

McKenzie Stewardship Steering Committee

January 22, 2008 3:30 pm—5:00 pm

EWEB Sky Bridge Conference Room

500 East 4th Avenue, Eugene

Participants:

Mary Allison USFS McKenzie River District Ranger
Johan Hogervorst USFS Forest Hydrologist
Marcus Kauffman Resource Innovations
George J. Regas USFS Natural Resources Team Leader
Ryan Ojerio Resource Innovations
Larry Six McKenzie Watershed Council
Nancy Toth EWEB
Karl Morgenstern EWEB
Kurt Steele USFS Willamette National Forest

Upcoming Meetings

| Topic | Date | Time | Location |
|--|-------------------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| Stewardship Group Organizational Meeting | Thursday January 31, 2008 | 6:00 PM – 8:00 PM | Vida -McKenzie Community Center |
| Steering Committee Meeting | Thursday February 21, 2008 | 3:00 PM -4:30 PM | EWEB |
| Stewardship Group | TBD | TBD | TBD |

Next Steps

- Shane Kamrath -coordinate logistics for the Vida-McKenzie Community Center
- George and Mary - put together information on the Bridge Project to review with Marcus prior to the meeting
- George – coordinate signs and refreshments for the meeting.
- Larry -contact Carol Ach to see if she would like to participate
- Ryan - review the stakeholder interview participants and outreach to interested participants
- Ryan - review stakeholder interviews and provide summary for the meeting.

Updates

On January 11th the Regional Office approved the McKenzie River Basin as a stewardship area. This means that stewardship contracts can be developed if they are consistent with the requirements of the stewardship authorities (see attached memo). It was noted that the specific boundaries of the stewardship area could be amended later if the stewardship group decides to do so.

Review of Work Plan

The remainder of the meeting was spent discussing the six month work plan for the collaborative group which focuses on group organization, pending and future stewardship projects and education.

Karl noted that it is important to establish realistic expectations early in the process. The Siuslaw Stewardship Group has been presented as an example and a model, but because of higher productivity rates on the Siuslaw, we should not expect the McKenzie to be the same. Forest service staff added that the other factor at play is the depression in the timber market which might cause some contracts to go unharvested as contractors wait until prices rise. Consequently there may not be a pot of retained receipts for the group to allocate. Marcus commented that there are other opportunities for the group to be engaged in planning processes; it's not just about deciding where to spend retained receipts. George emphasized the value of an initial, early success using retained receipts. Even if its just one local contractor it will be a good demonstration project to show local economic benefit and show people how the process can work.

Group Process

During the next six months one of the main goals of the group is to establish itself - formulate its mission, goals, decision making methods and ground rules. The draft timeline calls for a finalized charter by June. Some groups take longer than others to agree on a charter, so the timeline is flexible.

The steering committee talked about its role and if the committee needs to hold regular meetings separate from the group. The name "steering committee" could be misleading. Marcus said that it helps to be able to sift through information prior to bringing it to the group so as not to waste the group's time. But others noted that there could be the perception that decisions are made behind closed doors and that it would make for a lot of meetings. George mentioned that in other groups an executive or steering committee meets with the permission of the larger group. Marcus agreed that it will be important to involve the group in this decision about overall structure and possible sub-committees; he said there are lots of different ways to do this.

Stewardship Content and Input

The Bridge Project will involve two stewardship contracts initially and possible more in the future. There are upcoming decision points that the stewardship group can give input on. In the future the group will be able to provide input earlier in the planning process. But at least the group can get started on something now so they are not entirely involved in group process for the next several meetings.

Upcoming decision points:

1. A Regional Office (RO) deadline is coming up for specifics on the two upcoming project areas on Bridge. The RO would like to see descriptions of specific locations and actions. This is an opportunity for the group to give specific recommendations about what they would like to accomplish. Since this project is already in process, their input may come too late to make some of the changes that the group would like, but it is still a good learning exercise for them to explore what is possible to achieve with the stewardship authorities. Perhaps the steering committee would want to offer field trips or to project sites or at least present digital photos of the proposed project.
2. Contract development – the group can give input on the evaluative criteria that will be used to select the contractor.

George will put together some information on the decision points and timeline and review it with Marcus prior to the meeting. At then next meeting George and Mary will provide the context, background and identify key issues so the group can give informed input.

Education

During the next several meetings it will be important to make sure the group is up-to-date on the issues relevant to the watershed and that the group has a shared fact base. Ryan will be responsible for coordinating this effort by working with the group to identify what they want to learn more about and finding the resources to present to the group.

George suggested contacting Cheryl Frissel (sp?) as a good place to start. He also said that the website could be a good tool to post information. It's really important to counter some of the disinformation that is out there.

Mary suggested some education on Oak savannah restoration would be helpful since it will be relevant to the Bridge Project.

Meeting Agenda Specifics

Next the group discussed some of the specifics that they would like to get out of this meeting. It was an open discussion with many ideas bouncing around. Below are the suggestions that came out of the discussion.

- At this meeting we want to secure a commitment from participants. It will be important to be clear about what the commitment entails. Marcus said it's important to explain what the group needs to succeed - a committed core group that is informed and active.
- George suggested making sure that participants had ample opportunity to get into the interesting tasks of the group, e.g. providing guidance to projects, rather than boring them too much with group process.
- Kurt said it is important to give people a chance to talk and interact, but it needs to be structured somewhat to be productive.
- Johan suggested reiterating the findings from the stakeholder interview to give people a place to start in formulating the group's visions and goals.
- Karl suggested that bringing examples of visions, missions and goals could be a good place to start.
- In addition to people goals and expectations it's important to find out what their concerns are so the group can address those.
- Add an intermission in the middle to allow people an opportunity to talk and get to know one another.
- Johan asked if the group was concerned about having too many Forest Service people at the meeting. But Larry said that it is a learning process for everyone including FS staff. If the FS presence ends up negatively impacting the group dynamics, then we'll have to address it then.
- We should establish a regular meeting time for the group at this next meeting.