

## BIC Meeting Summary

### **November 24, 2020, 9:30am - 12:00pm Zoom Meeting**

**Members Attending:** Patti Adair, Paul Anderes, Sarah Buddingh, Leisa Cook, Tony DeBone, Patty Dorroh, Sarah Fesenmeyer, Nick Goldstein, Calla Hagle, Bill Harvey, Gina Nikkel, Jay Gibbs, Jim Brammer (standing in for Tom Montoya), Joe Hessel, John Huffman, Julie Keniry, Bill Lind, Peter Maille, Scott McConnell, Marissa Meyer, Todd Nash, Mark Owens, Steven Pozzanghera, Julia Riber, Kevin Robinette, Susan Roberts, Carl Scheeler, Lauren Smith, Kristen Shelman, Dan Shively, Andy Smith, Lena Tucker, Craig Trulock, Greg Wolf

**Interested Parties Attending:** Billie Jo George, Pam Hardy, Jessica Keys, Aaron Miles, Michael O'Casey, Tom Schoenfelder

**Facilitation Team:** Laurel Singer and Nate Midgley, National Policy Consensus Center

### **Convener's Welcome:**

- Representative Owens opened the meeting with a thanks to the group for making progress over the past year, and in particular, is encouraged by the progress made on the Desired Condition documents. He acknowledged that the Access subcommittee has been having a difficult time with theirs, but mentioned that unlike the other sections, this issue hadn't been addressed in prior iterations, which has made it a more troublesome process.
- Dan Shively of the United States Forest Service (USFS) also gave his thanks to the subcommittees for their hard work.
- Commissioner Susan Roberts echoed the idea of it being tough going for the Access subcommittee, but expressed confidence that they will get there. She closed out by wishing the entire group a wonderful holiday.

### **Components of the Forest Plan and How Projects Implement this Plan**

- **How are desired conditions achieved at the project level?** Julia Riber and Nick Goldstein from the USFS gave a presentation on the ways that broad forest plans and specific projects incorporate the Desired Conditions documents. This presentation can be found on the project website: [Blue Mountains Intergovernmental Council | Portland State University \(pdx.edu\)](https://www.npcc.org/blue-mountains-intergovernmental-council-portland-state-university-pdx.edu)
- **Forest Plan vs. Project Planning.** The Forest Plan is the overall strategy, whereas project planning is the tactics used which actually drives the action at the ground level. There hasn't been much group-wide discussion about these specific tactics yet, but the USFS wanted to make sure the group is aware that when the discussion turns to this stage of the planning, there will be another round of input to be had for the group to influence these tactics.
- **Adaptive Management and Flexibility in the Forest Plan.** There was discussion about ensuring that there is flexibility in the final plan so that managers on the ground can make decisions appropriate to specific contexts and not be restricted by the way that the plan is written. The USFS introduced the idea of adaptive management as a strategy to allow for

## BIC Meeting Summary

programmatic amendments. They stressed that the plan will not be set in stone; that there will be avenues to make adjustments. Craig Trulock brought up the use of county specific planning in order to tailor the project plans to reflect local concerns.

- **Forest-based Alternatives.** The USFS mentioned that there is some latitude to have different desired conditions for different forests, to reflect local preference. However, the more differences there are, the more difficult and time-consuming the final analysis will be. They also mentioned that it is possible to develop alternatives for areas to be able to mix and match.
- **Economic Support.** How can these projects reflect the stated desires to support local economies? The USFS encouraged the group to incorporate the desires to support economic development in their Desired Conditions document. In particular, the goals section is a good place to put those in that document and the group is already well on the way to incorporating these desires. But being able to appropriately balance the environmental and economic concerns is key for the final plan.

### Subcommittee Report Backs:

- The **Socioeconomic Assessment Subcommittee** recapped their last meeting and suggested that the first Wallowa County draft document is scheduled to be out by January. Peter Maille gave a recap of his research regarding the measurement of “resiliency”, based on timber production shocks in the 1970s and the 2008 recession. He mentioned that earnings per job is the key ingredient of this concept, because it reflects the economic fortunes of the traditional residents of the region. Additionally, he mentioned that the goal is to have three county profile mock-ups by the end of December. Scott McConnell recapped his discussion with the USFS economists, and how those conversations will impact the final reports, and mentioned that Loren Stout will make a presentation at the next subcommittee meeting about what he might present to the entire BIC.
- The **Forest Health Subcommittee** talked about their advancements in the Desired Condition document. The balance between technical appropriateness and plain speak was mentioned as a goal of the group. Their document is very close and will be ready for full BIC review by January. In addition, they hope to have this document out to members before that next meeting for review. A concern was raised regarding the use of “Decaid” as a modeling program, and there was agreement that it may not be suitable for snag mapping.
- The **Livestock, Grazing, Fisheries and Hydrology Subcommittee** provided a recap of the work they’ve been doing on the Desired Condition document. In particular, the group worked through the Hydrology section of the document line by line, and will be talking with a specialist about this section in a meeting later in the afternoon. The group hopes to have their finished document ready for the full BIC meeting in January. There was a question from the larger group regarding the incorporation of economic considerations and the subcommittee assured the group that they had been having these conversations.

## BIC Meeting Summary

- Finally, the **Access, Habitat, Wilderness and Set Aside Subcommittee** summarized changes they recently made to their Desired Condition document, and some of the on-going challenges they have experienced balancing the needs of the various interests in the subcommittee. There is general agreement that there needs to be access for the various communities, however, the disagreement is about the extent and nature of this access. Elk security and transportation planning is at the crux of this difference. Conversations towards resolution are occurring off-line. Finally, the issue of set-asides and the absence of an advocate/expert in the subcommittee was discussed. Craig Trulock mentioned he would consult with Tom Montoya and Eric Watrud about providing someone to this subcommittee to further explain this issue.

### **Next Steps Overview:**

- Final Subcommittee meetings to wrap up Desired Condition documents.
- No full BIC meeting in December as subcommittees finish their work.
- Umatilla presentation at the BIC meeting in January.
- February, USFS will review impacted standards and guidelines.

### **Next BIC Meeting:**

Tuesday, January 26 TBD

**Meeting Adjourned 11:15.**