

McKenzie Group Meeting Notes - Draft
October 16, 2008, 5:30 pm—8:00 pm
Leaburg Training Center

Participants:

Organization:

Bill Barton	Native Forest Council
Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild
George Regas	USFS, McKenzie River RD
Kurt Steele	USFS
Rachel Barton-Russell	Native Forest Council, legal council
Steve Northway	Corvallis resident
Karl Morgenstern	Eugene Water and Electric Board
Marcus Kauffman	Resource Innovations
Monty Wilson	Blue River resident
Shane Kamrath	USFS, McKenzie River RD
David Donahue	EWEB
Greg Wagenblast	ODF – E. Lane
Katie MacKendrick	Resource Innovations
Larry Six	McKenzie WSC
Johan Hogervorst	USFS
Josh Laughlin	Cascadia Wildlands Project

Main Actions

- McKenzie Group agreed to disband due to irreconcilable differences in perspective and interest.

Agenda Review

The meeting opened with an overview of the plan for the meeting. Marcus emphasized the need to start with reviewing the group ground rules and discussing the group vision – for the landscape and for the group. An evident rift in the group has deterred much forward movement and members of the group have voiced concern in the last two meetings over the direction of the group and the lack of trust and shared understanding underlying the group.

Group Process

Marcus first reviewed the group ground rules and asked if anyone present could not adhere to them. One participant said yes because of existing questions about honesty, unshared financial information and lack of follow-through with things that have been said in the group. The group then moved on to discuss the group vision.

A couple meetings past, the group decided to not require stewardship contracting as a pre-requisite for future collective efforts. However, as no decision-making process had been established, it was difficult to determine the extent of support for this decision. Within the group, some participants expressed interest in stewardship while others expressed strong opposition. One participant said if the group did not have common interests, it would be impossible to pursue a common future. Participants said they saw the group heading in opposite directions.

One participant brought up last week's small working group field trip, when several participants viewed three potential sites being considered for an initial restoration project. The participant wanted to be reassured of collective common interest otherwise he would be unwilling to participate further. He offered one site, described as a "non-controversial, scraggly, homogenous tree farm" as a litmus test for the concept of stewardship. In a round-robin fashion each attendee voiced their support for or opposition to a stewardship project on the site. Of the 14 participants, 11 voiced support for stewardship and three stated they either had questions remaining or would not support it. Facilitators did not participate. Some of those opposed to stewardship on the site took issue with it being described as non-controversial and brought up science that does not support extraction on such sites.

Another participant said that the diverse perspectives and knowledge held by participants are what is so valuable about the group. The group has the potential to learn from each other by working together on a small restoration project. However, some participants see stewardship contracting and timber extraction as an acceptable way to generate funding for the restoration work. And others would continue to participate if the group pursued stewardship (including commercial removal), but they would intervene with the intent of obstructing any forward movement of the group.

One participant pointed out that there is a difference between an economic motive and an economic outcome. It was noted that the group, through stewardship, is guided by a restoration motive and intends to use stewardship (a market-based mechanism) to achieve results. Some participants see stewardship as a market-based mechanism that can be used to accomplish restoration. But others see stewardship as a dangerous, secretive process and a top-down extractive scheme.

One participant said he supported road decommissioning and restoration, but not stewardship. If the group pursued stewardship, he would continue to intervene and be "a big old thorn in the group's side." The group realized it had three options: to disband, to carry forth with dissenting and contrary members in place, or to carry forth with a decision-making process determining majority-minority positions. The group acknowledged that it had been trying to move forward with the minority position in an attempt to accommodate all views and move forward together. In thinking about the majority-minority positions option, Marcus said the group needed to determine the value of a "contrary" opinion in the discussion. Others added there were questions around where funding would come from for a restoration project without stewardship. Those opposed to stewardship contracting could continue to participate in the NEPA process or partner with a local watershed council to work on restoration projects.

One participant said he had not seen one common interest come out of the group and for that reason he was no longer interested in participating. Others responded with similar sentiments.

Marcus said the group was reaching critical mass on disbanding due to irreconcilable differences. Some participants voiced disappointment that the group could not reconcile its differences. Even though participants saw restoration differently, they also saw an opportunity to learn through trying and doing, monitoring and evaluating. Some participants voice an interest in working together with others and would consider pursuing it outside of the group.

The participants agreed to disband the McKenzie Group. Upon reaching a decision to disband, the meeting adjourned.