

1. Introductions, etc.

Present: Audie Huber, CTUIR DNR; Brian Kelly, HCPC; Carrie Spradlin, UNF (Heppner); Ed Pearson, Dodge Loggin; Elaine Eisenbraun, NFJDWC; Greg Silbernagel, UBWC; Hans Rudolf, ODF; Jean Cassidy, community member; Jeff Tomac, WWNF (Whitman); Kevin Blakely, ODF&W; Kevin Martin, UNF (SO); Lindsay Warness, Boise Cascade; Commissioner Mark Davidson, Union County; Mark Stern, TNC; Judge Mark Webb, Grant County; Monte Fujishin, UNF (Pomeroy); Scott Aycock, Oregon Solutions; Scott Fairley, Governor's Office; Stanley Boatman, Boise Cascade; Steve Cherry, ODF&W; Judge Terry Tallman, Morrow County; Tim Lillebo, Oregon Wild; Todd Bucholz, UNF (Heppner); Vince Naughton, citizen.

Agenda Review

Questions or concerns relative to agenda:

- Moist forests don't have bulk of science so we need to go in with an open mind
- Send out a two-tiered contact list – those who are attending, and those who are on the list for “information only”.
- Need to add an update on Oregon Solutions
- Noted that the Ford Family Foundation has agreed to provide \$5,000 to the UFCG.

New Meeting Time:

- Proposed new meeting time: fourth Thursdays Concern: Holidays can be a problem
- Next meeting would be 26th of January or February 23
- Revisit at end of meeting

2. FFAC NEPA

Kevin Martin and Peter Dalke explained the opportunity for making the Umatilla Forest Collaborative projects “pilots” in the study of how to improve NEPA efficiency by the Federal Forestlands Advisory Committee. There has been no decision nor clear articulation of what this would mean yet, the purpose here is simply to make the group aware of the possibility. Tim Lillebo stated that an efficiency report had been done by BMFP and that he would distribute that report to the group.

Discussion included:

- the current qualitative evaluation that is taking place by a few groups to evaluate effectiveness of prescriptions in achieving desired results.
- The possibility that uncontroversial actions could fall under the various “categorical exclusion” rules.
- The role of the collaborative is to provide continuity and help with prioritizing. If you want to streamline NEPA, you must first understand the areas and issues with the least controversy. Does group want to focus on less controversial or more controversial issues? If it is less controversial then does it really need the collaborative? Common ground areas shouldn't take a lot of our time. (STAFF NOTE: There was no group consensus on whether or not the group should take on more or less controversial issues. It bears noting, however, that they have selected one of each to date).

Items for further consideration:

1. What does the group want to spend its time on?
2. What would the group recommend for streamlined NEPA? We don't have to decide today.

Keep an agenda slot for this item.

Further discussion included using other NEPA efficiency models from other agencies.

3. Oregon Solutions Designation Update

OS has forwarded the executive summary on to the management team and it will go to the governor's office later today or tomorrow. On December 16th, the admin committee reviewed an "Executive Summary" of the project proposal and agreed to use it as the basis for the request, versus the regional solutions advisory committee letter. The UFCG Administrative would be the convening body for the OS project.

4. Operating Principles

The Administrative Committee did not create a final consensus Op Principles document version to share with the group. Rather, Todd made all of the revisions suggested in the 12/1 meeting and Lindsay developed a Mission and Vision statement from a variety of other collaboratives. Brian Kelly also created a new value statement for the group to consider.

Scott noted that "keep it simple" is best.

The group discussed some of the text, which was recorded. The Admin committee will take the ideas and work with them and get it back to the group at their next meeting (mainly Todd).

Broad comments:

- We are throwing around a lot of terms like "sustained ecological system and community or economic system." We probably need to get close to the same page on what those words mean. Do we need a glossary?
- Mark Davidson - regarding the Mission; would like it to plainly state the goal of economic benefit for communities.
- Mark Webb noted that he would like to see the group transition from *outputs* language to *outcomes*. We are less concerned about board feet per se, but what should the desired future condition be and that will bring the appropriate amount of board feet.
- Discussion around finding the optimal point where social, economic, and ecological values intersect. While acknowledging that there will inevitably be trade-offs between these values, at least in the short-term and at smaller spatial scales.
- Is it sometimes OK if economics drives a project instead of ecological restoration goals?

New Group Values:

Bullet 1. Mutual statement of group respect.

Bullet 5. Holistic approach. When there is a chance for ecological restoration it will be incorporated into the big look at the project.

If anyone has any additional suggestions, send them to Todd Bucholz at tbucholz@fs.fed.us. At next admin committee meeting we'll go over them.

Decision making:

Lindsay gave a short PowerPoint presentation on a variety of decision-making protocols being used by other collaborative groups. Scott asked the group to consider the following questions: WHO is making the decisions? What TYPE of decision-making are they using (e.g. full consensus always, voting, or some hybrid)? And do they want to use SUBCOMMITTEES to facilitate smaller-group discussion and develop recommendations to the full group?

Regarding WHO, the group agreed that:

- Only persons signing the Operating Principles document may participate in group decision-making.
- Individuals must have attended at least 2 of the last 4 meetings to formally participate in group decisions (while allowing the use of "alternates" from the same organization if needed).

- Forest Service staff are extremely important to this effort, but should not participate in decisions.

Regarding the TYPE of decision, the group agreed:

- To be a consensus-seeking group, with a fallback vote as needed. Details of deliberation, timeframe, etc. to be required will go back to the administrative committee for recommendation.
- Quorum – Is a quorum required? (STAFF NOTE – It doesn't appear that the group resolved this issue, however it is probably a matter of course that if at least 50% of the signatory organizations will not be able to have a representative at a given meeting, that meeting should be postponed to a date that will ensure quorum at a minimum.)
- When dissenting from what appears to be a group consensus, members should provide a constructive alternative that they think will meet everyone's needs.
- If no consensus can be achieved, that will be noted and the group will issue more than one recommendation or report, with the persons noted for each report, and what actions they expect to take, if any.
- The group needs external communication protocols.

Regarding the use of Committees, the group agreed that:

- The Admin Committee is the only formal committee needed for now.
- The group is small enough that everyone is interested in the projects and should take part in detailed project discussions.
- Ad Hoc committees will be formed, as needed, to deliberate on areas of disagreement, to do research, etc.

5. Projects: Young Stand Development

The group then discussed the question of Scale and Stand Type for the Young Stand Development project.

Scale: Thomas Creek or all 70,000 acres of plantations?

Stand Type: Plantations or Unmanaged or both?

Scott noted that, in regards to the Young Stand project, the group is breaking its own ground in terms of how to proceed. It can decide to do science forums, literature reviews, site visits, all the way to actually proposing treatments – it is fully open. Kahler is a slightly more well-worn groove – it's actually in process and is similar to many other dry forest projects that have been considered by collaborative groups, but YSD is very different. Discussion points included:

- It would take most of next field season to collect field data on Thomas Creek.
- How was Thomas Creek selected? Mike Rassbach had a larger project already identified that seemed to have a representative sample of different plantation sites, but a portion of it had some sort of issue (?).
- Would NEPA at the Thomas Creek scale be substantively different than doing NEPA at a larger scale? Yes, watershed boundaries play a major role in cumulative affects analysis. When we spread out over multiple watersheds it creates diverse ecological impacts; the effects are more variable, and you can't as easily perform NEPA. Still might be NEPA economies of scale to consider here.
- Why are cool/moist forests a sensitive issue? Why do we perceive that there is less agreement in them? There is more restoration science around the need for restoration in dry forest types. Plus, there are some different habitats and species of concern (more?). They also may not be out of their normal fire cycles as much. Could bring in some scientists for a science panel?
- Most of these are 40 year old monocultures with off-site p. pine. To get scientific data out of these stands for what we want to do with unmanaged stands is unlikely. Should we be spending our time in these stands? On the other hand, the High Ridge research area has 50 years of data that is not being used. It also has some major roadless areas we could help with (what does "help" mean in this context??). We have 6 municipal watersheds. Are there better, more productive projects?

- We need to know what the wildlife biologists think should happen in these areas, as that is usually the sticking point now.
- Cool/moist forests are where the volume is and the USFS needs to get volume off to help pay for restoration elsewhere.

The group agreed on the following:

- To analyze both the Thomas Creek AND the adjacent High Ridge Area.
 - The analysis will be of the watershed as a whole –ridgetop to ridgetop, including both plantations and unmanaged stands.
- Bring Mark Henjum and Dave Powell to the next meeting to get their contextual information for this area.

Members noted that, if scientists are going to come out as part of a science forum or field tours, we need to begin planning ASAP.

Decision: The group will use the 26th of January as a Kahler project meeting held at the Heppner District office. Then the group will meet again at their February meeting (2/23) and reconvene the discussion on Thomas Creek. And have a subcommittee meeting on today's discussion to further it.