



Oregon Solutions Project Team Meeting *Harney County Restoration Collaborative Meeting 1*

May 5 2008

NOTES

Persons Present

Steve Grasty (convener), Harney County; Jack Southworth (convener), HDP; Russ Hoeflich (convener), TNC; Don Munker and Kenton Dick, Burns Paiute Tribe; Mike Billman, Ochoco Lumber; Curt Qual, Jerome Hensley and Teresa Raaf, USFS; Rick Brown, Defenders of Wildlife; Julie Weikel, ONDA; Russ Lane, ODF; Maia Enzer, Sustainable NW (on phone); Dan Nichols, Harney County; Scott Fairley, ERT; Jon Reponen, BLM; Asante Riverwind, Sierra Club; Tim Lillebo, Oregon Wild; Jessica Boone, Harney Chamber; Ron Garner, ODF&W; Rick Minster, OECDD; Ruth Schultz; Hines Mayor; Bob Freimark, The Wilderness Society; Bill Renwick, resident; Bob Otley, logger; Diane Vosick and Jeff Fields, TNC; JD Majors, logger; Debra Flynt-Garrett, resident; Lauren Jarrett, resident; Darrell Barnes, interested citizen; Scott Aycock and Pete Dalke, staff.

To-Do Items

Following are the to-do items that came out of the meeting (text changes were incorporated in the documents and are not listed here):

Scott Aycock – Send out Lakeview Declaration of Cooperation, Colville statements, and the Blue Mtn. Forest Partners Operations Manual and Declaration of Commitment to everyone in meeting

Robin Snyder – Update contact list with all present at meeting

Curt Qual – Will send a copy (pdf email) of the wall map at meeting to Robin so we can send to all

Tim Lillebo will notify group of the John Deere demo of large logging equipment (July Demo)

Russ Hoeflich – confirms TNC will provide support if the end result is a replicable process, defensible

Scott and Conveners – set up next meeting for field. **Steve Grasty, Curt, Jerry Hensley** to put together field trip. 2 days: First day field, 2nd day in meeting.

Diane - to chair Technical committee. TNC offering to put data together to prep for the next step and will help FS to know where to transition. TNC to staff, FS has data and sites, Harney Cty and TNC with GIS.

Diane/TNC – create a “laundry list” of the types of data the Technical Committee could generate.

Scott to provide a progress report

Jerry/USFS – Will give the group information (e.g. Unit, Sec.) about the field tour sites ahead of time.

Scott/County – to quantify private land supply (juniper) potential for group

All: USE **OS HARNEY** ON ALL TAG LINES OF EMAIL CORRESPONDENCE FOR MAIL SORTING

Interests

Participants began by introducing themselves and telling the group the reason that they wanted to attend this meeting. Interests expressed included:

- forest health
- landscape-based forest health
- forestry and fuels
- effective group process, desire to collaborate
- effective visioning with scientific support
- cooperation
- to learn more
- protect tourism economy from fire
- ecosystem restoration and healthy landscapes
- predictable supply
- utilization of material
- support for social and economic goals
- desire to see active forest management
- community economics and resiliency
- jobs
- forest protection from fires
- want to see better forest management
- want to see more forest management
- community protection from fires
- protection of federally-managed wild lands
- protection of wildlife and forest for future generations
- impacts on populations of fish and wildlife habitats
- to develop hope and opportunity
- see how Oregon Solutions process works
- build local capacity and long term trusting relationships

Glossary Items

Following are the list of terms to be defined in a project glossary:

- Restoration
- Forest Health and Forest Health Problem
- Ecosystem
- Natural Ecosystem Process
- Economic Resiliency
- Community
- Restoration principles
- Assessment

- Technical committee – group that can answer questions

Discussion Notes

Following are highlight notes of the discussion during each portion of the agenda.

1:00 p.m. Introduction

Scott Aycock reviews agenda, roles, ground rules. General discussion.

1:35 The Oregon Solutions Process

Pete Dalke, OR Solutions

(Handout)

Pete Dalke, the Natural Resource project lead for OS, provides an overview of the Oregon Solutions process. This is the most impressive gathering he's seen for the first project meeting.

1:45 Draft Ground Rules

Scott Aycock

(Handout)

Russ H – businesses and ecosystems in Harney are about to collapse. We must take a bigger step if we want to respond to the magnitude of the problem. This must be a bigger scale. Push beyond comfort /safety zone. Don't aim low!

Maia E – Still, this project must be implemented within the reality of the political world we live in and within budgets.

2:00 Project Overview and Background

Steve G- Harney County is going out on a limb on this project – provided \$250,000 for the NEPA process. They are accountable to the public. How much more can this community give without completely going away (depopulating) Transparency is important, but current private business negotiations can't be fully disclosed. Steve was able to provide the following details:

- a major corporation is interested in using biomass residue for a combined heat and power facility.
 - Need from 100,000-200,000 tons/yr. - 10 year commitment of supply
 - Can come from public or private lands, including juniper
- another company, a wood pellet manufacturer, is interested in developing locally and also requires 100,000-200,000 tons/yr.
- The county is also interested in stimulating the development of a small mill (not necessarily small diameter)
- The county is actively pursuing anything to use the LP buildings

- Without a healthy forest there is no opportunity

Jerry Hensley – Will discuss the Emigrant East Project area. TNC approached the USFS to look at a landscape scale project (100,000 acres). It is really difficult to do an EIS on 100,000 acres because you can't measure the cumulative impacts but you have to start somewhere to create the economics and develop infrastructure to utilize restoration materials. Stewardship authorities can be used under the HFRA (Health Forest Restoration Act) to set up 10-yr. contracts with multi-year extensions. This will allow EIS to look at a larger area with more projects under one analysis = economies of scale. The Emigrant East area is a good place to start to gather data since it has some baseline information. Jerry hopes to start implementation in 2009/2010.

Rick Minster – OECD, ODF, and OSU have recently signed an MOU to support forest cluster manufacturing.

2:40 BREAK

3:00 Draft Project Goals and Objectives

Asante R – The Sierra Club is concerned that there is such a focus on product that restoration achievements for T&E species will not be achieved, and we will see further wildlife habitat fragmentation. The Sierra Club wants to find common ground and will support material product if its a by-product of ecological goals. He sees other collaborative restoration initiatives lacking light-on-the-land equipment, and this could be a focus for our group. We aren't having an ecological health crisis – nature is resilient – we are having a societal health crisis. We are not in balance with nature. Issues---

- Remove excess roads to reduce fragmentation
- Return natural fire to fire-adapted ecosystems
- Doesn't see a lot of product opportunity due to inherent limitations – e.g. the 12-21" size range just isn't there
- Need to retool mills for smaller diameter production

Jeff F. – The draft problem statement is too narrowly-focused. Perhaps say "ecological health crisis" so that it brings in the human equation

Russ H – Perhaps broaden the scale of the conversation ... "in the face of Climate change we need to rebuild resiliency back into forests of Harney County and surrounding area for healthy ecosystems."

Julie W – we live in a community suffering from fears – jobs were tied to extraction and removed products; but there are also jobs in sustaining and caretaking as well as extracting. We need to get past the fear of not filling mill jobs.

Scott – there is also an issue of what supports the jobs? Some jobs are supported more by appropriations than others. In other areas like Central Oregon and Lakeview, broad consensus has been generated that appropriations will be insufficient to pay for all restoration objectives.

A group discussion followed on the issues of jobs/infrastructure loss. Participants discussed the following issues:

- Loss of jobs,
- Timber \$ is used for schools
- Declining enrollments,
- too expensive to live here without good jobs,
- county roads will decline
- we need to pursue common sense actions not science
- We've lost jobs associated with fiber as well as other federal appropriations
- Fire can be a good tool if its not catastrophic
- Cows on range can be an effective fire management tool
- Can't have a stable economic base without properly-managed federal lands
- Natural resources supported and sustained these communities

Purpose Statement

Transparency and openness of decision making process is important to the group.

Core Team Agreement: All can live with the following revised purpose statement:
"To achieve an integrated solution to multifaceted community /forest health problems"

Draft Goals:

The group then had a discussion on the Draft Goals, including the following comments:

- Threats – insects and disturbance should include a scientific list of T&E , recovery list of species of interest
- If we set a goal of dynamic recovery then species will recover and return too
- Can't just log small trees forever
- Utilize the trees that will die anyway
- We should have as a goal the expansion of forest product businesses and opportunity to grow them or bring in new ones – let industry determine the types of jobs they create and technologies they employ
- Shouldn't goals include climate change/carbon sequestration?

Sideboard:

- Juniper: Address juniper expansion issues and invasive juniper, needs, products and markets, transportation and harvest problems, access issues and roads – expensive to extract.

Steve G – we had a vibrant forest products industry once and resilient communities. Simplest to keep doing the same thing we were doing in some cases, but with new ideas. Before we lose all of our infrastructure. “Keep building buggy whips – but maybe in a new way.”

Geographic Scope

- TNC hopes to build capacity to look at a very broad assessment of other areas based on our work – but Emigrant East has a lot of data, so it's an appropriate place to start.
- Steve G feels comfortable using Emigrant East as a place to start
- The Grant County project is contiguous
- Trust can be developed through field-truthing and working together
- TNC and USFS will work together to provide data, resources even if it allows or forces plan amendments.

The Core Team

- Being built
- Asking for a commitment from those here to participate
- No parachuting in or out

Project Objectives

The group held some discussion on the following items related to the Project Objectives:

- Want to get on the ground quickly to “ground” the group
- Will need to sample areas – can’t cover everything.
- Don’t want to go to so many sites that all we have time for is traveling in the car. Want to get to know a site
- We need to come to agreement on the FRCC (fire regime-condition class) of a site.
- Need to be strategic in our efforts – pick representative sites
- Use previous efforts of other groups to reach common ground (e.g. blue mountain effort)
- Work both in the field and in room

ScottA –

- We’ll start with areas we think have a higher likelihood of developing common ground;
- The FS has already identified 2 prospective areas – Emigrant East and Marshall Devine - and has begun collecting data;
- The FS has agreed to provide technical data to a technical committee that will help us answer questions.

Core Team Agreement: The group agreed to do field tours in 1-2 areas, then create some questions for the technical committee to map and test ideas and assumptions. The group agreed to use the Emigrant East area to start the process.

4:00 Technical Needs

Diane V – it is essential to ID what we care about most to direct us to where we need to go first. We’ll need to obtain a variety of attributes, but which ones first?

The group deferred any specifics on the exact technical committee and makeup; must ID players. There will be some lag time. However, FS and TNC will get started.

The technical committee will need to at least identify the following:

- Old growth areas
- Species
- FR/CC
- Riparian areas

- Wildlife habitat

?? – Need to understand the federal sideboards – regulatory and economic – to what we propose. Don't have to consider them entirely rigid, but they are important to understand. The USFS will provide us with feedback as the need arises.

4:30 Next Meeting and Next Steps

- Will discuss given statements
- More discussion of community, federal lands, health and how it all comes together
- More understanding of how we entered into this agreement in the first place
- Discuss social and economic impacts and healthy lands and forests and how they mesh together for Harney county
- Get FS data
- Not too many stops, lots of walking
- Provide data about sites ahead of the trip for review
- Scott provides a progress report
- KEEP TO GROUND RULES
- Have people on field trip agenda to explain issues on trip - specialists
- County and FS to set up field trip logistics (FS tech overview, County tour logistics
- Agree to disagree

5:00 Adjourn