

McKenzie Stewardship Logistics Committee

February 21, 2008 3:30 pm—4:00 pm

EWEB Conference Room

Participants:

Mary Allison Willamette NF, McKenzie River District Ranger
Johan Hogervorst Willamette NF, Forest Hydrologist
Marcus Kauffman Resource Innovations, Program Manager
George J. Regas Willamette NF, McKenzie River Natural Resources Team Leader
Ryan Ojerio Resource Innovations, Graduate Research Fellow
Larry Six McKenzie Watershed Council, Coordinator
Karl Morgenstern EWEB & East Lane Soil and Water Conservation District

Upcoming Events

	Date	Time	Location
Stewardship Group Meeting (<i>Tentative</i>)	March 27 th	6:00 PM – 8:00 PM	Vida-McKenzie Community Center
Logistics Committee Meeting	April 9 th	3:00 PM – 4:30 PM	EWEB Building
Field Trip – Bridge Thin Project	May	TBD	TBD

Stewardship Group Meeting Summary/Debrief

The participants were generally pleased with the attendance and outcome of the first official meeting of the McKenzie Stewardship Group. Marcus felt that the introductions gave people an opportunity to start building relationships and the discussion of interests and concerns helped to show the diversity of the group. Some participants at the meeting were ready to get to work, but there is also at least one participant who was strongly critical of the collaborative process.

George noted that it is important for participants in the group to feel empowered and keep each other on topic; developing a consensus around group norms will help the group to manage conflicts that are bound to arise during discussions. Other Logistics Committee members agreed and echoed comments from the meeting that developing a decision-making method is a priority. Marcus suggested focusing on these two group processes before delving into discussions about the group's vision, mission and goals.

Johan brought up the subject of attendance and representation sparking a conversation about who is at the table and how to involve stakeholders who aren't interested or able to attend. For example, some people from the timber industry couldn't attend, but may be able to come to future meetings. Several suggestions came out of the discussion including using the website and email to disseminate information, ensuring participants are sharing information with their peers (constituents), and bringing in people who can report back to their organization (i.e. East Lane Forest Protection Association). Also there may be times when it is appropriate to host a separate meeting or workshop, such as a education session for contractors specifically addressing the (Request For Proposal) RFP process.

Variable attendance and questions of representation will impact the decision making process and the group will need to decide on how they want to address these issues.

Meeting Schedule and Location

Ryan gave a summary of the vote tally to date. The 3rd and 4th Thursdays of the month are both more popular than the other potential dates. Unfortunately, both of those dates are incompatible with at least one of the people who voted. Ryan also noted a suggestion to rotate the meeting locations between the Upper McKenzie Community Center and the Vida-McKenzie Community Center. Another suggestion was to hold meetings earlier in the day to avoid driving at night.

The logistics committee decided that the 4th Thursday would be best and set a tentative date for 4th Thursday – March 27th contingent on new votes that may come in tomorrow. They also agreed that evening meetings would allow greater attendance given people's work schedules. Several people supported alternating meeting locations and one person suggested the Leaburg Community Center as an option. Its important for the whole group to participate in these decisions, so they will be discussed at the next meeting.

Agenda for the March Meeting

The Logistics Committee reviewed a draft agenda and decided to focus on two topics 1) developing group norms and decision making method and 2) education about forest restoration/thinning.

Bridge Thin and Restoration Education

The Bridge Thin EA will probably go out for comment and review the first week of March and be open for public comment for 30 days. This would give the group a chance to read the EA, participate in the next meeting, and then submit comments. Rather than using the Stewardship Group meeting as a forum to give input on the EA, the Logistics Committee recommended that the meeting focus on understanding the scientific background and two alternatives described in the EA. Paul Anderson from the Pacific Northwest Research Station is tentatively available to speak to the group, which would help the group put the two alternatives for Bridge Thin into context. This is also a good opportunity to clarify and review the FS process for taking a project from scoping to implementation.

Marcus commented that Paul's education talk and following discussion will illuminate conflict, consensus and gaps in information about thinning and restoration practices. This will help the group think about their goals and how to develop an adaptive management and monitoring strategy that could begin to fill in some of those gaps.

George noted that keeping the group abreast of what is going on with the Bridge Thin Project at each meeting would help to keep them engaged in the process.

Future Action Steps

Craig Patterson submitted an idea for supporting local economic development that he'd like to discuss with the group. The Logistics Committee discussed how to incorporate it into the agenda. Marcus pointed out that Craig' concept is a possible means to accomplish a goal. Before the group can begin to make decisions about appropriate actions, they need to decide on the group norms, decision-making method, and then form some consensus about goals and priorities. Ideally the group will be ready to dig into a discussion about actions in the next couple of

months, but it depends on how quickly they can agree on group norms and a decision making process.

Education Curriculum

Ryan presented a draft list of topics and learning objectives. The Logistics Committee made the following recommendations for these topics:

Forest Thinning – Focus on the science behind thinning, the different practices and needs for equipment and expertise. Although fire, biomass utilization and climate change are important related issues, they could be separate topics in themselves.

Collaborative Process – Bring in this topic in April; focus on the steps in the process, where the group is at and where they are headed. The group doesn't need to delve into the specific stewardship authorities.

Oak Savannah Restoration – This topic could be included with the forest thinning talk or built into a field tour to see the Bridge Thin site in May.

Fish and Water – Both of these topics warrant separate discussions. Johan recommended bringing in recent research (i.e. the Hinkle Creek Study). The committee suggested scheduling these topics sooner rather than later.

Based on these discussion, Ryan will draft and post on the website an outline of the education topics and timeline.

Next Steps

Outreach and Attendance

Several suggestions were discussed regarding people/organizations that weren't at the Stewardship Group meeting. Ryan will review the outreach list to see if there are contacts there for the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Pacific Rivers Council, the State of Oregon Economic Development Department and the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). Marcus said he would contact Bill Richardson with the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation.

The Steering/Logistics Committee

This committee formed in order to get the group started, but over time the group will be able to do its own planning and logistics. Its important for the Stewardship Group to know why the steering committee exists and assure the participants that there isn't a hidden agenda. At the next meeting it would be good to discuss this with the whole group.