

McKenzie Stewardship Group Meeting Notes [amendments in blue – excludes hyperlinks]

July 24, 2008, 5:30 pm—8:00 pm

Vida-McKenzie Community Center

Participants:	Organization:	Email:
Bill Barton	Native Forest Council	bigbillb@earthlink.net
Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild	cl@oregonwild.org
George Regas	USFS, McKenzie River Ranger	gregas@fs.fed.us
William Blair	Infraspect Environmental Auditing	auditor@infraspect.com
Rachel Barton-Russell	Infraspect Environmental Auditing	auditor@infraspect.com
Steve Northway	Infraspect	
Karl Morgenstern	Eugene Water and Electric Board	karl.morgenstern@eweb.eugene.or.us
Marcus Kauffman	Resource Innovations	marcusk@uoregon.edu
Mary Allison	Willamette National Forest	mallison@fs.fed.us
Monty Wilson	Blue River Resident	spelcal@wmconnect.com
Shane Kamrath	USFS, McKenzie River RD	skamrath@fs.fed.us
Craig Patterson	Human Being	craigmpatterson@msn.com
John Pine	Oregon Department of Forestry	JPINE@ODF.STATE.OR.US
Greg Wagenblast	ODF – E. Lane	gwagenblast@odf.state.or.us
Penny Harris	USFS, McKenzie River RD	pjharris@fs.fed.us
Katie MacKendrick	Resource Innovations	kmackend@uoregon.edu
Carol Ach		organiccowgirl@live.com
Mei Lin Lantz	USFS, McKenzie River RD	mlantz@fs.fed.us

Next Meeting

Date: TBD using Doodle poll – mark your availability:

(<http://www.doodle.ch/rbdeskpp995fdmkb>), **Time:** 5:30-8:00 p.m., **Location:** Upper McKenzie

Main Actions

- Reorganize group, find new name, begin anew without stewardship authorities as a pre-requisite.
- Focus new group on restoration, wildlife and water quality issues; find a plantation area (~ 70 acres) that's flat, isolated or distinct, and of interest to the whole group, to focus group action and discussion.
- Disband logistics committee.

Follow-up Tasks

Task	Lead	Timeframe
Enter your availability for next group meeting in August in Doodle poll (check your email or see group web site http://ri.uoregon.edu/programs/CCE/mckenzie.html)	All	July-early August
Send Katie (kmackend@uoregon.edu) terms and definitions you want added to the list and discussed at the next group meeting	All	July-mid August

Think of/Write one-sentence vision statement and bring to share during next group meeting	All	July-late August
Provide email addresses of July meeting attendees to group	Katie	July
Set up Doodle poll to find date for next group meeting	Katie	July
Send statutory definitions list (from established sources) to the group to review before the next meeting	Katie	early August
Check on disclosing RI contract to Infraspect	Marcus	July-August

Agenda Review

In reviewing the agenda, one participant brought up the importance of discussing terms and definitions, a discussion that had been promised, but continually pushed back since February. The participant felt the group needed to discuss terms and definitions before restoration goals.

Marcus asked the group if they were prepared and would like to discuss terms and definitions during the meeting. The group decided to amend the agenda after discussing the letter to the group (the continuity of the group) to include a 20-minute discussion of definitions, and push the discussion of strategies to next month's meeting.

Infraspect Environmental Auditing noted that only three people in the group are not with a contract agency or NGO; there has been a fall off of non-agency folks.

Comments on 05-16-08 Meeting Notes

Marcus asked participants to take a few minutes to review the notes from the last meeting (05/16/08) and share any comments.

Terms and Definitions

One participant highlighted how the notes reflect that the list of terms and definitions generated during the last meeting is just a starting point. It is important to keep in mind that some terms may need clarification and new terms could come up in the future. Another participant added that the group needs to define the term 'stewardship' separately from McKenzie 'Stewardship' Group, and include the term 'operational goal value priorities' in the list.

Group Agreements

One participant brought up the group agreement 'Honor agreements made in the group' and asked participants how the group could make sure to do this. Another participant said we could do this by allowing our diversity to exist, finding out where we have energy, interest and intent, and moving forward.

Infraspect asked, "What is the scope of the authority of these agreements? What authority does this group have to define terms for things of the public domain?"

Field Tour Report

The conversation transitioned to the field tour held on June 27, 2008, and Marcus asked participants to share what they learned and what they liked and disliked. Meeting participants offered the following comments:

- I learned all management decisions are politically driven. (Different stand treatments occurred under different leadership).
- Fire hazards, degraded roads, subsidized extraction at tax payer cost, degraded forests, loss of biodiversity – what we saw is a prime example of what we should not be doing.

- I don't think you can go three other places on Earth and see the light, ecologically minded thinning we saw on the tour. Sometimes we don't count our blessings; we live in some of the most productive forests on Earth. If people are not going to use the forests here, where are they going to? The public won't leave the forests alone.
- Where's the connection between cause and effect? With restoration we need to quantify and qualify costs on the front end of the analysis, then we can see what is truly sustainable.
- I noticed how different our means of communication were out in the field compared to the meeting – we had civil discussions out in the field, here now we're having a dispute again.
- I would have liked to see a pre-violation forest, one that might be like what we would work toward (in a restoration project).
- I would like the notes to reflect a citation of authority for: Humans must extract resources from the national forest.
- I appreciated the tour. We saw a number of different tools used in trying to meet different goals at different sites.
- I wonder why hatcheries weren't visited.
- I hoped the energy from the field tour would be carried into the meeting.

Planning another tour

The field tour discussion sparked conversation around planning another tour, or multiple tours for the future to cover the interests of all participants, and to have more discussion on the ground. Individuals expressed interest in working together to develop separate tours focused on: reference conditions (pre-violation conditions); the aquatic system, fisheries, fishery habitat improvement; wildlife; and fuels treatment. The group would work together to help decide who speaks. And the tour(s) could include an ecological, environmental, and socio-political perspective (could bring in scientists, ecologists with different views). Tour planning will be a part of a future group meeting agenda.

One participant commented on how exciting it is to think that this group, with such a diversity of perspectives, could come together and succeed.

Letter to Group

On 5-23-08 one participant wrote a letter to the logistics committee *et al.* reasoning to disband the group. The letter was presented as part of the meeting handouts for participants to discuss disbanding the group or continuing based on interest and common ground. The participant described the motivation behind the letter as the fact that it is a poor time to be extracting large stems from the forest, with current timber prices; and the sentiment that the group is a rubber stamp for extraction and not restoration. The participant asked what authority this group has, when the Forest Service is the steward of this forest.

Marcus said the group does have the ability to influence activities; it also could contract a piece of land to steward. Examples of such projects are available from Oregon, California and Wyoming, where nonprofits and other organizations received contracts. Another participant added that the benefit of this group is its ability to consider, discuss and help design the actions the Forest Service takes.

Infraspect asked, “what happens when people abstract folksy groups?” and brought up dual control and parallel authority. [My engagement as an auditor is centered on observation pertaining to 'collaborative governance,' their are concerns about double control by official agencies personalities and participation as mere community 'folk.'](#) Infraspect asked whether the group is

an educational institution, advocacy or other organization; and said this is not a group or therapeutic alliance. We've been looking into the word local, and it looks to be 400 miles. We need some assurance that Marcus is doing his job.

In response, Marcus described his role as facilitator: he provides information and a forum for the group to make decisions.

Disband or Continue

The conversation returned to group continuity and each individual offered his/her perspective on whether the group should disband or continue. Some participants expressed adamant opposition to the group continuing, but a majority supported continuing to work together. The group has no formal decision making system, so participants kept discussing group continuity.

One participant suggested changing the group name and wondered what value the Forest Service sees in the collaborative group staying together without the Stewardship Authority.

Participants from the Forest Service said they would see value in the group helping with decisions, working through a pilot project on a small area of land, and taking a project from concept to implementation. The project wouldn't have to be timber extraction. It could be stream restoration work, weed extraction, etc. Stewardship contracting is one tool, just like fire.

Another participant added that restoration depends on what we're looking at, a particular piece of land, and supported the idea of looking for a 70-80-acre piece of land to focus on.

One participant opposed to the current group said we need to disband and form a new group focused honestly on restoration, wildlife and water quality issues, and not under the guise of restoration and doing extraction.

Participants adamantly opposed to continuing expressed the following:

- There are some serious sinister aspects to what is going on in this room and other deceptive actions. There is danger in this construct (Stewardship Authority) especially in how it is being represented in this room.
- I want a copy of every actual stewardship group sign-in sheet. I want the R.I. facilitator provide a copy of R.I. contract
- Real questions need real answers.
- I am interested in the issues, but don't think this group has value
- Only obfuscations to questions, little science
- I will be here regardless of the decision to make sure the group is not proposing commercial extraction
- Infraspect said there is evidence that people signed in with agency personalities; official personalities create official duties – nothing new is being created here in this room. In the event that the group is reorganized I would attend as an auditor. There is not enough information from which to support or decline the continuance of the group.

Participants supporting continuing expressed the following:

- These groups are difficult to work with; management on lands can change over time. It does on private lands. This group is a constructive way for people to represent the public.
- Stewardship contracting can be a good tool. The point of being here is to collaborate, work through problems and issues, and work with the Forest Service to manage the forest that we all love better.

- I am interested in stewardship (different than restoration), I understand the history and the Forest Service, which did do clear-cutting until 1989. Now, where do we go from here, how do we build bridges? I'm interested in stewardship and the simultaneous integration of the triple bottom line: ecology, economy, and social equity. We need to move in a positive direction to explore what that might mean. We should talk about what we want, how we might get there, and test different hypotheses.
- I am interested in timber extraction
- Patience and flexibility are needed in any group just starting out.
- I want to address the concerns about the number of agency people in attendance. People from the Forest Service have come to the meeting on their own time to support their community. They have come to listen and respond. If anyone steps out of that role, they need to be held accountable. There are agency people attending from water quality, wildlife, fire, etc. They shouldn't be coming across any other way than supportive.
- The first group meeting had the most community people attending. It was held at the Upper McKenzie Community Center.
- I want to see the group stay together, keep trying.
- I like the idea of looking at what our possibilities are, getting out in the field to figure out a restoration opportunity.
- I want to start anew without the assumption that we're working under stewardship authority.
- I support the formation of another group
- I support whatever group
- Do over, continue as long as group has a focus
- I see value in continuing
- I see value in this group, start over, reorganize, give it another shot
- It miffs me to no end: looking in the rear view mirror and continuing to go around in these ruts because our analysis is stuck there. I hope we can look forward and create new synthesis

Group Decision: continue under new conditions

After a couple rounds of discussion and participant perspectives, the group decided to continue working together under several new conditions:

- Stewardship Contracting is not a pre-requisite; move forward with a blank slate
- New group name
- Focus on a project (~70-acres) to give the group shape
- Group focus includes fire safety in addition to restoration, wildlife and water quality issues
- Group has no logistics committee; every meeting includes time to build an agenda for the next meeting

Next Meeting

Participants discussed the next meeting and agenda. The meeting will be held in the Upper McKenzie from 5:30-8:00 p.m. The date will be determined using Doodle poll.

Participants outlined a draft agenda for the next meeting (the first meeting of the new group) as follows:

- Definitions discussion
- Sideboards (for the type of restoration the group would like to see on the ground)
- Volunteers for a working group to identify a project area
- Vision discussion
- Agenda development for next meeting

Next Steps

George said he hoped the group could give sideboards to help define a project area, which he could use to find a possible area of the forest for the project the group would focus on. George said he is thinking about a plantation that's flat, isolated or distinct, and not offensive to anyone. The project will have to go through NEPA, but it could be expedited. The new group will discuss sideboards at the next meeting.

George said he would like to have a small, volunteer working group to work with him to identify the project area. He said he'd like Monty's help. The new group will discuss volunteers at the next meeting also.

Marcus asked the group about adding terms to the list drafted at the last group meeting? Participants agreed to send Katie terms and definitions that they want added to the list. Definitions are encouraged.

Homework

- Definitions and terms – send to Katie before the next meeting, sooner rather than later or at the meeting, will ensure the whole group a chance to review them before the next meeting.
- One-sentence vision – write or think of a one-sentence vision and bring it to share during the next meeting.
- Send around statutory definitions (from established sources) to the group to review before the next meeting (Katie).
- Share email list of July meeting participants with group (Katie).

The meeting closed with one participant thanking everyone for being at the meeting, and thanked Marcus for his work as facilitator.