

McKenzie Group Meeting Notes - Draft
September 4, 2008, 5:30 pm—8:00 pm
Upper McKenzie Community Center

Participants:

Organization:

Bill Barton	Native Forest Council
Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild
George Regas	USFS, McKenzie River Ranger
William Blair	Infraspect Environmental Auditing
Rachel Barton-Russell	Infraspect Environmental Auditing
Steve Northway	Infraspect
Karl Morgenstern	Eugene Water and Electric Board
Marcus Kauffman	Resource Innovations
Mary Allison	Willamette National Forest
Jim Baker	Blue River CDC
Shane Kamrath	USFS, McKenzie River RD
David Donahue	EWEB
Kevin Bruce	USFS
Greg Wagenblast	ODF – E. Lane
Penny Harris	USFS, McKenzie River RD
Katie MacKendrick	Resource Innovations
Larry Six	McKenzie WSC
Schee Six	
Mei Lin Lantz	USFS, McKenzie River RD
Johan Hogervorst	USFS
Josh Laughlin	Cascadia Wildlands Project
Jim Camthorp (? sp.)	Infraspect
Mary Stevens	Infraspect
Roberta Swift	US Army Corps of Engineers

Next Meetings

GROUP MEETING: THURSDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2008, 5:30-8:00 P.M., LEABURG TRAINING CENTER (downtown Leaburg, just past mile post 20, on the right side you'll see the fire station and the training center, they are two separate buildings.)

GROUP FIELD TRIP: THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 2008, DAYTIME, DETAILS TBD

Main Actions/Accomplishments

Group accomplished approving the following definitions!:

Forest health – The term “forest health” refers to conditions at multiple scales, including microclimates, that enable forested land –

- (A) to be durable, resilient, and less prone to uncharacteristic wildfire, insect, or pathogen outbreaks, while supporting viable native species assemblages and ecosystem services;

(B) to have, or to develop, natural conditions consisting of historic species composition, function and structure, hydrologic function, sediment regime that are within the natural range of variability and anticipated future conditions.

Collaboration – A process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond what any one group could envision alone. [Assumes NO END GOALS]

Restoration – The renewing and returning of a natural system so that its functions and qualities are comparable to its natural range of variability.

Follow-up Tasks

Task	Lead	Timeframe
Update the McKenzie Group Draft Terms and Definitions document to reflect the approved definitions.	Katie	September
Work with Small Working Group volunteers to identify potential sites for demonstration project	George	September/October
Contact George (gregas@fs.fed.us) if interested in volunteering to help identify potential sites	All	ASAP
Submit description for decision-making process to Katie (kmackend@uoregon.edu) for group to consider at next meeting	All	September
Bring one sentence vision statements to next meeting	All	10/16/2008

Agenda Review

The meeting opened with introductions and a question from Infraspect asking for an update on whether Resource Innovations could disclose Marcus's contract for providing the group with meeting facilitation services. Marcus said his contract is proprietary and Resource Innovations cannot disclose it to the public. The group then moved focus to terms and definitions.

Terms and Definitions

The group recently created a list of terms to define (see notes 05/16/08) and at the last group meeting (07/24/08) expressed interest in spending time identifying definitions for those terms, which reflect common understanding. Participants submitted potential definitions for the terms before the meeting and Katie compiled them. Several terms, including stewardship, mitigation, forest health and restoration, received multiple definition suggestions. Marcus suggested starting the definitions discussion with these terms. The group agreed. One participant requested starting the definitions discussion with a definition for 'definition', and shared the following from Dictionary.com (<http://dictionary.reference.com/>):

Definition –

1. The act of defining or making definite, distinct, or clear.
2. The formal statement of the meaning or significance of a word, phrase, etc.

The group agreed this definition for 'definition' sounded good.

Collaboration

One participant brought up the term ‘collaboration’ and said at principle in this group is collaboration: that we value differences and look at interests that may be common. Another participant clarified, however, that he was not present to collaborate if it meant managing resources in the sense of degrading resources through logging. Infraspect also clarified that as an auditor, it has concerns about the definition the group decides upon for ‘collaboration’ and how that definition fits with the collaborative governance doctrine and collaboration as a legislative mandate.

The group decided they are comfortable with the following definition for ‘collaboration’:

Collaboration – A process through which parties who see different aspects of a problem can constructively explore their differences and search for solutions that go beyond what any one group could envision alone. [Assumes NO END GOALS]

Forest Health

The group began discussing a definition for ‘forest health’. Participants said a basic tenet should be that no land owes any human anything; and forest health has nothing to do with legislation or people. Others added it is critical for a healthy forest to have a disturbance component and to consider resiliency, scales, microclimates and historical conditions, but historical could be problematic depending on the timeframe.

One participant interjected and asked about how the group makes decisions. Participants agreed this should be discussed, but not right at this moment.

The group approved the following definition for ‘forest health’:

Forest health – The term “forest health” refers to conditions at multiple scales, including microclimates, that enable forested land –

- (A) to be durable, resilient, and less prone to uncharacteristic wildfire, insect, or pathogen outbreaks, while supporting viable native species assemblages and ecosystem services;
- (B) to have, or to develop, natural conditions consisting of historic species composition, function and structure, hydrologic function, sediment regime that are within the natural range of variability and anticipated future conditions.

Restoration

The group moved on to discuss restoration. Participants commented on the need for a simple definition and discussed the need to differentiate between ‘mitigation’ and ‘restoration’. One participant clarified that it doesn’t have to be all or nothing (mitigation or restoration), pieces could be restored, restoration could be done away from roads, a project could be both restoration and mitigation. Regarding mitigation, participants agreed the group needs to concentrate on biological mitigation, not economic, and regarding restoration, the objective is biological or physical. One participant noted the importance of adding humor to the discussion and quoted a past professor who said, “mitigation is when you feel good about the damage you have done.”

Infraspect added when using the terms repair, mechanisms and management activities, the group needs to be regarding of federal and state authorities and restoration protocol.

The group approved the following definition for ‘restoration’:

Restoration – The renewing and returning of a natural system so that its functions and qualities are comparable to its natural range of variability.

The group decided to amend the agenda to continue discussing definitions up until the intermission. After a short break, Marcus asked the group where they wanted to go next: discuss more definitions or move on to demo project or vision.

One participant said it is important that we address the things we say we're going to, but we also need to be looking forward. We might like to have another field trip before winter weather limits our access. Participants agreed to set time aside at each meeting to discuss definitions, and to move on to think about a small demonstration project and a field trip. The next two terms to discuss will be 'stewardship' and 'mitigation'.

Restoration Project

At the last meeting, the group had discussed the possibility of focusing on a small, demonstration restoration project. To move this forward, the group decided to work on outlining the type of project it would like to see on the ground, including outlining ideas, goals, sideboards and identifying volunteers for a working group to work with George to identify a project area. Below are the ideas, goals, sideboards and names of volunteers that participants shared.

Project Ideas

- Obliterate a real horrible road in a riparian reserve, in trout habitat
 - Potential site: Rebel Creek Road near French Pete, clearcut in the wilderness, ATVs breached blocked road
- Steep slope that is slide prone, high value, high risk
- Site is a private forest or recently acquired parcel
 - If recently acquired, ask small timber company forest exec. to join the group
 - Potential site: a parcel the forest service recently acquired –
 - 49 acres up Hwy 242 near Lost Creek, has threatened and endangered species
- Plantation
- Meadow restoration, continue the work of Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
- McKenzie River side channel, remove wood through thinning and put it in the side channel
 - This type of restoration is seen as high value from an aquatic perspective
- Evaluation of lost cottonwood clusters as a result of rapid river height phasing, or ramping
- Fish and forest related projects
- Focus on LSR lands
- Could be mitigation

Project Goals

- Focus on restoration
 - Prescription is driven by the group and supported by science on cutting-edge variable density thinning
- Restore biodiversity and non-economic species, including terrestrial molluscs
- Extraction is NOT the driving force
- Limit or eliminate temporary roads associated with thinning
- Look at project economics and enhancement of ecosystem services
- Prioritize our time and resources
- Keep track of financial accounting for project

- In the interest of transparency, it is important that we as the public have an idea of the mandate for forest service participation
- Involve local people in what we do
 - Involve local contractors, if some removal involved in what we do, even if have to provide training
 - Involve qualified, local people in surveying for species
- Make sure have whole group buy in

Sideboards

- No interest in restoring matrix lands
- Less than 70 acres
- Nothing over age 50
- Don't be too restrictive to limit options (hope to present options on the field trip)
- Markets should not be the starting point

Outstanding Questions/Issues

- How do we fund this?
 - NFF, grants, cost share
- What does restoration entail?
- What surveys have been done? (on species present at potential site(s))
- Sideboards for thinning

Small Working Group Volunteers

- Monty
- David Donahue
- Bill Barton (maybe)
- Chandra Legue (maybe)
- Josh Laughlin (maybe)

Field Trip Comments

- Could visit a hatchery in the winter, as opposed to some forest sites

During the demonstration project discussion, participants brought up the importance of transparency and knowing the motives for each participant's involvement in the group. One participant said if we all come with our cards on the table we will better be able to work together, we can all be educated and we can all participate in an informed way.

Participants asked Infraspect why it is auditing the group. Infraspect said it is here to make observations about collaborative governance.

Another participant said the reason for starting the group was stewardship, and there is still hope the group could use it as a tool.

Participants expressed concern about moving forward without buy in from the whole group. To move beyond mistrust, participants recommended that the group develop a mission, vision and a decision-making process. One participant suggested developing a vision on the ground and cited the last field trip as a time when the group was less position based and more interest based. The group made discussing a decision-making process and a vision the priorities for the next meeting.

Next Meeting

Group meeting: Thursday, October 16, 2008, 5:30-8:00 p.m., Leaburg Training Center

Draft Agenda:

- Decision-making process
- Vision
- Terms and Definitions
 - Stewardship, Mitigation

Group field trip: Thursday, November 6, 2008, daytime, details tbd

Next Steps

- Small Working Group volunteers work with George to identify some potential sites for the demonstration project