BIC Subcommittee Reports Outs for April 2021

Sub Committee Name: Socioeconomic Assessment Committee

How do we gather data to better characterize the social and economic conditions for communities affected by the Blue Mountain Forest Plan that can better inform forest management practices?

Meeting Date: April 6th, 2021 8-9:00 a.m.

Committee members in attendance: Paul Anderes, Sarah Buddingh, Nils Christofferson, Patty Dorroh, Nick Goldstein, Jim Hamsher, Julie Keniry, Peter Maille, Scott McConnell Mark Metcalfe, Kristen Shelman, Susan Roberts, Autumn Elison

Interested Parties:

Documents/presentations reviewed:

- Overview of Harney County profile draft from the Ecosystem Work Group
- Scott McConnell's Implan Modeling document

Key Issues Discussed, Decisions Made, Points of Agreement/Disagreement:

- **Peter Maille gave an update on his work developing the Risk Opportunity Index**. He conducted the third of three beta tests with Columbia County, which went well. Discussions have been very important for the process, and the next couple months will be spent revising. Maille said that by the end of June he will have something to finalized based on these revisions which can be used to begin exporting to other counties over the summer.
- **Scott McConnell discussed his continuing work with the implan modeling**. Ranching, timber, and recreation were identified as three distinct economic impacts—and he has used forest service survey data to develop modeling for recreation. McConnell walked the group through some examples to demonstrate how the model works. One early insight: compared with ranching and timber, recreation doesn't necessarily produce new jobs, due to already existing capacity. This project has started at the 30,000 foot level, but McConnell said that now it is time to start digging into the details.
- **Mark Metcalfe asked how this implan modeling will relate to actual plan management?** How do we transform this from the abstract to actual inputs that would allow managers to achieve certain objectives? While this is a good framework to start discussions, how could it be used, either before or after the plan is developed, to either build or evaluate management units? Nick Goldstein suggested providing some statistical context of the on-the-ground current reality. McConnell said he is searching for that data, and asked the group who REV should reach out to find that data? FS will help to provide data: Metcalfe will provide timber data; grazing is a little bit harder, but someone from the FS will reach out to the grazing lead of the region; and Goldstein will do some digging regarding service contract data.
- **Autumn Ellison of the Ecosystem Work Group walked the group through the Harney County profile draft**. The subcommittee was provided with the opportunity to provide feedback, with the goal of the discussion to get the temperature check of the group. Patty Dorroh said that this is the chance to conduct some county analysis, so it would be great to develop some additional historical context. There was some thought that there is a current overemphasis on collaborative elements, and that the profile should include more information on things like litigation and changing conditions. Autumn mentioned that the goal is to make a readily-reproducible template for use in the future. The group liked the timeline element, but some work will need to be done with the counties to build it out further and provide important

context. Julie Keniry asked if it would be beneficial to send out a query to County representatives to begin sourcing these elements, which Autumn agreed was a good idea.. Nils Christofferson asked how specific the group thought the profiles be? If the profiles are able to show the broad strokes—especially since so much of this flows from federal policy—then do they need to get hyper specific? However, those federal policies did have different effects for different counties, so there was a suggestion that there could be a broader federal timeline at the beginning, then a timeline for specific counties. Autumn suggested that the group should email her any additional feedback that wasn't able to be provided during the meeting, which can be incorporated into another draft in a month or two.

Potential Areas of Overlap to Other Subcommittees:

Questions or Feedback needed from other Subcommittees:

Issues to elevate for full BIC consideration:

Next Steps:

- Julie Keniry will send out asks to County representatives about the County profiles.
- Julie and Patty Dorroh will connect to discuss what specific contextual elements should be included in the profiles.
- Group will send additional feedback on the county profiles to Autumn Elison.

Next Meeting: June 1st, 2021 from 8-9am

Subcommittee Chat Resources:

Nils et al -- The sam.gov website is open to the public (though you do have to create a log-in) and was recently updated to include a searchable database of all federal contracts: https://beta.sam.gov/reports/awards/standard

This data used to be housed on a third-party site (FPDS) which I believe is what Eric White and Heidi H-S relied on for similar analyses in the past. I'll keep digging through to see if I can find FS-specific data.

Sub Committee Name: Forest Health

How do we develop wildfire management and suppression strategies that protect both natural and economic values?

How can we develop timber management strategies that support local community economies and forest health?

Meeting Date: April 21st, 2021, 1:00-4:00 pm

Committee members in attendance: Paul Anderes, Nick Goldstein, Mark Kirsch, Tom Montoya, Nick Myatt, Todd Nash, Sam Palmer, Susan Roberts, Carl Scheeler, Eric Watrud

Interested Parties:

BIC Subcommittee Reports Outs for April 2021

Documents/presentations reviewed:

- Desired Conditions document suggested revisions.

Key Issues Discussed, Decisions Made, Points of Agreement/Disagreement:

- The group welcomed new BIC member Nick Myatt from the Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife to the group.
- The group then jumped into the **Desired Condition document suggested revisions** provided by the broader group at the last full BIC meeting. They worked through the document addressing the suggested revisions in turn.
- There were a number of suggestions regarding the **definitions of certain word choices** and the group generally agreed that keeping the terms broad enough to be synthesized with the other documents into the final plan was their preference. Local flexibility was also identified here and in past meetings as a benefit, so drilling down too far into the specific definition could inhibit some of this beneficial flexibility. It was agreed that the Standards and Guidelines section of the forest plan is a more appropriate part of the finished forest plan to address some of these concerns.
- They reiterated that the **intention of the document** is to thread the needle between accessibility for lay people and to provide direction for on-the-ground forest managers. So language reflects this group desire. Further clarity and more specific definitions will be included elsewhere.
- There were two instances where the group thought that it would be useful to connect with individuals who were not able to attend the meeting off-line prior to the next full BIC meeting to provide additional clarity to the document—which are addressed below in the Next Steps section of this document.

Potential Areas of Overlap to Other Subcommittees:

Questions or Feedback needed from other Subcommittees:

Issues to elevate for full BIC consideration:

Next Steps:

- Susan Roberts will connect with Commissioner Todd Nash to discuss his suggested edit.
- Laurel will ask Amanda Lindsay of the FS about the utility of keeping the charts in the final Desired Condition document.

Next Meeting:

Chat Resources:

Nick Goldstein to Everyone (1:21 PM)
forest health: The perceived condition of a forest derived from concerns about such factors as its age, structure, composition, function, vigor, presence of unusual levels of insects and disease and resilience to disturbance. Perception and interpretation of forest health are influenced by individual and cultural viewpoints, land management objectives, spatial and temporal scales, the relative health in stands that comprise the forest, and the appearance of the forest at a point in time.

Nick Goldstein to Everyone (1:31 PM)
resilience: The ability of a social or ecological system to absorb disturbances while retaining the
same basic structure and ways of functioning, the capacity for self-organization, and the capacity
to adapt to stress and change.

Nick Goldstein to Everyone (1:40 PM)
Timber harvest: The removal of trees for wood fiber utilization and other multiple-use purposes.

Timber production: The purposeful growing, tending, harvesting, and regeneration of regulated
crops of trees to be cut into logs, bolts, or other round sections for industrial or consumer use. For
purposes of this subpart, the term timber production does not include production of fuelwood.

Sub Committee Name: Access, Habitat, Wilderness and Set Aside

How do you provide access for human needs and protect important habitat?

Meeting Date: April 30th, 2021 10:00 am - 12:30 pm

Committee members in attendance: Paul Anderes, Anthony Botello, Dan Dorran, Sarah Fesenmeyer, Nicholas Goldstein, Jim Hamsher, Jim Hamsher, Bill Harvey, Mark Kirsch, Bill Lind, Nick Myatt, Todd Nash, Mark Owens, Sam Palmer, Timory Peel, Steve Pozzanghera, Susan Roberts, Carl Scheeler, Kristen Shelman, Craig Trulock

Interested Public: Billie Joe George, Timory Peel

Documents/presentations reviewed:

- Desired Condition document revisions by Harney County

Key Issues Discussed, Decisions Made, Points of Agreement/Disagreement:

- The goal of the meeting was to address the **Desired Condition document revisions provided be Harney County**. The group worked through the changes one by one, and where there were changes that the group couldn't find consensus on it was agreed that they would be elevated to the full BIC for consideration in the future.
- Commissioner Paul Anderes asked if there is way for this group to spend some time in the future advocating for the USFS to spend more money on road maintenance.
- There was also some discussion about how to deal with road closure and administrative use in this document. It was reiterated there will be an **additional travel management plan** later to address some of the concerns in these areas, but that further discussions could be had in this regard moving forward.

- It was noted that some of the components of the document may be better suited to different places in the final plan, but this can also be addressed by future redline documents. Carl Scheeler reminded the group that there has never been an Access Desired Condition document, so some of the language is included to provide clarification in this regard.
- The subcommittee wants to make sure that the USFS understands that **the committee is not recommending additional set asides**. To this end, Scheeler provided a statement that the group reviewed and incorporated into the Desired Condition document.
- The new version of the Desired Condition document will be forwarded to the subcommittee who can provide redlines ahead of the next subcommittee meeting. Ideally, after that meeting the group will have a finished document that can be forwarded to the full BIC.

Potential Areas of Overlap to Other Subcommittees:

Questions or Feedback needed from other Subcommittees:

Issues to elevate for full BIC consideration:

Next Steps:

- Laurel will send the newly revised version of the Desired Condition document to the subcommittee members to allow for further redlines. These should be sent to Laurel no later than cob Friday, May 21. The next subcommittee meeting will be dedicated to addressing these comments.

Next Meeting:

- Friday, June 4th 10 a.m.-12:30 p.m. (Hybrid meeting prior to full BIC meeting in Wallowa County)

Chat Resource:

Anthony Botello to Everyone (10:33 AM)
If a Maintenace Level 2 or above road is also a road the County has asserted RS2477 on, then that road would be on a maintenance schedule.

Nick Goldstein to Everyone (12:09 PM)
Appropriate uses of general forest area are not constrained by new administrative set asides.