

WALLOWA WHITMAN FOREST COLLABORATION  
FULL GROUP ASSEMBLY January 23, 2013  
La Grande Ranger District, La Grande Oregon  
MEETING NOTES

In Attendance: Tom Montoya, Bill Gamble, Katy Nesbitt, Dick Fleming, Steve Edwards, Dylan Kruse, Darilyn P. Brown, Patrick Shannon, Larry Nall, Gunnar Carwash, John Laurence, Mike Hayward, Tim Kerns, Mark Davidson, John Buckman, Paul Ester, Bill Boyd, Rex Storm, Ken Gebhardt, Steve Hawkins, Randy Jones, Nathan Goodrich, Veronica Warnock, Lindsay Warness, Dan Stark, Bruce Dunn, Mark Porter, Jenny Reinhardt, John Williams, Mark Moeller, Tim Lillebo, Bill Gamble, Steve Hovekamp, Ann Carlson, Veronica Warnock, Jodi Kramer, Dan Stern.

### **Introduction of John Laurence the new Wallowa-Whitman National Forest – Forest Supervisor**

He comes from a Science background. Looks forward to working with staff, members of the public, and the collaborative regarding stewardship of the land. He is interesting in applying what we know about how ecosystems and communities function with regard to that stewardship.

Collaborative process is a fundamental change in the way we sit down and talk together about how our public lands might be managed. He has a high interest in the collaborative and the Forest Service is here to participate, provide expertise and work with everyone.

#### Questions:

1. I stepped in at the end of your meeting with the La Grande District Personnel. Based on your discussion with district personnel it appears you're interested in research and risk taking. You are interested not only with biophysical but to the social science interests as well. How does that play out within collaborative as well?

As a Plant Pathologist I spent a lot of my career thinking biophysical aspects of forest and forest ecosystems and how they are managed. A colleague (He had responsibility for social science) and I (had responsibility for biophysical science) and we talked a lot about the interaction of the problems we were both dealing with at the time. From those discussions I realized it is imperative to work together regardless of organization or special interest to try and figure out way to move forward in public land management.

There are many social wants and needs of our public lands. The time has come where we really have to sit down as a group and use all of our collective thought and wisdom to try and figure out how we are going to move forward. I am interested in an experimental approach. There a lot of different ideas about how public land should be managed, I am not the one to say any particular idea is right or wrong. That is for the collaborative to talk about. Of course, there are obviously policies, regulations, and laws that govern what we can do but within those a group like this can bring the most innovative thinking and approaches to try and optimize the interest of the folks on the collaborative. This includes recreation, solitude, keeping communities vibrant and healthy and keeping public schools open and we have good jobs for folks.

Do you like to hunt, or fish, or bird watch, or hike? Yes

Do you live in a wood house? Actually I believe it is concrete.

Do you like trees? Yes

Do you like camp fires? Yes, I like campfires - Then you are going to do great!

2. We are hearing an awful lot from our congressional folks, and governor that did a study recently that would double the outputs on national forests in eastern and SW Oregon. Everything seems to be moving toward increasing what gets done on the land at a time when it seems to be going the opposite way with the agency. How are you going to deal with that?

We're poised with some real opportunities in eastern Oregon. Our tri area forests are poised to be able to deal with some big issues on a landscape scale. Because of the interest of the governor, local communities, and the congressional delegation we are in a position which we haven't been in before in terms of selling our priorities as being pressing and attracting new resources to carry that off. I have no political wisdom on what congress is going to do. I believe we can make a compelling case for the time being now and the place being here. We have new tools in terms of analyzing what needs to be done and being able to demonstrate what needs done and what we can do.

There have been real advances in the past few years regarding landscape analysis. I am not sure there is a specific answer for you. The Forest Service is maxed out in terms of the number of people and what it can get done. There is no easy solution but by prioritizing the work that needs accomplished and getting on with that work at a rate we can do it. These collaboratives and other organizations gives us innovative ways to accomplish the work. We need a partnership to solve the problem.

## **Lower Joseph Creek Watershed Recommendations Presentation**

Jenny presented a slide show of the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed integration recommendations.

The Community Planning Process was described in terms of three levels:

1. Assessment –
  - a. Location to analyze
  - b. Resource groups and leaders identified
  - c. Data gaps, collection and analysis
  - d. Watershed conditions/Issues/recommendations to correct issues
2. Integration -
  - a. Sharing between resource groups of conditions/issues/recommendations
  - b. Evaluation of recommendations toward other resources (mutual benefit/adverse impact)
  - c. Determination of recommendations to; move forward on, revisit, areas to avoid
  - d. Final assessment, reaching consensus on recommendations
  - e. Pass information to landowners, land managers for implementation

3. Implementation –
  - a. Seek out Funding
  - b. Begin NEPA document
  - c. Supplemental data collection to occur
  - d. Monitoring

Wallowa County Collaborative is currently between the Integration and Implementation levels of the Community Planning Process.

The slide show displayed recommendations that were approved through resource integration during the Wallowa County Planning Process. Integration identified many mutual resource benefit recommendations to be carried forward to implementation. This was presented on a resource by resource basis with maps and a summary of recommendations.

**SEE RECOMMENDATIONS in BRIEF IN ATTACHED DOCUMENT.**

**Information from the slide show will posted on the Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative web site. Format of display is yet to be determined due to the number of maps and photos. Thank you for your patience.**

Steering Committee of Lower Joseph Creek Watershed would like to invite members of the Forest Collaborative to participate in developing project boundaries based on the recommendation. These will be brought back to the Forest Collaborative as part of the next step in the process to present to the Forest Service. Wallowa County is looking for a subset of the Forest Collaborative that is interested in working with the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed Collaborative to move the Watershed Analysis forward.

One of the unique things in the process is all this is pre-NEPA nothing official has happened but the Forest Service now has great data and vetted projects that have been looked at by a huge diversity of individuals with a level of data standard that we have worked with the Forest Service to develop. We are handing the Forest Service updated information with social buyoff with multiple resource groups behind the data. That is hopefully where the benefit kicks in.

For the sake of brevity we left out of the presentation a great amount of data collection information and process that resource groups utilized. Examples: C&T plots, Interpretive Indicators of Rangeland Health (IIRH), MIM sites, 12 PFC analysis etc) As we put a boundary around the geographic areas that information will be provided. The information is already in the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed document and file.

Acres revealed in the presentation were the areas identified as having the highest deviation from historic conditions and the highest need of treatment. There are more areas in need that would be slightly or moderately deviated from historic.

Question:

Was Forest Service (FS) involved in data collection protocols?

The FS provided a great deal of the data collection standards and protocols prior to field work. Some examples are Range: C&T plots and Interpretive Indicators of Rangeland Health. Forestry: The Field Assessment form used to gather data was based on what information the FS

needed from Silviculture and Fuels/fire. Riparian and stream data collections were based on MIMS and PFC's from the FS.

Was the data applied to the FS databases?

The data collected for the Forestry Group was – yes.

That data was also checked for accuracy with the FS silviculturalist. This maintained contractor data quality.

This presentation was an overview but was there an analysis completed regarding fish species, stream temperature, etc.?

The Riparian chapter addressed fish habitat, stream temperatures, culvert replacement.

Spawning habitat improvements and culvert replacement for fish passage can be expected as well.

Was fish species in the streams identified?

There is only Steelhead in Joseph Creek. That was one of the reasons started with Upper and Lower Joseph Creek Watersheds. There is no historical record of Salmon. It was less controversial and that simplified the analysis.

What scale of projects are you considering?

This was a discussion last Friday with the steering committee. We estimate four different NEPA documents.

With all this data how fast will it expedite the Forest Service ability to do NEPA? Having all this current data and information is good, hopefully it will speed up the NEPA process but some of that has to do with the capacity of the Forest Service. There are still some data gaps that need filled and the plan is to have the first NEPA completed by the summer of 2014. There is also hope of moving forward with some CE's (categorical Exclusions) that can stand alone to get people working on the ground this summer.

Is there any previous NEPA out there that can be used and/or modified to move forward on these projects? The most recent EA within the watershed is the Baldwin project. NEPA for Baldwin was completed in 2001 so it is at least 12 years old. There are many NEPA documents within the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed but how much was completed would require a visit to each document and implementation records.

Now we need to identify our boundaries, Purpose and Need, and gather recommendations to bring forward.

The Wallowa County Community Planning Process for Lower Joseph Creek Watershed is looking for a subset of WWFC volunteers to help move recommendations forward through project boundary identification with emphasis of moving forward quickly.

There is a need to move forward on projects this summer to allow for the additional data collection of some departments.

The WWFC will provide a larger buy-in of the products coming out with much broader support. This hopefully will create more recognition in turn more funding to get projects done with less litigation to stop them.

Lindsey and Tim Lillebo are both interested in being part of the WWFC subset for Lower Joseph Creek Watershed and a representative from ODF will likely be involved. Lindsey recommended putting together a list of next steps and expectations for the next month on a type of timeline to provide clarity for everyone. \*\*

February 12<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> are the meeting dates identified for working with the WWFC – Lower Joseph Creek Watershed subset. All Wallowa County meetings are open to the public.

It was recommended to send out an invite to the remaining WWFC to see if additional individuals are interested.

## Operating Principles Framework

Lindsey guided the group through the recommendations for changes by individuals.

**Topic: The word “native” in the following section.**

Section II. Group Values

Part b. this now states “**Participants agree to collaborate in good faith.**”

Part d. Focus on projects within the National Forest:

subsection v. that protect and restore clean water, stable soils, **native** vegetation and quality habitat for native fish and wildlife.

1. Insert caveat here

The term **native** was discussed. The question brought forward to the collaborative is: Do we want to leave the term “native” in the statement?

By using the word native we are not implying that we are proposing management to eradicate non-native plants and animals on the landscape noxious weeds being obvious exception. Since the statement is listed under the topic Focus on projects it can be interpreted as that is the primary focus but there is allowance to use other vegetation as well: i.e. Rangeland needs, nitrogen fixing plants, erosion control. We realize there is limited supply of native seed source as well.

It was suggested to have a footnote in the operations guide that states, “Focus on native vegetation does not exclude or preclude the use of non-native vegetation and/or exclude eradication of invasive weeds.”

It was agreed to add the above caveat to the guide.

## **Topic: Forest Plan guidance displayed under Group Values**

There was discussion of whether or not Forest Plan guidance should be added to the operating principles. It was discussed in depth.

John Laurence – new Forest Supervisor- One role of this collaborative group is to provide the Forest Service on land management needs as the area dictates. John does not want the group to be limited in what is permitted through plans and guidance. It may ultimately lead to altering information in the Forest Plan and to lead to an amendment of that plan.

The collaborative group agreed to leave the Forest Plan out of the Group Values. It was recognized that the Forest Service has Plans, Policies, and regulations that guide them. It was discussed that creativity in collaborative ideas should not be limited in regard to new opportunities. It was also addressed that some proposed actions may require a Forest Plan amendment if necessary and the Forest Collaborative not limit their scope of options and recommendations.

The group reached consensus that the Forest Plan would not be added.

## **Topic: Decision-making process**

There was discussion on consensus and not being present at a meeting where a decision was being made.

- 1) The word “proxy” was changed to “Alternate” Proxy implies voting and the WWFC is based on consensus in decision making. Everyone was in consensus with the change.
- 2) There is wording in the Operations Framework that allows an individual or organization to send an alternate to a meeting to represent the person or organization. This alternate must provide the opinion of whomever they are representing and not their personal opinion.
- 3) Only one representative can sign a report to prevent a decision from being balanced to one side. Several signatures for one organization is not permitted. Everyone was in agreement on this. Safe guards against this exists in that they must have signed the Operating Principles Framework and have attended at least 2 of the last 4 meetings.
- 4) There is strong desire to maintain trust and respect amongst the group. If the collaborative is aware of someone with strong opposition and unable to attend the meeting, then should be an opportunity of the opposing viewer to submit a statement within two weeks to state their opposition and discuss it at the next meeting.

## **Topic: Inability to reach consensus**

- 1) If there is opposition to a collaborative decision the dissenting member(s) are asked to provide a constructive alternative that will meet the group’s mission and values. The key is participation and agreement. Consensus is the first objective before moving into presenting an alternative.

## **Patrick checked for interest in a continuation of the WWFC and ongoing planning of grants and funding?**

- 1) Sustainable Northwest's goal was to help the collaborative get formed and help people understand decision-making process and what the framework looks like. It would be good to have a local entity be a host to carry this forward. Patrick is more heavily involved in the Blue Mountain Forest Partners and he's willing to hand it off and be a more vocal group member. It's meant to be an interim but there is enough interest from county folks and local folks to get this moving.
- 2) Question: What level of funding is needed? Answer will be researched.
- 3) Wallowa Resources is hoping that they are performing satisfactory. There was input that WR would be committed to the following: raising funding, facilitation, host, and note taker.
- 4) Most felt that it was important for Nils to be a contributor more than a facilitator. Nils has beneficial input for the group but that does not preclude Wallowa Resources from providing secretary or administrative type of assistance for accounts and other things.
- 5) A preference was made for a non-stakeholder that has no ownership in any outcome or decision to serving as a facilitator. Tim and Mark are appreciated of Patrick's facilitation. Patrick indicated he would have to check his availability.
- 6) Input was provided that the governor's office has a proposal out to create a 4.5 million dollar fund to help collaboratives in Eastern Oregon. Hopefully that will be established in time to meet our needs. That would seem a logical source to help fund this organization.

### **Topic: Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative Web Site**

The Forest Collaborative website was demonstrated on the overhead. The development of it was discussed. The site itself it was shown on where to find the meeting notes and all the information for the collaborative would be posted there.

If you go on the Wallowa Resources web site at [www.wallowaresources.org](http://www.wallowaresources.org).

1. Across the top go to the - Stewardship work – tab.
2. There will drop options and go to the- Community Planning Process - a link will appear to the Forest Collaborative.
3. The upper right of the site has Upcoming Forest Collaborative Events.
4. There is information about the Forest Collaborative, The Mission Statement, Collaborative Priorities, Current Projects, and Operations Group Members.
5. At the bottom of the page you will find past meeting notes and field trip notes.

Also under the Stewardship work tab under Community Planning Process there also is the Upper Joseph Creek Watershed information. It provides results from the Upper Joseph Creek Watershed Assessment that we previously did. This can be looked at as a reference or informational piece that's parallel to the Lower Joseph Creek process and that's a place for good information.

## **Topic: Other**

### **NEPA**

- 1) Lindsay - she went to the Blue Mountain Forest Partners meeting and there's a lot of overlap in the collaboratives. The Blue Mountain Forest Partners is looking at ways to reduce NEPA time on projects within the Forest Service. They are working with the Forest Service to actually directly reduce time frames with a goal to get NEPA documents out within one year.
- 2) Lindsay thought it might behoove the WWFC to do an iron triangle type task force of collaborative people willing to work on that overarching project. The Blue Mountain Forest Partners are also including talking points that reference fire salvage etc.
- 3) It may be an opportunity to meet with Blue Mountain Forest Partners to help this W-W Forest Collaborative to make contact and see what other collaboratives have already done to move ourselves forward faster.

### **Upcoming Workshop**

- 1) Patrick provided information on a workshop coming up regarding wet mixed conifer. It is coming out of the Northwest fire science Consortium and is a joint fire science funded project that looked some of the science regarding moist mixed conifer.
- 2) This presentation workshop is in Hood River on April 15 and 16<sup>th</sup>. Sustainable Northwest is the main conveners of it with Northwest Fire Science Consortium. The idea is to get attendance from collaborative people and agency personnel there to have discussion on the current sciences and management. Fire science wants workshop to target a concise group of people in April. They want to target collaborative groups, stakeholders, and agency personnel.
- 3) John Lawrence was on the board for the Joint Fire Science. Northwest Fire Science is groups of federal and state agencies stepping out and being quite progressive about synthesizing and delivering information related to fires, forests, and range ecosystems.
- 4) The Joint Fire Science is always looking for places for new projects. They are a very dynamic group that's a good resource for any collaborative that faces fire regimes concerns.
- 5) Sustainable Northwest will coordinate it and send the information around. Dylan Cruz stated they have a target number of attendees. They will share that information and then they can follow up with how many individuals can go.
- 6) Lindsay would like to go and there's a need to get individuals on all the collaboratives represented at this Mt. Hood workshop.

It was asked if there is a connection between the April workshop and the panel meeting with in Walla Walla. It's a separate group of people however the two different groups are talking to each other. What Peter Stein at the field trip targeted more toward suggesting management options and alternatives based upon the synthesis of the science. It takes what the original group has done a step further.

### **Future Meetings and Items needing follow-up:**

The next scheduled Forest Collaborative meeting is February 27, however, Patrick, Dylan, Nils and others will not be there. There is a tentative date of March 6 scheduled for the next meeting.

The March Forest Collaborative is March 27<sup>th</sup> date is spring break. They will work through the Operations Committee and discuss it to see if the first week of April will work.

## Lower Joseph Creek Watershed – Sub-group

Lindsey recommended putting together a list of next steps and expectations for the next month on a type of timeline to provide clarity for everyone. \*\*

February 12<sup>th</sup> and 26<sup>th</sup> are the meeting dates identified for working with the WWFC – Lower Joseph Creek Watershed subset. All Wallowa County meetings are open to the public.

It was recommended to send out an invite to the remaining WWFC to see if additional individuals are interested.

## Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative Group Operating Principles Framework

DRAFT: 1/23/2013

### I. Group Mission

Mission: To improve the social, economic, and ecological resiliency of the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest and local communities, through collaboration by a diverse group of stakeholders.

### II. Group Values

Participants in the Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative agree that their collaborative efforts should:

- a. Recognize the legitimacy of the interests and concerns of others, and expect that their interests will be represented as well.
- b. **Participants agree to collaborate in good faith.**
- c. Work on tangible, implementable projects in the short-term while also building information and engaging in deliberative dialogue on other issues which appear to have more potential for conflict.
- d. Focus on projects within the National Forest:
  - i. with the highest restoration need,
  - ii. which can provide long-term benefits,
  - iii. which are aimed at promoting ecological resiliency and natural disturbance regimes,

- iv. that provide economic and social benefit to local communities and reliable/stable supply of material, and
- v. that protect and restore clean water, stable soils, native vegetation and quality habitat for native fish and wildlife.

- 1. Focus on native vegetation does not exclude or preclude the use of non-native vegetation and/or exclude eradication of invasive weeds.

- e. In pursuing these efforts, the members of the Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative will strive to incorporate holistic landscape-scale information and analyses before making recommendations that take into account: adjoining private lands, grazing allotments, and the value of wildlife habitat and corridors

**Comment [Jenny1]:** Inserted based on January 23 Forest Collaborative meeting – Caveat to address term “native” in sub-section v.

### III. Representation, Participation, Committees

“The Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative will welcome all stakeholders and actively foster diverse perspectives, needs, and expertise that includes, but is not limited to representation and input from:

- Federal and State Agency representation
- Community nonprofit support organizations
- County Commissioners
- Economic Development
- Contractors
- Forest industry representatives
- Environmental/Conservation Groups
- Other elected officials
- Concerned community members

- Landowners
- Tribes
- Recreation interests
- Agricultural interests
- Educational interests
- Mining Interests
- Scientific Community
- Other interests as appropriate

Signatories on any report submitted to the Forest Service or other authorities must have signed the Operating Principles of the Wallowa Whitman Forest Collaborative. Only one signatory per organization is allowed.

#### IV. Ground Rules

##### A) Basic Rules for Collaboration

Members and contributors to WWFC meetings/discussions will:-

- Respect each other in and outside of meetings.
- Not enter into any “backroom deals or agreements”.
- Not tolerate nor engage in personal attacks.
- Respect the personal integrity and values of participants.
- Avoid stereotyping participants or other stakeholders.
- Not make commitments lightly
- Keep and honor all consensus agreements
- Regard disagreements as “problems to be solved,” rather than as “battles to be won.”
- Understand that the participants represent a broad range of interests, each having concerns about the outcome of the issues at hand.

- Recognize the legitimacy of the interests and concerns of others, and expect that their interests will be represented as well.
- Keep their colleagues/constituents informed about the progress of these discussions.
- State their interests, problems, and opportunities and avoid taking positions before consensus is reached.
- Air problems, disagreements and critical information during meetings to avoid surprises.
- Search for opportunities and alternatives noting that the creativity of the group can often find the best solution.
- Agree to verify rumors at the meeting before accepting them as fact.

*B) Meeting Behavior - all participants will:*

- Come to meetings prepared.
- Respect the basic rules of collaboration (as stated above).
- Voice their concerns during meetings and take the time to resolve those issues.
- Refrain from side conversations during the meeting.
- Make sure only one person speaks at a time – let individuals finish their thoughts and then take a deep breath before responding.
- Respect the facilitator and meeting agenda.

*C) Meeting planning and coordination*

- As a general rule, WWFC meetings will be scheduled for the fourth Wednesday of every month.
- Meetings where key decisions will be made will be announced at least two weeks in advance.
- Meetings will be announced via email and available on the calendar located on the WWFC website (or by phone and/or mail for members who do not have email).

- Meeting agendas will be sent out approximately 10 days prior to the meeting to allow for group input and suggestions.

#### *D) Record keeping*

- Minutes will be taken at each meeting and shared with members who are on the list serve or have requested them by mail no later than 2 weeks following any meeting.
- Minutes from the prior meeting will be reviewed at the beginning of the next meeting and any issues (clarifications, corrections) will be discussed; meeting minutes will be approved by consensus.
- Collaborative members, and as appropriate their organizations will be listed in all minutes, with information indicating their presence or absence.

#### *E) Internal communications protocol*

- A web page will be maintained for storing and sharing all information. Partners are encouraged to help develop content for the website. The web page is located on Wallowa Resources web site – [www.wallowaresources.org](http://www.wallowaresources.org) – under the *Stewardship Work* tab, and under *Community Planning Process*.
- The direct address is: [http://www.wallowaresources.org/index.php?option=com\\_content&view=article&id=112&Itemid=67](http://www.wallowaresources.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=112&Itemid=67)

#### *F) External communications protocol*

- Information about the collaborative will be made available to external stakeholders via the website and other venues as appropriate; all efforts will be taken to ensure that the group's work remains transparent to external audiences. Non-members will have access to all information and the ability to share thoughts and comments with the group.

## V. Decision-Making System

“The Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative will make every effort to make decisions by **consensus**. Consensus is defined as decisions that all parties can support, or ***at a minimum, agree to live with.***”

DRAFT

### *A) Participation*

While anyone may participate in meetings and deliberations of the Collaborative or any working groups that have been established, only persons signing the Operating Principles document may participate in Collaborative or working group decision-making. Individual members must have attended at least 2 of the last 4 meetings of a body to formally participate in making decisions (while allowing the use of “alternates” if needed).

Collaborative members are encouraged to attend meetings in person. If this is not possible, members may designate an alternate to attend a meeting and contribute to discussions on their behalf. Alternates must sign the operating principles and the name of the alternate should be conveyed via email to the Collaborative facilitation/support office prior to the meeting. It is incumbent upon the Collaborative Member to ensure that the alternate can accurately convey their position. It is also incumbent upon the person representing an organization to accurately convey the position of the organization they represent. Collaborative and working group agendas should note if a decision would be made during that meeting. Materials and information that will help inform the Collaborative or working group member about the decision-point should be distributed at least a week before the issue is to be considered.

The Collaborative agrees that substantive decisions will not be made at meetings where the spectrum of stakeholders is not present. The group may make tentative decisions at such meetings, or may delay decisions until the following meeting.

Technical input and assistance from Forest Service staff personnel is extremely important to this effort, recognizing that Forest Service staff may only participate in an advisory capacity.

## *B) Reaching Consensus*

Project-related decisions will be made first by the project subgroup(s). Decisions made during project subgroup meetings will be recorded in the meeting minutes and distributed within two week of the meeting to all subgroup members, and any other WWFC member that requests them in advance.

**In the decision making process, dissenting members are asked to provide a constructive alternative(s) that will meet the group's mission and values.** Each subgroup or full group meeting will begin with a brief review of the decisions made during the previous meeting. Subgroup/Collaborative members are encouraged to prioritize attending meetings in person or via other arrangements, such as sending an alternate.

Decisions made during meetings will not be revisited unless significant new and relevant information becomes available that could affect the decision. The subgroup will present their recommendations and rationale to the Collaborative for discussion and final ratification.

There will be a minimum of two weeks between the meeting when a subgroup makes a decision and the meeting where the Collaborative is asked to make a decision. This requirement ensures that subgroup members that were unable to attend the meeting have time to develop and share their viewpoints with the subgroup or the Collaborative before a decision is made.

When making decisions either by subgroups, or the full Collaborative, participants will be asked to indicate their support either by a show of hands or verbal confirmation. Each participant has the freedom to disagree with elements of decisions as they're

being developed, but must offer a constructive alternative that seeks to meet the needs of all participants involved.

Consensus on a decision about a project, recommendation, or action the group plans to take will be reached when all meeting participants can make one of the following statements about a decision:

1. I agree with the decision and will publicly support it.
2. I agree with the decision but will refrain from publicly supporting it.
3. I can live with the decision (and won't disparage it in public).

Once the full group has ratified a decision, a report will be given to the USFS for their consideration in their role as managers of USFS lands and waters.

#### *C) Inability to Reach Consensus*

Subgroups and the Collaborative will make every effort to reach consensus within a given timeframe for making decisions (as laid out in the project timeline developed at the outset of a project). As stated above, there will be a minimum of two weeks between when the subgroup makes a decision and the decision is brought to the Collaborative for discussion and ratification (see "Reaching Consensus" for interim steps).

If the subgroup cannot reach consensus during a meeting, members are encouraged to continue the conversation via conference call, email discussions, in-person meetings, or whatever format is most effective between meetings to better inform a decision-making process. If a time comes when the Collaborative is forwarding its recommendations to the WWNF management team and it is unable to reach consensus the following actions will be taken:

- Areas of agreement and disagreement will be clearly recorded in writing in the report; and/or

- Separate reports will be written and submitted that address the areas of disagreement.

In such cases, each document will include:

- The name of the lead author and names of all who agree with the report
- A description of their proposal and the rationale used to develop it
- What the members of the Collaborative anticipate doing if their proposal is chosen by the USFS (i.e. defend it in public), or not chosen (i.e. file an objection, appeal, litigate, etc).

In order to sign the report, the person must have committed to the operations principle.

- There is only one signatory per organization allowed for these reports.

## VI. Roles

Wallowa Resources is the “host organization” of the Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative and will provide, as funding allows, fiscal administration, neutral facilitation, outreach, minute-taking, and other functions desired by the group. Wallowa Resources may enter into contracts with other entities to perform desired functions.

The Board of Commissioners for Wallowa, Union, and Baker Counties were the initial conveners of this organization.

## Lower Joseph Creek Watershed Recommendations Slide Show in Brief

There were seven total resource groups for the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed.

1. Range – included weeds, botany.
2. Forestry – includes fuels/fire
3. Riparian – fish, hydrology
4. Wildlife
5. Transportation/Recreation
6. Cultural
7. Socioeconomic

Socioeconomic – this resource group has been the least active to this point. The list of recommendations coming out of Integration will move this resource forward to completion.

The Integration of the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed Resource Groups produced a number of approved recommendations through a numerical rating process of evaluation. The rating process looked at contributing benefit or adverse impacts of a recommendation toward each groups own individual resource needs.

Results of Integration for resources are as follows:

Explanation of tables for Forestry and Range – Each table has a recommendation column listing the amount proposed with a column identifying the amount that was agreed upon through the integration process. The Further Discussion column is what will need to be revisited and will require addition information and discussion.

Forestry Action Items:

1. Restore stand structure diversity to Historic Range of Variability
2. Increase Large component to meet Late Old Structure

### **FORESTRY RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

The acres in the table are Priority acres where stand conditions are critically outside of historic conditions. It does not include areas needing treatment of lower priority.

Fuels acres are based on high density areas of fires starts and hazardous fuel stands that support all three of the following conditions: 1. Heavy down woody, 2. multiple layers of live trees (ladder fuels), 3. degree of overlapping of tree crowns – 55% + crown density

Once the fire density and stand conditions were overlapped then ridge tops, streams, and roads were identified as priority boundaries for fuels and fire. Treatment of areas outside of timbered stands were recommended from fuels resulting in larger size treatment blocks.

Resource Group	Recommended Action	Recomm. Priority Acres	Integration Final Agreed to	Further discussion	Comment
<b>FORESTRY</b>					

Silviculture	Restore stand structural stages to HRV distributions in watershed	20,632 ac	16,076 ac.	4,556 ac.	Biophysical groups. (Warm Dry PP/DF), (Warm Dry DF/PP), (Cool/Dry DF/GF/WL)
Fuels –	Restore priority area to historical structural distribution and conditions	28,200 ac	28,200 ac		Overlapping Silv. And Fuels priority = 6,150 acres. Treatment types are limited in HCNRA Roadless

**Forestry Treatment Prescriptions  
Priority Acres - Silvicultural Only**

**Recommended Treatments Common to All Biophysical Groups**

- 1) Silviculturally thin priority stands once within first 16 years. (Acres do not include other resource priorities: fuels, wildlife etc.)
- 2) Retain snags over 12" – unless unsafe to do so
- 3) Retain old trees (>150 years), early seral, fire resistant species.
- 4) Create mosaics of openings and no treat areas. (Gaps/Skips) Gaps of .1-3 acre openings. Feather stands 132 ft. (2 chains) out from perimeter.
- 5) Reserve treatment of lower priority areas until high priority areas are completed. Consider re-entry cycle of high priority at this time approx. 20 years.

**Forestry Treatment Prescriptions  
Priority Acres – Silvicultural Only**

Biophysical Group	Agreed to Acres of Priority	Sq. ft. basal area/ac	Additional stand treatment
Ponderosa Pine/ Douglas-fir (Warm Dry)	7588	60	Create mosaic. Tree-length harvesting & supplement with additional treatment to reduce fuel loadings for under burning. Allow for maintenance burning.
Douglas-fir/ Ponderosa Pine (Warm Dry)	5233	60	Yard tops. Large percentage acres are cable-logging / 35% + slope.

Douglas-fir/Grand fir/ Western larch (Cool Dry)	7811	80 - Thin from below	Use co-dominant trees to achieve min. density. Vary spacing – create heterogeneous mix of species and density. Tree-length harvesting if possible, mechanical fuels treatment should be utilized as follow up if needed.
---	------	----------------------	--

## RANGE RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY

**Weeds had Early Detections. Aggressive treatments recommended. Containment, Control, Eradication were the three primary treatment types identified.**

Recomm. Action	Recomm. Quantity	Integration Agreed To	Further discussion	Comment
Fence	23.5 miles	20.5	3 miles	Includes repair, new fence, rebuild
Trail work	10 miles	3 miles	7 miles	Tee Pee Ridge Cattle Trail Maint. Revisit.
Clean and Maintenance Ponds	21 ponds	21 ponds		If pond is in a draw or creek would not prefer it to be maintained and would be negative effect to Riparian; need more info
Spring Development	6 locations	5 locations	1	Rock Creek Spring Development in draw-need further info
Rock water gap; water development	1 location each	All approved		
Weed Treatments	Entire Watershed			Follow weed treatment protocols.
Thinning for forage	8,100 acres	8,100		5,200 acres that overlapped with Silviculture Recommendation

## **RIPARIAN RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

### 4 Springs

29 Different road segment recommendations were provided that included decommissioning, culvert replacement, maintenance, etc.

## **WILDLIFE RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

1. **Mosaic habitats** on landscape.
2. **Restore healthy ecosystems** - upland, riparian shrub habitat and healthy grassland.
3. **Snag retention**; Offer firewood sales or units
4. **Re-establish aspen stands** in appropriate habitat. Use Rx burning as a tool.
5. **Protect Stream Integrity/Riparian areas**; alternate water sources for cattle.
6. **Improve forage production** - Open up dense stands; Prescribe burn
7. **Protect springs** by fencing or using natural barriers.
8. **Restore shrub and hardwood habitats** in lower gradient streams.
9. **Maintain road stability** especially in riparian areas.
10. **Manage for Recreational impacts** on wildlife, bat roost sites (ie. Rock features).

## **CULTURAL RECOMMENDATIONS SUMMARY**

1. **Apply geotextile and 6-8 inches of road base** -Instances where unimproved, native surface roads pass through arch
2. **Hand felling/thinning/manual removal of fuels** over total site avoidance.
3. **Removal of excess fuels** for site protection from wildfires.
4. **Low intensity/short duration fires** for lithic scatters, can dumps, stone and earthen features and sites with deeply buried deposits
5. **Protect historic and prehistoric sites** with wooden or perishable materials (rock art panels and rock shelters):
6. **Desire to Protect and/or achieve low intensity/short to moderate burn duration** through fuels treatments.
7. **Protection of sites from more intense fires through:** Construct fire line, re-draw burn blocks, apply water/foam, protection wrap.
8. **Locate all cattle congregations** in areas of previous ground disturbance
9. **Notify archaeologist immediately** of inadvertent discoveries.

## **ROADS INTEGRATION:**

There is multiple resources providing road recommendations with the key resources being: Riparian, Roads/Recreation, Range

Road discussion points during integration:

- Integration – Large % of actions – related to stream crossing and culverts.
- Lack common reference for definitions – storm proofing, de-commission, closed, etc.
- Some Recommendations from previous NEPA
- Seasonal Access
- Resource needs vs. Roads recommendations - access where, how long, etc.

- Leave any Changing of Current road status to (TMP) Travel Management Plan (consideration needed for future projects – dependent on access – adds Complexity

During integration it was agreed that the Lower Joseph Creek Watershed Steering Committee would determine the best approach on roads recommendations:

The following was decided:

1. It was recognized that the TMP was also underway and a recommendation that would change the current road use status would be left for the TMP. Example: a Lower Joseph Creek Watershed recommendation to decommission a road and the current road status is open and in use.
2. To identify roads currently under an existing NEPA document that could potentially have the work shelf ready for implementation.
3. List what resource made recommendation, what it was, is the road segment under NEPA, is recommendation consistent with current road use status.

**ROADS RESULTS**

**A. = Roads recommendations that are consistent with the current road status and can be moved forward on in the field. 16 are shovel ready with completed NEPA and 12 will need NEPA completed.**

<b>A. Roads Recommendations Summary</b>	
Treatments recommendations <b>consistent</b> with Current Road Use	
TOTAL road segments = 28	
NEPA done	needing NEPA
16	12
<b>Available for funding and implementation</b>	Complete NEPA Evaluate on severity of conditions on segment by segment basis.

**B. = Roads recommendation that will change the current road use status and are being left for the TMP.**

<b>C. Roads Recommendations Summary</b>	
Treatment recommendations <b>changing</b> Current Road Use	
TOTAL road segments = 18	
NEPA done	needing NEPA

	13	5	
	Leave for TMP	Leave for TMP	