

Umatilla Forest Collaborative

Meeting Notes: March 22, 2012

Forest Supervisor's Office- Pendleton, Or

Attendance: Davilyn Brown, HCPC; Brian Kelly, HCPC; Angela Johnson, ODFW-John Day; Irene Jerome, AFRC; , Gary Miller, USFWS; Vince Naughton, Forester and community member; Lindsay Warness, Boise Cascade; Larry Givens, Umatilla County; Kathleen Cathey, Senator Wyden's Office; Hans Rudolf, ODF; Greg Silbernagel, Umatilla Basin WSC; Ed Pearson, Blue Mt. Lumber Products; Sue Greer, OWEB; Steve Cherry, ODFW; Scott Fairley; Governor's Office.

USFS Staff Present: Dave Powell, Mike Rassbach, Carrie Spradlin, Johnny CollinKevin Martin, Todd Buchholt, Monte Fujishin.

Convener: Bob Davies, Eastern Oregon University.

Staff: Scott Aycock, Oregon Solutions; Valeen Madden, NFJDWC.

Meeting convened at 10:05am.

Introductions/Agenda

- The Agenda was reviewed with the opportunity for additions.
- Previous meeting notes approved.
- Scott Aycock asked the group to provide any questions/concerns regarding the group in writing to him.

Process

- The **Operating Principles** were reviewed and all previously requested changes have been made including any redundancies. The NFJDWC will handle Fiscal Admin and staff issues. A statement was added stating that once decisions are made by the group, those decisions are not to be revoked and re-evaluated unless new information is presented. The authority of the Admin Committee and staff roles were defined.
- Within the **Mission Statement** there was concern in using the term "Forest Management". Agreement was made to state as follows: "To develop and promote *balanced solutions from a diverse group of stakeholders*, to improve and sustain ecological resiliency and local community socioeconomic health in and near the Umatilla National Forest. Balanced solutions could be defined broadly or on a project by project basis.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

- Important to keep all interests even when prioritizing
- All National Forest issues or just vegetation management/trees? Does the group want to keep the statement broad in order to accommodate future projects?
- Byproduct of the groups work will be an economic and social benefit
- Any "red flags" should be eliminated to avoid being counter-productive
- Develop a glossary of terms for the group
- Will the group make recommendations on a landscape or watershed scale?
- The **Vision Statement** was approved 'as is'.

- The content of **Group Values** was ok- Scott will work on the wording.
- **Representation, Participation, Committees:** Group has elected to not have sub committees but rather an Ad Hoc Committee. The group will hold meeting regardless of attendance
- The **Ground Rules** were approved 'as is'.
- **Decision Making:**
 - **Participation** This is not a static group; therefore it's physical members can change. If a person attends 2 of 4 meetings, either by way of conference/video call or in person, they are eligible to have a voice and vote within the group. Alternates are acceptable whether from the same organization or not.
 - **Consensus Seeking** If a party knows they will not be attending a meeting that will involve a vote and are unable to send an alternate, they are to let a member of the Admin Committee know that they will not be present. The member will be given the most adequate information possible to review and form a vote. They will then give their vote to the Admin Committee who will carry it to the group at that meeting. If a consensus cannot be met, the topic will be taken to the Ad Hoc committee. If the Ad Hoc committee comes to a consensus, the vote will be brought back to the group and the process will be documented. If a consensus cannot be met, the vote percentage will be brought back to the group and will be documented in its report to the Forest.
 - **Quorum** The term quorum will not be used , but rather an understanding that the full group in its diversity will be represented. If all sides are not in attendance then the meeting will continue, however any decisions will be tabled until the next meeting.
 - **Reversibility of Decisions** approved 'as is'.
 - **Outcome of Group Decisions** approved 'as is'.
 - **Administrative Committee** Scott drafted a statement of informal intent for the Admin Committee. He will add language on the importance of the diversity within the committee as well as the expected length of commitment to the committee and the process by which to replace committee members.
 - **Staff Roles** approved 'as is'

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

- At times we may need to "agree to disagree" and move forward with the group's larger picture in focus.
- Scott noted that, while collaborative groups focus on a finite number of projects, National Forests as a whole tend to migrate towards decisions that would be acceptable to the collaborative group; Forests know it's generally a clear path moving forward.

Draft UFCG Work Plan (see Attachment A)

- Proposed work plan approved "as a start". The group understands that changes can and likely will be made. Scott will get a copy of plan to the group at the next meeting.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS:

- It will always be the Forest's decision whether to carry out group recommendations
- For the cool/moist forest work – the group will likely want to develop “joint inquiry” tools
- Reach out to other collaborative groups who may have various forms of information
- Per UNF: Group needs to determine the proposed cool/moist areas soon in order to have enough information to move forward with planning data collections for NEPA.
 - Thomas Creek: roughly 2,000 acres of plantation units

- Can Thomas Creek data gathering be achieved for this field season? UNF will return to the group to answer.
- Per Scott: Group realistically will not be able to achieve an action before next year.

Kahler Stand Analysis- Prescriptions

- Field surveys are continuing.
- While there is mainly Ponderosa pine, Doug Fir, Grand Fir, Juniper and Mt. Mahogany are also present. Seems to be a lot of Mistletoe in the Doug Fir.

Variable Density Thinning:

- Target of 50-60 basal area per acre
- Favor leaving the following species - Pine, Western Larch and when present and healthy, Doug Fir.
- Currently at 100-130 basal area
- Able to leave clumps and take lower volume of stems when necessary

Skips & Gaps Thinning

- Leave clumps and open areas
- Take up to 21" trees
- Prescribed burning a typical prescription to mimic natural fire occurrence
- Currently fire has been excluded and density is way beyond normal HRV.

COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

- Q: Are there local contractors that are trained and competent to do this type of prescription? A: While FS hired contractor are exceptionally competent, individual trees are marked. Designation by prescription is available for stewardship contracts; still, all trees are clearly marked by the Forest Service.

- Wildlife feedback: Important to leave big game cover areas across the landscape. Elk in particular are an indicator species; meaning they give indicators of the quality of habitat for other species. From a wildlife perspective, Skips and Gaps is the preferred prescription.

- Skips and Gaps and Variable Density are fairly similar in the effort needed to carry out the prescription, and the expected volume of harvest.

- Group needs to look closely at desired future conditions: Thinning does not allow for regeneration, while Skips and Gaps does. In time thinning results in a single strata stands, while Skips and Gaps over time would result in multiple strata stands.

- What data needs does the group have? Scott will provide a matrix of data requested and present it to the group.

GENERAL NOTES

- As part of the Oregon Solutions process, the group needs to draft a Declaration of Cooperation letter stating their goals, and an implementation plan.

- Bob Davies will have an EOU student look at the website and make sure it is safe to use.



- Bob Davies will look into utilizing students to help with lit. reviews and field research as needed.

APRIL 26th MEETING IN THE FIELD!!

- A bus will leave the UNF office at 7:30am and travel to Heppner then on to Fairview. If you don't ride the bus we will meet on site at 10am.
- BRING YOUR OWN LUNCH.

Meeting adjourned at 2:40pm.

ATTACHMENT A: UFCG 2012 WORK PLAN

Task	March	April	May	June	July	August
KAHLER:						
Review Existing Conditions Data	X	X	X			
Field Tours		X	X			
Develop Desired Future Condition			X	X		
Develop Project Purpose and Need			X	X		
ID Priority Areas for Active Management				X	X	
Review Prescriptions to Achieve DFC				X	X	
Develop Recommended Management Guidelines					X	X 
COOL/MOIST FORESTS – Discovery Phase						
Determine Scale/Geography of Initial Focus	X					
Review Existing Watershed(s) Data		X	X			
Field Tours – plantation/unmanaged; recent projects/pre-project Coincident: USFS field data gathering				X	X	
ID Areas of Agreement/Disagreement; Develop Joint Inquiry Tools (e.g. science panels, research/monitoring needs; etc.)				X	X	X
Develop Roadmap to Collaboration for Cool/Moist Forests on the UNF.						X
(Later Cool/moist phases: Later phases would include steps such as shared management principles and implementation.)						

ATTACHMENT B: KAHLER DATA MATRIX

Data Requested	Notes	Provided?	Source	Location
Replanted vs. natural regeneration	Plantations			
- which species?				
Fish species present				
- note ESA or sensitive species	Note mgmt. direction			
Wildlife species present				
- note ESA or sensitive species	Note mgmt. direction			
- Big game winter range				
- Snags				
- Management indicator species				
- Habitat connectivity				
Fire regime and condition class by site				
Roads analysis for restoration strategy				
Economic feasibility by site				
Recreation uses and dispersed camping sites				
Stand density				
Species composition				
Stand structure/seral stage				
Historic range of variability	Species, structure, density expressed in tables/%s. (Using old or new For. Plan?)			
Climate change predictions	To assist with "Future RV"			
Local community economic conditions	Communities and counties			
- socioeconomic profile				
Contractors	Presence, capacity, etc.			
Grazing allotments	Issues?			
WUI areas				
Private inholdings and adjacent private lands	Land uses, conditions			
Invasive weed species and sites				
Already approved/planned				

Data Requested	Notes	Provided?	Source	Location
implementation activities				
Smoke management issues				
Specially-protected areas	Roadless, potential wilderness, etc.			