

McKenzie Stewardship Logistics Committee

April 9th, 2008 3:00 pm—4:30 pm

EWEB, 500 East 4th Avenue, Eugene

Participants:

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 Events

Topic	Date	Time	Location
Stewardship Group Meeting	Thursday April 24 th , 2008	5:30 PM – 8:00 PM	Leaburg Training Center
Logistics Committee Meeting	Wednesday May 14 th , 2008	4:00 PM – 5:00 PM	EWEB
Bridge Thin Field Trip	TBD (May)	TBD	TBD

Updates

Ryan relayed comments that both he and Mary had received from Craig Patterson regarding the location of the meetings and the fact that Ryan had not followed through on his request to share Craig's idea at the initial stewardship group meeting.

George said that Native Forest Council has submitted a Freedom of Information Act request for all information relating to the McKenzie Stewardship Group. The request could include information that Mary presented to EWEB early in developing the idea to form a group. The Forest Service is working on the request.

George suggested the group check out a publication on restoration ecology, he'll research the reference info and pass it on to the committee.

Creating Space for Group Input

Both of the updates evolved into a discussion about how to create opportunities for members of the group to provide input. Larry noted that the past two meetings have felt rushed towards the end and suggested that adding a half an hour might help. This time could be spent hearing specific ideas, but also as a way to get a feel from the group about how the process is going. Other members of the logistics committee agreed that this is needed. The committee then discussed how to structure this time for members to raise concerns, comments or present ideas.

The committee weighed the pros and cons of making time at the beginning or end of the meeting and offering an "open-microphone" type of space or scheduling individuals, such as Craig, who have specific ideas to present. The committee agreed that some topics raised might be outside of the scope of the Stewardship Group, but that someone in the group may be able to act independently on an idea or suggestion through the agency or organization that they represent.

The key challenges, everyone agreed, was to 1) make sure that members of the group who are less assertive feel they can speak and 2) there be a reasonable time limit so that regular agenda items get adequate time.

A second thread that emerged from this discussion was the need to involve the group in establishing agenda items. Committee members agreed that making time for the group to give input on future agenda items is a priority. As well, it is important for the group to begin thinking about how to establish a steering committee or executive committee to take over the role of the current logistics committee.

The committee agreed to extend the meetings times by ½ hour by starting at 5:30 pm rather than 6 pm and to use the additional space to do a round-robin check in with group members. Members could raise concerns, propose future agenda items or just provide general comments.

Future Meeting Locations

Ryan asked the group if he should confirm the meeting location at the Leaburg Training Center in light of Craig's comment that the group should be focused on the Upper McKenzie Watershed. The committee agreed that Leaburg site is an appropriate location to be part of a rotation between upper and lower river locations. They suggested that the next meeting be upriver. Ryan noted that he had called about reserving the Upper McKenzie Community Center, but that it was regularly used by another community group every 4th Thursday evening (the same time as the Stewardship Group meetings). George suggesting that the group could meet at the school. Ryan agreed to investigate available facilities upriver for the May 22nd meeting.

Summary/Debrief of the March 27th Stewardship Group Meeting

The committee was pleased with the meetings turnout but felt that there wasn't sufficient time to adequately cover the agenda times and hear participants' comments. They felt that the education portion could be improved by shortening the presentation and ensuring that the material isn't too technical, makes good use of pictures and other visuals and is relevant to local conditions. One committee member expressed concern that the presentation didn't adequately address the need to treat plantation stands.

Marcus noted that bringing in local voices to the presentation; perhaps by having joint presentations or a panel would be the best way to link the science to the experience of locals on the watershed. For example, it would be good to have Karl and or Larry partner with Dave Kretzing, a hydrologist on the McKenzie District, to discuss key water quality issues on the watershed.

Develop Agenda for the Next Stewardship Group Meeting

Stewardship and Collaboration

Marcus and Ryan built this topic into the group's schedule to provide space for people to discuss stewardship collaboratives, how these processes develop, and the challenges involved with starting and maintaining a collaborative process. Marcus has confirmed to guest speakers: Chanda LeGue from Oregon Wild and Gregory McClarren from the Metolius Multi-Party Monitoring Group to share their experiences with collaborative stewardship groups.

Discussions about the role of the agency and the decision process will be part of this meetings discussion. But Marcus emphasized that one of the goals of the group is to learn together so that in the end the decision making method is less important. Through this group learning and the

consensus building process, the participants discover areas of common ground from which the group develops its recommendations to submit to the Forest Service. George echoed this sentiment saying it is not about who has the most votes, but about what everyone can agree to.

Bridge Thin Update

George noted that there might be a decision on the EA alternatives by then, but either way the update will probably be brief. There is time on the agenda to discuss the proposed field trip and schedule a date.

Group Structure

The other items on the agenda include developing ground rules and a group decision-making method.

Future Agenda Items

Ryan asked for input on the draft work plan of the group for the months of May June and July. He had tentatively scheduled the education topics – water issues and fish issues for May and June, respectively. The committee agreed that these would be good to address and suggested adding fire issues to the July meeting agenda. But they also reiterated the need to have the whole group give input on what they want the schedule to be.

One committee member inquired about how to bring in information about the local economic impacts of stewardship contracting. Marcus said that he knew a few people who could address this topic. The crux of the issue is how to capture the value of material coming off the district in the local economy. George noted that the Oregon Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) could be a valuable partner in bringing resource to support this effort.