

Hood River Stewardship Collaborative

April 20, 2016

Facilitator's Summary

The following Facilitator's Summary is intended to capture basic discussion, decisions and actions, as well as point out future actions or issues that may need further discussion at upcoming meetings.

Action Item	Responsible Party	By When?
Update Discussion Protocols	Emily	May 18 th
Coordinate to develop new Stew Crew website	Casey, EJ, and Emily	May 18 th
Provide Waucoma maps to Stew Crew	Casey	June meeting

Present for all of part of the meeting: Jon Paul Anderson (High Cascade, Inc.), Tyson Bestone-Riggs (OR Dept of Forestry), EmilyJane Davis (OSU Forestry & Natural Resource Extension), Sam Doak (HR Resident), Casey Gatz (U.S. Forest Service), Keith Harding (Hood River Valley Residents Committee - HRVRC), David Jacobs (OR Dept of Forestry), Larry Martin (HRVRC & HRSWCD), Hugh McMahan (HRVRC), Clay Penhollow (Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs), Russ Plaeger (BARK), Rick Ragan (HR Soil & Water Conservation District), Anne Saxby (HR Soil & Water Conservation District), Andrew Spaeth (Sustainable Northwest), Janeen Tervo (U.S. Foreste Service), Cindy Thieman (HR Watershed Group)

Facilitator & Notes: Emily Plummer, DS Consulting

Welcome and Introductions

Facilitator, Emily Plummer, welcomed everyone to the Hood River Stewardship Collaborative (Stew Crew) meeting, noting that the purpose of the session is to get acquainted, as this is Emily's first session with the Stew Crew. Additionally, the group will continue conversations aimed at identifying information and technical assistance needs to inform the Stew Crew's recommendations for the Waucoma Planning Area.

February 12th Meeting Follow-up

The group decided to implement a new meeting summary approval process starting with today's meeting summary. Within a week following the meeting, Emily will provide a draft summary of the action items, general discussion, and decisions made during the meeting. Suggested edits can be provided and then a final draft will be sent out (or posted) prior to seeking approval at the next meeting. Meeting summaries will be posted to the Stew Crew website.

Set the Stage for Constructive Conversations

Discussion Protocols: In order to facilitate effective and respectful conversations, Emily offered discussion protocols for the Stew Crew to review and adjust to fit their needs. The group reviewed the discussion protocols, noting that some revision would be helpful to clarify intent, however, generally agreed that the protocols would be helpful to implement. Those present weighed in with their level of support for adopting the discussion protocols using the **Five Fingers of Consensus** (see description below). It was suggested that protocols be posted in the room during meetings.

- **CONSENSUS:** (All 1's- strong consensus) There was agreement to use the discussion protocols for Stew Crew conversations, recognizing that this is a living document that can be adapted to suit the needs of the group.

- **ACTION:** Emily will update the discussion protocols with the suggested clarification and will bring a revised draft to the May meeting.

Five Fingers of Consensus: Emily provided the group a handout describing the Five Fingers of Consensus, a tool used to gauge the level of support for actions or decisions amongst group members. Using this tool, individuals are asked to show the group where they are on an issue by raising one or more fingers, as follows:

- 1 - I can say an enthusiastic yes to the decision (or action).
- 2 - I find the decision acceptable and have no serious objections. Improvements could be made, but aren't necessary.
- 3 - I can live with the decision, but I'm not overly enthusiastic. I have questions about the strengths & weaknesses and need more discussion or more work done.
- 4 - I do not fully agree with the decision and need to register concern. However, I will not block the decision. More discussion is necessary for full support.
- 5 - I do not agree with the decision and will actively block its movement. More discussion is necessary or an alternative resolution is needed.

It was noted that this tool uses a 'modified' consensus which allows for different degrees of agreement: all 1's and 2's signify strong consensus, whereas, a range of 1-4 is not as strong, and all 3's and 4's are weak consensus. The degree of consensus is important to take note of and explore as a group in order to ensure that the group is working to build understanding and decisions that everyone can get behind.

There was discussion around the Stew Crew's decision making process moving forward, including:

- How and when are decisions made?
- Who should weigh in on consensus decisions?
- How is Stew Crew 'membership' determined?
- How do we incorporate those in the room – does everyone get a 'vote' regardless of frequency of participation and the number of people representing the same interest?
- What happens if everyone in the group is a "1", except one person, who is a "5"?

It was noted that these questions are important to answer when the Stew Crew discusses their decision making structure and processes. It is expected that the May meeting will be focused around these process conversations.

What makes for good collaborative process?: Emily provided the group with a handout detailing aspects of what makes for a good collaborative process, noting that many of the Discussion Protocols stem from experiences captured in this list. It was noted that in order to have a successful collaborative process, it is important to maintain an open mind when it comes to working together, and to avoid 'boxing in' or categorizing other's perspectives, and in doing so limiting the space for collaboration.

Assessment Interviews: Prior to the May Stew Crew meeting, Emily will contact Stew Crew members to gather more information regarding structure and process needs, Stew Crew successes and challenges, etc. It was suggested that Emily talk to the Stew Crew members who have participated over the long-term to learn more about how the Stew Crew has worked in the past.

Information and Technical Assistance Needs for the Waucoma Planning Area

Casey provided background information on the Waucoma planning area. He noted that the Forest Service (USFS) will not be working on the Waucoma project until 2017; thus there are not agency resources dedicated to the project yet, and surveys will not be conducted until 2017. He noted that due to the schedule, the Stew Crew has an opportunity to provide proactive recommendations to the USFS, instead of reactive recommendations to a proposed project.

In 2013, Casey explained, the Interdisciplinary Team (IDT) prioritized where to direct efforts over the next five years. The Waucoma planning area was included as a priority area. Many of the specialists that

prioritized the Waucoma have since left the District, so there is limited information regarding the prioritization; however, he noted that specialists pointed to the following characteristics as impacting their decision:

- opportunities for treatments;
- huckleberry enhancement through thinning of over-story;
- low soil impact from treatments due to low topography in the north section;
- 200 acres of riparian reserve to improve;
- owls are in the area and owl habitat improvement opportunities;
- opportunities to improve habitat with aspen snag creation or meadow enhancement; and,
- road maintenance opportunities.

The Waucoma planning area is approximately 4,000 acres and is defined by ‘hard’ boundaries, consisting of roads, property lines, etc. The planning area includes Mt. Defiance and Kingsley Reservoir. These boundaries could likely be adjusted if needed. The area is not in the Scenic Area, and has a number of land-use allocations, including matrix-timber emphasis, riparian reserve, un-roaded, roaded recreation-limited harvest, and administratively withdrawn lands.

Casey provided a series of maps showing land-use allocations, slope, general over-story, past harvest, and ownership; these maps will be provided to the Stew Crew via email and Casey will bring a large print out to the next content-focused meeting.

→ **ACTION:** Casey will provide maps to the Stew Crew via email.

Rick provided a description of the planning area, noting that the Waucoma Ridge in the north was a traditional travel path to Indian Mountain and the huckleberry sites were valued by native people. Much of the land was logged in the early 1900’s and there is currently an irrigation pipeline that goes through the planning area and into Kingsley Reservoir. The area around Mt. Defiance is rocky. Also, the Warren Lake area is a popular recreation area.

Rick noted that in 1996 there was a Watershed Analysis that was done and may have some helpful information. [*Facilitator’s Note: following the meeting, Russ provided a link to the 1996 analysis: https://fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fsbdev3_036588.pdf]. It was noted that much of the information that is available right now needs to be updated, including map layers.*

Janeen provided input on what is most helpful to hear from the Stew Crew in regards to their recommendations. She noted that there are multiple forest plans that the USFS needs to consider when assessing how to manage these lands, including the NW Forest Plan and Mt. Hood Forest Plan; these plans create sideboards for any actions through the Standards and Guidelines. Janeen explained that it is helpful to get both general and specific recommendations, and if there are areas with significant distance between perspectives, it is helpful to drill down into those differences in order to be able to provide details on the differences in perspective. Janeen also suggested that the Stew Crew does not need to worry about the sources of the funding, instead, they should provide recommendations and the funding sources can be adjusted as necessary.

What additional information do we need in order to inform the Stew Crew recommendation for Waucoma?: The group worked individually to brainstorm information needs and then reported out to the group. The following questions/areas of interest were noted:

- Landscape level issues, treatments, needs.
- Legal parameters (e.g. Endangered Species Act, Clean Water Act)
- Topographical maps
- Justification on boundaries

- Watershed Analysis information?
- What are we trying to restore?
- Can the area be used to help disperse recreation use?
- Opportunities for recreation
- Recreation resources
- Recreation resources, opportunities
- Important recreation sites, corridors, etc. that are valued and used by people in the communities of the gorge and beyond (location, type and extent of use, why they matter to people).
- Data on historical and current recreational uses inform planning area and potential future increase
- Are there trails that should be buffered?
- Volume of water coming out of the area into irrigation district – current use, future anticipated use and demand.
- What is the condition of biodiversity, resilience to disease, insect and fire?
- Fire adaptation – much research says that late seral is best.
- Fire history and regime.
- Fire regime
- Fire regime - priorities
- Fire history
- Fire potential/history.
- What are the effects of fire suppression in Waucoma?
- Fuels treatments along private lands.
- Interaction with adjacent landowners.
- Can disease, insect, and fire resilience be improved?
- Are there disease or insects in the Waucoma area?
- Forest healthy stands – disease issues
- Forest health/stand disease issues.
- Forest stand information? What is the need?
- Stand age/origin (snags, down-wood, composition,); pit locations
- Can biodiversity be improved? How?
- Presence and location of wildlife species? Which species are within the Waucoma?
- Wildlife usages
- Fish and wildlife usages.
- Stream quality/problem roads.
- Fisheries.
- Fish species and distribution.
- Are there culverts that restrict fish passage?
- Invasives?
- Invasive species
- Which “resources” (e.g. fish, wildlife) are out of the range of natural variability (i.e. not the way they should be)?
- Are all treatment options available? Shelterwood, early seral, older stands?
- Vegetation type.
- Huckleberry areas/ potential.
- Where are the historic huckleberry fields?
- Map of meadows and historic huckleberry areas
- Primitive land purpose.
- Cultural resources/archaeology
- Harvest history (long-term), stand age, history.
- Are there overstocked areas in need of thinning?

- Economic viability of work.
- Economically viable harvests opportunities.
- Impacts of grazing

The group will revisit this list of information needs at a later meeting to prioritize and determine the steps to gather the necessary information. Cindy explained that there is funding (\$13,000) for technical assistance for the Waucoma project and that there may be other opportunities for technical assistance through other programs. The Stew Crew needs to identify what their information needs are, if information is available, and if not, explore options to gather information.

Next Steps

Stew Crew website development: Cindy explained that the HRWG website is not the best site to host the Stew Crew website and so there is interest in developing a separate Stew Crew site for posting the meeting materials and summaries. It was noted that ongoing funding will need to be secured to fund the website. Casey and EJ volunteered to help develop the website.

→ **ACTION:** Casey, EJ, and Emily will work to develop a website for the Stew Crew. They will meet within the next two weeks to discuss.

Set date for next meeting or regular meeting date?: The group decided to hold regular Stew Crew meetings from 2:00-5:00 on the third Wednesday of the month. The next Stew Crew meeting will be on May 18th.

Action Items: Prior to the next meeting, Emily will conduct assessment interviews to help identify process and structure needs. Casey will provide maps of the Waucoma planning area to the Stew Crew. And Casey, EJ, and Emily will begin work on the Stew Crew website.

This summary is respectfully submitted by DS Consulting Facilitators; suggested edits can be provided to Emily at emily@dsconsult.co.