

**State Forests Advisory Committee Meeting**  
**Friday, June 29<sup>th</sup>, 2007**  
**DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY<sup>1</sup>**

**In Attendance Committee Members:** Mike Bordelon, Vergie Ries, Ginny Van Loo, Rex Storm, Wayne Naillon, Barrett Brown, Dave Kunert, Klaus Puettmann, Phil Cogswell, April Olbrich, Carolyn Eady, Nancy Willmes, and Jill Bradford.

**In Attendance Others:** Andy White, Todd Reinwald, Scott West, Rosemary Mannix, Wayne Auble, Mike Totey, John Barnes, Barbara Lee, Jeff Foreman, Randy Peterson, Chris Jarmer.

**Morning Public Comment**

No Public Comment

**Housekeeping**

The Meeting Summary from April was approved without changes.

Mike covered the changes to SFAC membership.

The BOF Tour has been rescheduled to Sept. 6<sup>th</sup> in the North Cascade District.

Mike reviewed the Committee charter with the group. A few minor edits were suggested.

**Field Trip Follow-Up**

- Vergie appreciated having the OSU presence. It added to the tour.
- Nancy enjoyed the tour in an area that she was unfamiliar with. It underscored the challenges of managing a land base that is in scattered parcels.
- Carolyn felt the Black Rock Freeride area was an eye-opener for managing a high risk recreation area.
- Barrett felt it was good to be out to a smaller district. The challenges were illustrated well concerning operations in a scattered land ownership.
- Phil felt it was an interesting tour. He suggests getting a bus that keeps the entire group together so that the driving time can be used for Q&A.
- If we cannot get a vehicle to fit the group, Barrett suggests moving members around in the vehicles.
- April particularly appreciated having district staff in each van. It helped provide context for the stops on the tour.
- Ginny thanked West Oregon for illustrating the diversity of issues they face while managing scattered parcels.
- Rex agreed it was a nice tour. He appreciated the staff putting it together.
- Klaus felt it would be nice to view some operational activities on the ground for future tours.

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting Summary reflects key issues, discussions and decisions, not verbatim language.

## **State Forests Informational Update Topics**

### BOF Update:

Rosemary Mannix gave an update on the performance measures and the BOF direction related to the measures. Reports will be given to the BOF every two years.

Carolyn asked what prompted the BOF to discuss passive management. Mike answered that the discussions that the BOF had with various stakeholder groups prompted them to look at an allocation approach to managing state lands. This could result in some lands being passively managed. Rosemary and Mike fielded a number of questions on the current analysis being done by the program at the direction of the BOF to look at ways to increase ROAV while evaluating the impacts to environmental and social values.

### IP Revision Status:

ODF is placing the Species of Concern discussion on hold until work on the BOF direction has been completed. Carolyn asked for updated landscape maps with lands that have had operations highlighted.

### FY08 AOP Public Comment Update:

Todd R. updated the group on the public comments received and specifically covered how the SFAC comments are being reported. Phil would like to see more diversity of representation in the small groups next year. Separating the stakeholder groups could provide richer discussions. Jill will send out the link to the approved 2008 AOP once it is available.

## **Recreation Assessment**

### *Overview:*

John Barnes provided a PowerPoint presentation on the third-party recreation assessment findings. The contractors gave recognition for the level of professionalism in the recreation program. Recognition was also given for the major accomplishments that have occurred since the first plan. The contractors visited a total of 40 sites. Some detriments were identified that included:

- Complexity of system
- Lack of resources to manage the recreation program
- OHV use (design behind the use)
- Department can't keep up with level of OHV use
- Biophysical impacts of OHV use
- Acquisition of new facilities places additional demands on the system
- Safety issues (i.e. no risk management plan)
- The need to apply DFC concepts to the recreation program
- Lack of a cost/benefit analysis

The report identified the need for a business model that includes the limits of acceptable change, invasive species management, monitoring and research, and a suitability analysis.

The conclusions that were drawn include:

- The need to realign the organizational structure
- Integrate recreation planning into forest operations
- Implement a business approach
- Update a strategic plan / incorporate DFC
- Commit to ongoing monitoring and response system
- Improve OHV standards and guidelines
- Expand use of GIS mapping
- Expand relationships and partnerships
- Complete recreation standards and guidelines
- Expand forest interpretation

The next steps are to share report findings with ODF constituents and stakeholders, identify near-term priorities, and engage in initial long-term project scoping.

***Initial roundtable:***

The group was asked to provide their initial gut-reaction to the findings of the assessment. What stands out, any surprises, member concerns?

- Ginny was shocked that there is no comprehensive plan and that there is no tracking of the dollars.
- Vergie was surprised that the management tended to be more reactive rather than macro-planning.
- Phil feels the fact that the assessment happened reflects well on the department. Phil was not sure the project timeline would produce a useful report but he states he was wrong; this is a very important first step. He states that there is no plan for dealing with over-use. This could be helped by a reservation or permit system.
- April feels there needs to be a balance between being strategic and opportunistic.
- Barrett feels the report is extremely important. The OHV community encouraged the study. He feels the context is slightly off and all the issues cannot be addressed today. Barrett also noted that there were factual errors in the report which need to be corrected and he asked if ODF could draft a one or two page document that addresses these errors. Mike agreed that this was something ODF could do.
- Wayne feels that the non-motorized users feel the assessment is a very accurate assessment of the issues. Recreation has been at a critical juncture for a while and they are glad that multi-use and lack of staffing is being looked at and discussed. ODF needs more recreation staff to accommodate the use. West Oregon District needs a full time recreation staff person. The non-motorized users would like to see more consistent recreation plans across the NWOA.

- Nancy applauds ODF for being responsive to recreational users. She feels some disappointment in ODF for not setting restrictions in areas where use affects the environment.
- Dave questioned the funding for additional staff, where does it come from? He asks whether ODF should carry the whole burden or work with neighboring landowners to share the responsibility. He states that recreation management objectives should reflect DFC objectives stated in the FMP.
- Rex feels there is a glaring lack of discussion regarding fiscal responsibility for recreation management. He feels there is a parallel between the counties asking the BOF for increased financial performance and the findings of this report asking for increased recreational performance which will increase spending for recreation management. He would urge ODF to talk to the BOF post-haste about their perspective on the findings on this assessment.
- Carolyn feels that public education will need to be large scale to help the public understand the changes that will take place.
- Phil agrees that the financial impact is a topic for discussion. How ODF pays for recreation management is a topic of concern for many stakeholders.

***Breakout Group Feedback:***

Group 1: April, Wayne, and Dave.

- Question 1: First steps for ODF to take –
  - Evaluate conditions and work on problem areas.
  - It was suggested that conditions are known for Tillamook and Forest Grove.
- Question 2: Remedies –
  - Look at inherited use and impact.
  - Work with educational signage.
  - Identify funding for ODF budget.
  - Recreation user groups should lobby legislators.
- Question 3: Anything not addressed –
  - Did not address shooting. ODF should look at using designated areas for shooting.
  - Other recreational user groups (bird-watchers, kayaking, etc.) were not looked at.
- This group would like to see trails connected on the forest.

Group 2: Carolyn, Rex, Nancy, and Vergie.

- Question 1: First steps for ODF to take –
  - Strategic planning
  - Business plan
  - Agency needs to identify errors in report.
  - Present findings to BOF and get direction in a way that does not ask open ended questions but more of a presentation of a plan and getting BOF agreement.
- Question 2: Remedies –

- Look at other user's fees besides camping fees.
- Increase education and interpretation to educate public about changes.
- Partner with other recreational providers. Learn from others.
- Question 3: Anything not addressed –
  - More passive recreationists were not represented.
  - Report did not address fiscal responsibility.

Group 3: Phil, Ginny, and Barrett.

- Question 1: First steps for ODF to take –
  - ODF should develop an interim operating plan while developing the strategic plan, providing a context for decisions to be made.
  - A suggestion was made to defer new projects while this is being done.
  - Answer the funding issue.
  - Pay attention to unorganized recreation or “non-represented” recreation.
- Question 2: Remedies –
  - This group agreed that the remedies identified were reasonable.
  - More coordination with other agencies. Utilize lessons learned by other entities.
  - ODF could do better at acquiring grant dollars.
  - This group stressed the importance of structural reorganization.
- Question 3: Anything not addressed –
  - Identify what decisions are made at what level.

***Post-Breakout Roundtable:***

When asked what role SFAC should play in the next steps, most members agreed that the Recreation Advisory Committees were better suited to aid with the interim operating plans. Agency management should address the strategy and policy issues and provide briefings to SFAC.

**Afternoon Public Comment**

No Public Comment

**Next Meeting**

Potential topics for the next two meetings could be:

- Progress of Recreation Assessment changes
- Update on ODF's State Forest's budget
- Tillamook Transportation Plan
- TSF Reorganization
- Wilson River Watershed Assessment
- Adaptive Management
- DFC Mapping
- Integration of recreation in harvest activities