



for the greatest good



BLUE MOUNTAINS
FOREST PLAN REVISION - 2015
Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman
National Forests

Meeting Notes

Public Workshop on Pace & Scale of Restoration and the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision

Hosted by the Wallowa County Natural Resources Advisory Committee (NRAC)

Enterprise, Oregon | July 28, 2015

These notes reflect the best efforts of the notetaker to capture the discussion of meeting participants, but in no way are these notes a word-for-word transcript as the notetaker may have unintentionally missed some statements or dialogue. Also, the notes do not attempt to correct or clarify any statements made by participants.

Participants: Cynthia Warnock, Mike Hayward, Bruce Dunn, Roy Garten, John Hilloch, Ed Minalia, Ross Stenkamp, Gina Birkmaier, Jack Snyder, Mark Bujanovich, Chad Nash, Tim Newton, Don Bronson, Raider Heck, Jeff Jenkins, Greg Barreto, Kristal Jenkins, Wendy Falk, Peggy Kite Martin, Mike Fack, Lesslie Jones, Sam Magera, Otilia Thiel, Patrick Thiel, Heather Melville, Elwayne Henderson, Jack Southworth

US Forest Service (FS) participants: Tom Montoya, Kris Stein, Jake Lubera, Sabrina Stadler, Gunnar Carnwath, Peter Fargo (notetaker)

Organizations represented: Wallowa County, Wallowa County NRAC, local logging industry, local ranching industry, Oregon State University Extension Service, Oregon State House of Representatives, and USFS

--

Introduction – Jack Southworth, Facilitator, High Desert Partnership: We are here to discuss the Pace and Scale of Restoration as it relates to the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision. We’ll begin with introductions around the room and then hear from NRAC members.

Introductions around the circle: Please briefly introduce yourself and your concerns regarding the Pace & Scale portion of the Blue Mountains Forest Plan.

- Would like to see major changes made in Forest Plan; either a new alternative or major changes to increase pace of forest restoration
- Would like to see a real logging job on the forest
- Private landowner; forestry background; industry/logging family from Idaho; voice of the small guy; lack of forestry work is starting to hurt the private landowner
- FS Ecologist; here to listen to everyone and hear your concerns and suggestions for moving forward
- FS Public Affairs Officer; here with my laptop to capture everyone’s input
- FS Forest Supervisor; here to listen and understand all issues related to Pace & Scale

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- I have a ranch near Seneca; I am here with the High Desert Partnership; I was asked to facilitate these meetings
- Private landowner and forestry consultant; would like to see FS get something done one way or the other
- Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision team leader
- Landowner; been to a lot of these meetings; seems like we are going backward; hate to see businesses shrinking because we do not have the economic base; used to have 5 mills in this County; everyone was working, and it was profitable; want to be able to utilize our natural resources
- With Ferret Creek Logging in Wallowa; would like to see FS come up with a plan they can actually use
- Permittee and on NRAC; want to see a plan that we can use for grazing and logging; want to see us use natural resources wisely to support ourselves, our families, and our County.
- Wallowa County Commissioner. In 2003 we hired a consultant to work on the forestry piece. The plan hasn't gone far enough, but I feel that some of it was heard.
- Oregon State Extension representative and NRAC member. The County's need should match the FS need. We should have a Forest Plan that meets the ecological and economic side; I bet there aren't 20 pages in the plan about the economics. You talk about not having the money, but the money is there in the forest, ready to be harvested and brought to town. The forest can be managed with a positive economic output.
- Lifelong resident of Wallowa County and County Commissioner; time to get back to work in the forest, get it cleaned up, and use the economic asset to get the County back on its feet
- Need to use the land to keep our local economy as strong as possible. We are losing ground on access, range, and pace & scale; we seem to lose *all* of the time.
- Represent ranch property/inholdings on the Imnaha; want to maintain the health of forest, not just access; don't want to see monoculture either; we need to increase wildlife
- Third-generation logger and contractor, Stewards of the Wallowas. Have done little in the way of harvest since the '90s. My kids have never been on logging equipment, because it's rare in Wallowa Co.
- Like to see a plan that primarily focuses on concerns of local residents and businesses; they should get the driving focus of the plan.
- I was here in the heyday of the sawmills; there are no mills left; trees are dying, falling down, or burning up. Let's get this done, and quickly, without 20,000 more meetings.
- Forest user; concerned with how the whole plan is written; plan cites data that's 15 years old (e.g., hunting stats, economics, dollars that come from hunting). Plan needs to include up-to-date data that represents current science and surveys. These forests are important to a lot of people.
- Deputy District Ranger: looking for creative solutions
- District Ranger: here to listen and learn
- Former FS employee; want to see where this is going and if we can get back to multiple use
- Oregon State Representative: Would like to manage the forest more like a business; put people to work; make it a viable asset to the communities.
- We need to manage the forest ecologically and economically; need more timber harvest
- Would like to see FS follow the laws that we have to follow in the woods (e.g., erosion caused by prescribed burns)
- Landowner surrounded by FS: Want to see FS be sustainable, economically and ecologically; want to see where we are with the plan.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- Resident: historical multiple-use user; small business owner. Forest needs to be managed aggressively before it all goes up in smoke; closing roads is not the answer for safety; do not close anything that is already open.
- I'm a native; woods have been part of our lives/history. I pay taxes on the whole forest, not just part of it. Concerned for our forest.
- Long-term resident; worked these lands since I was 4 years old; have planted trees, fought fires, built fences. Thinking of 250 dislocated timber families (1/7 of Wallowa County), many of which I met when I worked in the unemployment office. Think of the people who aren't in this room and are affected. I was the Mayor of Joseph. The cost to our society and economy of losing 1/7 of our people is unfair and should not happen.
- Would like to see the woods opened up to more wood cutting. The Lostine River valley is a fire hazard, but we cannot cut wood there. Safety issues with fallen trees. Not nearly as busy (cutting wood) as I used to in 80s and 90s. Now there is hardly anything available.
- Made my living off the forest and outfitting cattle. So much of "multiple use" has been cut out. Range permits have decreased; less AUMs. Focus on safety and fire.

What are your comments, questions, or concerns about the Pace & Scale of Restoration?

- Husband's family has two tracts of forest land; logging family from northern Idaho. I had a forest products degree but married a farmer, which was a good choice because loggers have had it hard these days. Gifford Pinchot and others stepped in to protect the forests from excessive harvesting; now the pendulum has swung the other way. I have thinning I need to do on my land; we're adjacent to FS. We have a loss of infrastructure here; lower prices compared to north Idaho; contractor pool is shrinking; only two people in the area that a private landowner can work with economically. As a private individual, I don't have thousands of acres to spread my risk over. If you only have 10-400 acres, you cannot spread cost out. 50%-70% of the cost goes to the logger, so there is only a 30% return to pay for a treatment. The FS has the opportunity with thousands of acres to spread risk and treat the forest more business-like. They have the luxury of cutting more sustainably. I feel sorry for the FS; your hands are so tied by the environmental movement; the public doesn't understand the nitty-gritty of ecology, etc. The FS workforce has shifted to more "-ologists" instead of timber and range. There are many people you can collaborate with that are not just working from spreadsheets. There can be a lot of collaboration outside the agency to get things done. There is nothing more discouraging as a landowner than to look at a treatment that's needed on your land, but it doesn't make economic sense. There is a resource and value that's wasted on our NF; it is not that it's too expensive; I am sure we can find a way.
- Curtail this process. I'm happy that we have slowed down a little, but I don't think we can go any slower. At the best we won't even remove half of the Wallowa cut. FS can't be thinking about reforestation. There isn't enough emphasis on volume/access for logging jobs. One year, slash. Next year, pile. Next year, burn. That's too expensive for any private operator. I recommend a one-and-done operation with the same operator. Most of the nutrients in a tree are in the limbs; they need to be left out there. You can't afford to take slash out or burn it up. Loggers can always figure out a way to do the job, especially with today's mechanical equipment. FS could make a lot of money selling trees if they could/wanted to. I can offer solutions to do this right.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- Teddy (Roosevelt) and Gifford (Pinchot) talked about how to wrestle the timber land from the people to make it better. Now it is the opposite; we need to wrestle a portion of NF to truly manage it sustainably. Not too sure how some call what Hancock is doing sustainable; I spent about 20 years managing those trees that they're now clearcutting. Generations of people get close to the land; it's true. It's embarrassing for somebody to drive by and see me sitting on a stump and crying. 300,000 acres is about 25% of FS-managed ground in Wallowa County; could support a sawmill tied to a biomass plant; could improve the County in many different ways. I was on the school board when we lost all the families/kids in the '90s, so I know how much that hurt. FS ought to be cutting about half of the trees down; not clear cutting but thinning it for economic use and fire safety.
 - o FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: The plan doesn't speak to the specific treatments that you mentioned.
- At least make the forest less likely to burn up; remove volume; do it in a scientific, "dirt forester" way. I know we took most of the big trees out long ago; leave the best and take the rest. Ten log cutters could do a better job than ten kids out of college.
- Page 215 of the DEIS, Vol. 1, Ch. 3: Desired Condition for Ecological Resilience. Where is the Alternative that meets that Desired Condition? Alternative D (48% of forest land) was County supported, but Alternative E (33%) was preferred by the FS.
 - o FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: We developed our timber projections assuming a "non-declining flow"—that is, none of the harvests in future decades will be less than the decade before. This approach to avoids ramping up volume and then ramping down again. We never developed an alternative for declining flow.
 - o FS Forest Plan Revision Team Leader, Sabrina Stadler: We were concerned that if we did a declining flow, it would be considered promise that we cannot keep due to the funding necessary to support that level of timber volume output, it also could lead to a boom/bust cycle, which could affect the ability to maintain the timber infrastructure in the long term.
- I see 790 million board feet according to projections. If you want to have a sustained yield, you cut the growth not principle; you are not even coming close. 250 million board feet a year: That's just growth, not even principle. I think we should cut over 65-70%.
 - o FS Team Leader, Sabrina Stadler: A lot of that 790 million board feet is coming out of smaller diameter trees, so there is a substantial cost to treat it.
 - o FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: In the desired future conditions (DFC), we are trying to achieve more ecosystem diversity, including more old growth than we have now. For example, the Historic Range of Variability shows 40-60% Old Forest Single Story in dry upland forests, but currently only 5% in present state. To get there, we need to let our forests grow. Two main goals going forward: Treat excessive fuels and promote stand diversity.
- Participant - my solution addresses old growth. If it's an old tree, leave it. Most mills can't take them anyway. I can't understand what the FS is doing with timber sales, then doing fuels reduction and spending a lot of money.
- You can't just go on diameter; mills can develop the capacity to cut them.
 - o FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: The main restriction is the assumption that we made to not have declining flow in timber volumes.
- Budget affects all of these alternatives. You need one that doesn't depend on budget. What do we need to do regardless of budget? There is always more money available to do the jobs that need to be done.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: I hear you saying, “We shouldn’t have budget-constrained alternatives.” The Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ), the ceiling for how much volume we can cut, is not constrained by budget. Budget affects different parts of the plan but not the ASQ.
- FS Team Leader, Sabrina Stadler: What Gunnar is talking about is specific to timber production. There was one alternative, Alternative K which was eliminated from detail study, because it was felt that it is unrealistic for us to expect to have a completely unconstrained budget.
- We can’t make the forest look like it did 500 years ago. Where does that come from anyway?
- Change your assumption. You basically said, “We aren’t going to cut enough trees to make a difference in this decade.” I think if you cut more trees, more will grow. In the plan, I read “contribute to economic opportunity for local communities.” Nice statement, but there is no alternative to back up that statement.
 - The solution is to be aggressive. We understand the constraints the FS has around its necks. You can manage around those with more than a 0% risk theory. We need to get together, the community and FS, to get us back to work in the woods. We need a plan that sets rules that let us get back in the woods.
 - 20 years ago, we did a field trip to a sub-watershed. A young FS specialist said, “We just have to protect the potential old growth.” The answer to old growth is to cut around them. The goal should be trees to the mill—not too much focus on ecology.
 - Move the risk level of this plan way up. In the plan now, the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest says 7,300 acres annually. How many acres are actually available in Wallowa County? 1.3 million acres, including wilderness. 150-200,000 acres still available 19 years ago. That was when PACFISH was putting the screws to us. We need to be aggressive on each acre, but also on the acres that we’re willing to enter. This plan needs to give us some opportunity to manage lands that have not been set aside. Make 400-500,000 acres available in our County; get through it in 20-25 years. Only 4 sub-watersheds are projected to improve over the next ten years under the proposed plan.
- We’ve been talking about Pace & Scale since 2003; clearly it is not aggressive enough. Congress is starting to get interested in this topic. We may see some meaningful legislation on restoration / fire. If Congress is paying for fire out of the treasury instead of FS budget, they will want to reduce the fire costs. Given the circumstances we’re under, you need to address the non-declining flow, so there is an alternative that is meaningful to this community. On the Umatilla and Wallowa-Whitman, we can’t ignore the moist-mix conifer forests; we need to harvest them. The plan includes suitability for different areas (e.g., potential Wilderness Areas, Inventoried Roadless Areas); areas suitable for timber production are not managed for timber. Areas that are suitable for timber should be managed for timber first and foremost. See that next generation of trees are there to harvest again.
 - FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: The desired condition, as written, is not to maximize timber production; it is to maximize ecosystem diversity and resiliency.
- That is part of the problem with the plan; no lands are managed first for timber production.
 - Forest Supervisor, Tom Montoya: We are not managing just for timber harvest; we have received many comments from the public to not manage only for timber production.
 - FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: By moving the forest toward Historic Range of Variability, we are trying to ensure species viability for species that evolved in these forests. At the same time, we feel confident that we’ll be able to do more timber work in stands like mixed-moist conifer.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- You want to follow the science. Hang your hat on the science and do the work. I am biased in favor of the people of Wallowa, not any one species.
- During last week's meeting, the biggest concern was the encroachment of timber affecting grazing. We need to treat those areas aggressively, and I'd like to see the FS be more creative. Don't get stuck on one path; there is a lot of knowledge here; people that learned out of a book don't get it the same way people understand who are on the ground. You can't put numbers on Mother Nature; it doesn't always work. Also, we don't go into the riparian areas; they need to be treated too. There are other sources of erosion that affect fish in streams besides logging in riparian areas. My suggestions for the plan: Keep it simple; it goes on/on; there is a lot of redundancy; evidence that the "-ologists" aren't speaking with each other. You can write a good/simple plan that gives you the ability to manage on-site. You need local flexibility.
 - o Forest Supervisor, Tom Montoya: We need a plan that people can use. More guidelines and fewer standards will lend more local flexibility. We did away with the 21" rule in Alternative E. We are also working on a riparian areas conservation strategy. One thing we have to deal with is consultation with the Services. We need to look at examples like what we're doing in the Lower Joseph River.
- Instead of a 3-legged stool with economic, ecological, and social legs, this plan reads more like an ecological pogo stick. Instead of restrictions, we need to look at *how* can we do this? Not *can* we do this? We have to work, and ask how. There are ways to work around the ecological needs.
 - o FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: It's a delicate and difficult balance.
 - o Participant: There is more concern for the ecology, e.g., roads and elk. Roads are not as detrimental as the plan makes them out to be.
- The old term "multiple use" comes to mind. In some forests, Rangers have stood up to these interests; they have been able to make sales. As a contractor, I've looked at 30 different timber sales; two of them worked out economically. You are in a position now where you can't put up a timber sale. We aren't doing any good for the forest. FS is getting fewer and fewer bidders. Need timber sales that are economically viable and do work that is good for the ground. The alternatives in the Forest Plans don't address that. Do sales aggressively; then leave the ground alone for 15-20 years.
- We need to treat all size classes. If you have nothing but big trees, it's not a healthy forest. You need size classes that sustain the health of the forest. The process of all this, as a private contractor, this will run me out of business. I can't wait; this process takes too long. Make a decision, and let's move on, so a guy like me can figure out what to do next.

Second round of input:

- Even if you only use 40% of your ground, it would be an improvement. We can do 80 million board feet per year on private land; not dealing with the same red tape. Don't get bogged down with the million board feet number; it is completely feasible. I manage moist-mixed conifer; I did a perimeter cut and now have more white fir than I know what to do with. Clearcutting can be ugly; logging is always ugly, but it heals itself. Use the right tools for the right situations. Don't limit yourself.
- The idea of wanting the forest to look 500 or 5,000 years old doesn't make sense to me. FS showed us an example: of course, a big tree. Put a fence around it and take 2/3 of the trees out or 1/2 the trees out.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- FS ecologist, Gunnar Carnwath: You may be referring to the historic range of variability (HRV). Where does that come from? It comes from the realization that a focus on timber production wasn't creating viable habitat for all species in the forest and that we need to actively promote ecological resilience. There is a specific range of forest conditions associated with a historic disturbance regime – provides resilient ecosystems and habitat for all of the plants and animals we are concerned about.
- Participant: Our forests have been protected to death. I think if the trees in the forest are healthy, then everything else will work out. I don't think we need to worry about what you were talking about.
- I also disagree with the historic range of variability concept. Over 12,000 years of history, we don't know what is the actual structure that's sustainable. My problem is your plan will not get you there. 75-80% of forested acres have to be entered.
- Wallowa County does have a local land-use plan that the Forest Plan should be compatible with. Your plan is not meeting our custom/culture in Wallowa County. Our plan is two pages long compared to your 1400 pages. Do what you plan, but plan what's expected for growth rotations. When you look at the proposed actions in the plan, there is no way we will get there. We need to make sure we can/will implement what we plan.
 - How to come up with standards? Watershed, subwatershed, overlaying with management areas. Tell me the new plan gets us out of the current situation. You have little blocks of land out there that you need to meet standards on. The new plan should not use small checkerboard pieces of ground, or you won't have room to manage. All uses should not happen in all areas. I want to see watershed-scale management areas or bigger. Not just the bottom or top, but the whole watershed.
- Surveys: There are 35 about ecology but only 1 about the economy. In the Lower Joseph Creek I saw improvement, but we used information from the Upper Joseph Creek, not from the Lower. Also, most of the economic measures were about the FS budget—not the economic value to the community. We should use the best numbers on the economy that we can. This is not just about the best science; it is also about using the best numbers.
- Monitoring: We need to monitor to learn; we need to monitor to document our positive impact out there and to defend good work. Where is the documentation when we did that last time? If we're going to spend the money to do the work, we need to spend the money to do the monitoring.
 - Forest Supervisor, Tom Montoya: My commitment is to sit down with Wallowa County to review your plan and how we can improve ours. The economic section of the FS plan is the weakest; we can use your help to improve that section. I agree with you that monitoring is the first thing that falls off the plate when budgets get tight. The Collaboratives can help us there.
- People in this room that are active foresters understand the long time horizon required to see the value of good work. Everyone else, especially the environmental community, wants to see it look good tomorrow. We need to educate/communicate better, so others understand what we are doing. Collaboratives are part of the solution.
- We need interim steps to make sure we have the mill infrastructure to do anything in the future. The industry is your ally and partner; if you lose that, you are in deep trouble. This plan should be a stop-gap measure to kick-start the industry.
- Make it a good plan; then use it; don't let it sit on the shelf.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- Make it simple, so professionals on the ground can do their job. A less restrictive plan is more user-friendly.
- I've sat in these meetings since 1976. We've kicked around the same ball, but it's never landed. I think the Collaboratives are positive, but we need to put a good plan in action fast. A small biomass plant can't get enough wood. A guy stepped up to the plate and invested his whole life in a biomass plant, but you are about to kick him out the back door.
- We need to make sure we use the people we have in this room. Show me what the future is, whatever it may be, so I can decide what to do. No more limbo.

Third round of input:

- I heard "boom and bust." It wasn't timber overharvest that made the bust. It was environmental policy from DC that changed our economic situation. Don't worry about a "bust" 40 years down the road when you're going to bust everybody today. We need to work to change the policy; there is some movement in Congress to do that; taking the money away from fires may help.
- Use common sense. I've been working for outfitters since I was 15 years old. Care of the forest has been ignored. Manage more like a business; real forest management would produce a healthy forest for timber, grazing, wildlife, and recreation. Forests act more like a fantastic torch now. Removing the forest products sustainably will pay for these programs. People who live in other parts of the world shouldn't decide what goes on in our smaller communities. FS does not manage the forest like they want it to be good in the end. We need a healthy forest.
- Why not open trees to cutting within 100 feet of roads. Drive up the Lostine River valley; it is a fire hazard from the word go. Thin it. It's my right to go cut firewood, and it's getting harder and harder; make it easier and help us help you.
- This is about our culture; I believe we need a stronger vision statement that includes "communities". The whole time I've been involved in this process, I've been a public official with the State of Oregon, then Mayor of the City of Joseph. We have to be careful about the lines we are crossing. But the FS needs to give people options, such as wood cutters who now are cutting firewood. Their bottom line is *survival*. Dislocated timber workers have standing in the planning process; certified by the federal government as dislocated from timber industry in Wallowa County. That's a good place to start: social and economic input. We need to get the 250 timber workers back in this game. We could be writing our own prescriptions. We need to do "log-scaping". Too many people were left out of this plan at too many steps along the way. Don't forget about the people that lost everything. When we do this comprehensive plan, we need to look at budgets; one big equipment investment may leave many others on welfare. Consider conflicts of interest.
- I feel like a parent trying to teach a child to count. It's frustrating to me that many people in this room are not being heard. We have so much intelligence in this room, but people with book learning are telling them they are wrong. Consider the community's knowledge.
- Educate the public: This is what a healthy forest looks like after logging; spend some money on communications/PR. We as business people know that if we destroy our assets, we're going to go out of business. FS has a massive asset in the forest; need to take care of it. Management should pay for itself. FS staff can just shrug and say, "Oh well, now we have a new plan." We can't do that here in this community.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- FS does plenty of PR: “Come to the forest; it’s magical.” Urban people tell you how they want their forest, but the people living here know it’s not working. Make things more realistic; begin a PR campaign to aggressively reverse the public perception that loggers/grazers are not good stewards. We are good stewards of our land. We are behind you to help get the truth out there.
- I was very sad to see mills close in ‘90s. With this meeting, I see a lot of hope.
- Too much credence put on “-ologist utopian” for forest conditions. You’ll lose your cattle men and timber harvesters if you don’t move quickly.
- When everything is burned up and in terrible shape, where do we go from there? We need to aggressively get in there and take care of some of our problems. We have already compromised so much. Environmentalists probably can’t measure a board foot of timber; they need to be educated. I bet in 40 years the timber will burn up if we don’t manage it.
- I am new to the area; it sounds like this plan was guided by utopian ideas. It’s not aggressive enough; still fettered by same utopian ideas that need to be broken.
- Can we add a chapter written by Wallowa County about how we want our forest managed?
 - o Forest Supervisor, Tom Montoya: That is why we’re here – to listen.
- I propose we set aside two parcels that are adjacent to each other. Let the FS manage one and locals manage the other for sustainability.
- We are dealing with a swayed public; that comes from bad marketing. Today the NF is driven by the Obama Administration; it is out of balance. The solution is to get a new administration.
- Sustainability and balance
- FS District Ranger, Kris Stein: I have been out in the field but not enough. I have seen good and bad timber treatments. I look forward to working with you in collaboration.
- FS Deputy District Ranger, Jake Lubera: Need to learn to crawl then walk. We are part of this community. The forest is our backyard, and we all want to take good care of it.
- Desired Conditions are not the problem, but how you’re getting there is a problem. Need to have a new alternative written. We’re not going to fix the forest without getting into the dry forest in addition to moist-mixed conifer areas.
- FS doesn’t have a lot of credibility with standards like the 21” diameter screen. But all those little trees grow in and stress the bigger tree as if it was cut down. We need an aggressive plan; there is a “biomass disaster” lying on the ground. We need to salvage like crazy. Big sales are good, but bring back small sales. The bid process is arduous; need to take some of that away.
- I don’t see the opposition showing up at these meetings. They can sit back in their chair and have the moral feeling of doing something good for the environment, but they don’t have scars from trees working on the forest. A massive numbers of people are turning out to tell you that what the NRAC and Wallowa County Commissioners are proposing is what we’re on board with. The County should have its chapter in the forest plan, so Wallowa County is separate – its own site-specific entity.
- Marketing is out there that 9/10 forest fires caused by humans. Not true; it is lightening. We need to work on Congress, but we need policy pressure from the FS too. Two hundred years ago, people risked everything they had to do what was right. We need internal pressure from FS—not necessarily lobbying but informing. The word “sustainable” needs to go back to how we understand it: a garden where we have stewardship responsibility. People who are in your opposition, enviros and other special interests, do not understand what’s happening on the ground here. Community and economic health is directly connected to the health of the forest. Everyone would be better off if we aggressively managed the forests. In the middle of the room is a big elephant – the solution! Aggressive

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

management. Treat this as a state of emergency. Not just fire but disease/insects. My solution: Be aggressive to increase your budget, family jobs, etc. We need pressure from within the FS up the chain; offer your own recommendations. Get those policies changed, and we'll do what we can as citizens.

- Did a lot of hardwood logging the Leopold Sand Counties of Wisconsin. We cut, and the forests grew back healthier every time. Don't let public opinion or environmentalists go too far without education. You know what a healthy forest looks like and how harvesting can keep it from going to hell. I saw the pine beetle move into Colorado; by the time the FS allowed harvesting it was too late.

Wrap up by Forest Service representatives: What did you hear?

Gunnar Carnwath, Ecologist:

- I heard a lot, and I appreciate everyone's thoughts, emotions, and solutions
- Underlying theme: Many people want more volume than what we're predicting in Forest Plan.
- There are ways to get that:
 - (1) Increase the land base, e.g., areas where the goal is to maximize timber production
 - (2) Reconsider the assumption about non-declining flow. That is one of the main things that is controlling timber volumes. I heard the word "aggressive" over 50 times. There seems to be a consensus in the room about increasing volumes. We would need to look closer at what it means for the future if we have declining flows; more meetings and discussions to consider the implications; but I hear the desire to think about it.
 - (3) There is skepticism about the Desired Future Condition and whether it's wise to manage for the Historic Range of Variability.
 - (4) Wanted to touch on ASQ volumes. We can get timber production from other areas that are not specifically suitable for timber harvest if we go there for ecological reasons. Those volumes can be significant and are not part of ASQ.
- Overall, I hear that we need to get something done, so people know what to invest in / what not to invest in, and so they can get on with their lives. I get that, and we're working on it.

Sabrina Stadler, Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision Team Leader:

- I hear the concern that timber sales need to be viable and need to address fire risk.
- People want to see how fast we can get this done.
- We discussed declining timber flows, and we have some restrictions there. We have to write these bulletproof documents to prepare for possible litigation. I can sympathize with what you're talking about and the need to keep timber infrastructure in place. I understand your concerns but also want to see this plan get implemented. We have a lot of legal/regulatory waters to navigate as well.
- Overall, I think folks want to know how we can get more volume.
 - o NRAC member: The sign of a good plan is one where you're being sued, and the counties are all with you on amicus.

Tom Montoya, Supervisor, Wallowa-Whitman National Forest:

- Thank you all for sharing your passion and concerns.
- It's never easy to hear that folks are disappointed with us.
- We can look at declining flows. We can also look at how we can treat unsuitable lands.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- We also need to think about folks that are not at the table: e.g., regulatory agencies, tribes, environmental groups—all have a voice in this plan and need to be at the table. There are some differences in values, but they are not necessarily game stoppers.
- In the Collaboratives these folks are all at the table, and they recognize the challenges. There are many policies that we need to follow.
- I want to express our appreciation for Wallowa County working on a complex plan, across many forests and with other counties involved. We look forward to working with Wallowa County.
- About PR; we have been getting back to our identity: community, nature matters, nature provides. I heard a lot of people say that we're not providing a lot to the community, and we need to do better.
- I can tell you we are committed to listening. Let's see what we can come up with.