BLM-centric and is not coordinated with management activities on private lands.

Q. In reference to the volume of production, why stop at 25 to 30 years [the length of time Jay mentioned in his presentation regarding potential annual harvest levels]? Would this be sustainable?

A. Beyond 25 years we don’t know what happen. This [the work completed so far for the collaborative forestry initiative] is not a planning process, which would provide answers to questions such as that.

Q. Forest Engineering is important in maintaining this habitat, which requires that we continually go into it. Is this actually economically viable?

A. Our commercial thinnings are similar and sell even in this [economically down] environment.

Q. As this all becomes more expensive, is the logger going to carry the burden?

A. The current situation is not economically efficient. Our staff typically takes three to five years to prepare a project, only about 65% of which make it to the market. We are hoping that a process like this will yield a higher success rate. Economic efficiency of an individual project determined by the timber sale price.

Proposed Schedule—Jay Carlson

Jay provided an overview of key requirements of the process:

- Open to the Public
- Information [about the project, such as meeting notes and handouts] on a website
- Collaborative based but not consensus
- Must follow the requirements of NEPA [National Environmental Planning Act]
- Must follow the Consultation process [as required by the Endangered Species Act].
- Will take time and energy

How will the process engage with stakeholders?

- One moist site project and one dry site project
- Projects will be from the ground up
- Process will involve project design
- The process will develop on the basis of our collective experience
- Phase 2 of the process will build on this initial phase and consider up to 3,000 acres worth of work [approximately one year's work for the Roseburg District]

Jay presented a proposed schedule and asked attendees what start times for evening meetings and field trips worked best for them. The following schedule resulted from this discussion:

February 24 th 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Initial open house (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project overview • Collaborative process (not consensus) • Phased process • Anticipated pilot project areas • Schedule
March 3 rd 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Moist forest project (Johnson Cleghorn) design scoping session (meet to prepare for site visit trip); discuss what we will be seeing (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing conditions • Desired conditions/rationale • Types of actions/extent • Operational considerations

	Other speakers/researchers
March 6 th 8:00 am to 4:00 pm	Moist forest site (Johnson Cleghorn) visit (<i>Public Field Tour; Saturday; 0800-1600 hours</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing conditions • Desired conditions/rationale • Types of actions/extent • Operational considerations
March 10 th 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Moist forest (Johnson Cleghorn) design follow-up (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop alternatives for analysis
April 7 th 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Dry forest project (Major Glasco) design scoping session (meet to prepare for site visit trip); discuss what we will be seeing (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing conditions • Desired conditions/rationale • Types of actions/extent • Operational considerations Other speakers/researchers
April 10 th 8:00 am to 4:00 pm	Dry forest site (Major Glasco) visit (<i>Public Field Tour; Saturday 0800-1600 hours</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing conditions • Desired conditions/rationale • Types of actions/extent • Operational considerations
April 14 th 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Dry forest project (Major Glasco) design follow-up (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop alternatives for analysis
April 21 st 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Discussion of analysis methodology (resource by resource) (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Field methodologies • Analytical methodologies • Reference material (including conflicting references) Values discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social • Environmental • Economic
May 19 th 6:30 to 8:30 pm	Preliminary Findings (<i>Public Meeting; 1830-2030 hrs</i>): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resource by resource effects • Climate change discussion • Cumulative effects • Biological assessment Any “tune-up” needs

Challenges and Benefits of this Process—Jay Carlson

Jay presented an overview of the challenges of this initiative, with a core message of, “This will be difficult, but it is important.” For more details see a copy of his presentation (available on request; it is too large to e-mail).

Interactive Discussion: *What do you hope that this initiative will yield and how do you want to contribute?*—All attendees

The meeting attendees and BLM employees broke into four groups (divided by counting off). Volunteer recorders lead each group through the following process: every group member was asked to answer the following question while the other group members listened, “What do you hope that this initiative will yield and how do you want to contribute?” The answers to the questions were recorded on flip charts, and, in the end, the recorders reported back to all attendees.

The information recorded on the flip charts is listed below:

Group #1

What do you hope that this will yield? And how do you want to contribute?

- Good for opposing to get together
- Hope for more discussion and will try to help
- Idealism can be good
- Good forest and produce jobs
- Forest is deteriorating, wants active management
- Gridlock in courts
- Wants to listen and better understanding with effective compromise
- Concerned status quo is destroying a culture and forest....need to do something soon
- “Industry” wants thoughtful discussions
- Would like ability to move forward with project with less opposition
- Like to see deliberate decision for healthy environment and community
- Riparian, aquatic and fish sideboards
- Want to learn more about “industry” needs
- Will ask many simple questions
- Challenge assumptions
- Opportunity for a healthy landscape for vegetation, economics, wildlife
- Site specific management rather broad with many prescriptions
- You are part of the ID team sorta
- Fiscally responsible for nation and country
- Balance and solutions
- Hope to move forward, involved public, resolve gridlock, contribute by listening. Yield a different outcome, contribute an open mindedness
- More equal sidedness, more collaboration, maybe contribute student work
- More balance
- Plan something to carry through, contribute history
- Different ideas, really listen, contribute ideas
- Collaboration can work
- Trusting relationship, more accountability, transparency, contribute expertise
- Greater protections for the owl, contribute prescription suggestions, how not to homogenize

- Hopes thinning allows old growth to be left alone, contribute by being involved
- Hoping for a working model of sustainability, continue to contribute time and passion
- Has ideas on alternative plan
- Idea for terrestrial level collaboration, enthusiasm and experience

Group #2

What do you hope that this will yield? And how do you want to contribute?

- Find out what's going on
- Provide her attention; contribute
- Reorientation of BLM around habitat development
- Opening eyes to question assumptions
- Observe – sounds good
- Learn something about collaboration
- Pro-collaboration – understand others point of view
- Contribute experience and knowledge
- What stays vs what we take away
- Develop a project that heads off controversies early on
- BLM is a partner
- See how we can use hardwoods to better potential
- Develop common ground: Healthy communities, healthy forests
- That participants understand the nature of these lands
 - Legal and historic background
 - Uniqueness of these lands
- Sit down and work through long-standing issues
- Social, environmental, economic interests are served by common ground
- Think outside the box, work together
- Protect water and soil resource
- Economics and history
 - Brings a level of technical expertise...harvest systems
 - Fascinated at the complex processes
 - Concerned with this getting stopped before operational
- Water quality
- Paradigm shift to value additional values of resource

Group #3

What do you hope that this will yield? And how do you want to contribute?

- Learn about collaboration
- Participate as a common member
- Provide experience, ecological, economic
- Partner
- Legal and historic background
- Transformative: conflict to collaboration

- Sound ecosystem management
- Water quality, habitat, etc.,

Group #4

What do you hope that this will yield? And how do you want to contribute?

- Bring a perspective in silviculture, yields ecologically responsible harvest
- Habitat – clarification of this plan vs current plan contribute to habitat
- Jobs for students for their future in this community
- Yields collaboration – bring together social/ecological values and break gridlock
- Longtime resident grew up here potential for something new and different. Give some historical perspective
- Historical perspective in relationship to O&C Act. Special management perspective important to county economics
- Silviculture, timber management, retired from BLM tired of BLM management wasting money and either get rid of BLM or actually manage the land
- See if this process can work. Retired forester. Revenues to county have been lost. Worried about county taxes, services lost.
- A process of success to develop habitat, interested in logs on truck, contribute thoughts from experience working and recreation
- Silviculturist at BLM for 33 years. Used to have clear objectives/process. Now gridlock, want it to work.
- Projects/work just die after work done. There are opportunities would like to see and contribute District cruise and BLM economic and feasibility
- Concerned Citizen...come together and create jobs, want to help facilitate a positive outcome to create jobs
- BLM employee Coos Bay...walk away with a road map that gets to balancing economic, social and environmental.
- Hydrologist BLM – many areas across U.S. landscapes perspective how can could work and protect the resource
- As a wildlife biologist want to participate in habitat analysis and bring in science and look at other social economic models