

Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forest Management

Meeting Summary

1:00 to 4:30p.m. June 1, 2009

**Location:
Santiam Room
Oregon Department of Forestry
2600 State Street
Salem, OR**

Attendees

Participants: Jamie Barbour, Paul Barnum, Ron Cease, Gail Crosby, Audrey Hatch, Gary Larsen, George McKinley, Janet McLennan, Don Nearhood, Craig Patterson, Keith Reynolds, Gary Springer, and Sara Vickerman.

Guests: Joseph Duda - Colorado State Forest Service and Rob Williams – Meridian Institute

Oregon Department of Forestry Sponsors: David Morman and Jim Paul.

Mediator: Mike Schnee

Introduction and Background

Mike opened the day with a short review of the March 6 meeting and some themes that emerged from email exchanges since that meeting.

1. The March 6 meeting grew out of the Oregon Board of Forestry's desire to foster "a forum for widening and deepening Oregonians understanding and support for sustainable forest management".

In an effort to accomplish this, the concept of an Oregon Roundtable is being explored. The concept "...requires the emergence and unleashing of champions -- state and local leaders who are willing to step out and lead the dialogue, assessment, reporting, and application of sustainable forest management efforts."

Upcoming Board of Forestry projects will require public involvement processes. Can an Oregon Roundtable be established that will more effectively and efficiently fill this need than traditional approaches?

2. Handout (Attachment A) – Summarizes hopes/fears regarding an Oregon Roundtable that were expressed at the March 6 meeting.
3. At the end of the March 6 meeting a call for volunteers to further develop the idea of an Oregon Roundtable resulted in today's (June 1).

4. A few themes seemed to resonate during email exchanges leading up to the June 1 meeting.
 - How do we get people excited about forests? forestry?
 - How do we encourage discussion about the “triple bottom line” (environmental, economic and social values) for Oregon’s forest resources. What are the appropriate audiences to take part in the discussions?
 - What is the appropriate role for an Oregon Roundtable? Is its scope larger than just assisting the Board of Forestry and ODF? What is the relationship of the organizing partners – federal and state agencies, universities, private companies and individuals?

ODF Budget Context – Jim Paul and Discussion

The focus of Jim’s information was on how the future ODF budget would affect the Board of Forestry’s strategic planning efforts. Because the budget cuts for the upcoming biennium will have significant effects on ODF programs, the Board and the agency feel that it is even more critical to do a good job of strategic planning. Thus the commitment to accomplishing the strategic planning is strong, however it will have to be done on a more limited budget.

One concern expressed by the group was that the Board and ODF would have limited funding to implement their strategic plans and to support sustainable forest management concepts that might be endorsed by an Oregon Roundtable.

Group Perspectives on the Roundtable Concept

Questions, based on the email themes, were posed to the group to better clarify what was important to them in a roundtable approach.

- *How do we get people excited about forests(?) forestry(?)*
- *What are the outcomes that you would like to see from a successful roundtable approach?*
- *What would be the role of a roundtable approach?*

The following ideas were recorded during the discussion. As we move forward with developing the roundtable concept, these ideas for what a roundtable should aspire to do will be incorporated.

1. *Improve communication with the public so that common values (interests) can be understood*
2. *Discourse around sustainability matures*
3. *Venue exists to discuss sustainability*
4. *Provides opportunities to implement approaches and respond to issues.*
5. *Informs!*
6. *Helps us learn from our mistakes. (we are not learning from our mistakes)*
7. *Demonstrates where social, environmental, and economic approaches are successful.*

8. *Connects the citizens of Oregon with the totality of Oregon's forests and the management of the forests.*
9. *Provides integration and interpretation of information that exists. Facilitates the discussion.*
10. *Provides a vision of where we want to go. Adds "values" to the discussion.*
11. *Helps establish quantitative targets.*
12. *Helps real issues rise to the surface.*
13. *Demonstrates that forests and humans are integrally related.*
14. *Neighbors and others think positively about forests and management.*
15. *Integration of information and values is achieved.*

Important aspects of a Roundtable – Individual group members reported some specific “must haves” in order for them to participate.

1. *Must be able to translate ideas into on the ground action by practitioners*
2. *Provides assistance to implement ideas*
3. *Must deal with biodiversity as a “front and center” issue.*
4. *Efficient process.*

In addition to the specific ideas, there was group discussion around the following topics:

- “Audience/participants” - a range of possibilities was discussed. Some thought strongly that the roundtable should strive to reach the basic citizen level as well as the highly informed technical and policy experts.
- “Interpretation and integration” of information into implementable approaches is a highly needed function that a roundtable should facilitate.
- “Values” – a roundtable format should provide a safe environment for people to bring their values to the table. All values should be respected. The forum should strive to find solutions that meet multiple interests in balancing social, environmental, and economic interests.
- “Importance of a forum to promote discourse” – a forum that will encourage participants to conduct good faith discussions that enhance learning is valuable. Agreement may or may not be reached, however the “maturing” discourse is in itself highly valuable to enhanced understanding of forests and forestry.
- “Need to compare and contrast different approaches to meet sustainability goals” – eventually there needs to be discussion about specific practices and how they contribute or detract from meeting goals. Identification of barriers that limit sound approaches should be explored and incentives that encourage sound practices identified.

Gary Larsen agreed to offer the group a written summary of his ideas on some beneficial aspects of a roundtable. Those ideas are included in this summary as Attachment B.

Board of Forestry Projects – Potential Pilot Project(s) for Roundtable?

The purpose of this agenda item was to describe the work plan for three Board of Forestry projects and to promote discussion on the potential to use one or more of them as a pilot project for an Oregon Roundtable.

David Morman described the 2009, 2010, and 2011 timelines for upcoming Board of Forestry projects on the “2011 Forestry Program for Oregon”, the “Sustainable Forestry Indicators Project”, and the “2010 Oregon Statewide Forests Assessment”. Handouts were sent prior to the meeting along with the agenda.

David also described a handout on the implementation status of the Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management.

All three projects could be considered as pilot projects, however the 2010 Oregon Statewide Forests Assessment is on a shorter time track and thus might be more difficult to take on.

Group Discussion on Potential Projects

Mike stated that Janet McLennan and he had discussed some of Janet’s perspectives on how the Board of Forestry projects might serve as projects for an Oregon Roundtable. Janet agreed to present those thoughts to the group today (see Attachment C). After Janet described her thoughts everyone was encouraged to comment on Janet’s ideas or propose other ideas.

The discussion that followed applied many of the ideas brought up during the earlier topic on roundtable concepts. As the discussion came to a close, the group agreed that the indicators project and the FPFO project are the easiest fit for a roundtable pilot. Based upon the general support of the group, the decision was made to have a subgroup move forward with developing a specific proposal describing the roundtable approach and a pilot project dealing with all or some of the Board of Forestry projects. The draft proposal will be reviewed by the participants of the June 1 meeting and then likely forwarded to the larger group who met on March 6th.

Next steps

- Distribute a summary of the June 1, 2008 meeting.
- Janet, Gary, Paul, and Ron agreed to work with David and Mike to prepare a draft proposal for development of the roundtable structure and pilot project.
- The draft will be routed to the attendees of the June 1st meeting for their review. Final editing will occur and a draft proposal forwarded to the larger group (and other interested parties) who met on March 6th.

Attachment A Handout - Ideas expressed at the March Meeting

Hopes	Fears
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Enhanced communication among resource professionals, closely involved stakeholders, political institutions, and the general public• Good faith dialogs• Fewer “disconnects” between the informed participants, political institutions, and the general public• More social, economic, and	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Is another forum worth the costs? We have tried and tried but have yet to achieve the success we hope for.• Redundant processes• Time spent redoing work already done• Good faith dialogs are hard to establish – it is in some parties’ interests to not build agreement

<p>environmental benefits are realized</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Brings inspiration to the discussion!• Acts as a catalyst for “many” to take action to implement or support SFM• Include a broadly defined public – not just the usual players	
---	--

Critical Elements For a Establishment of a Roundtable

- Clearly defined and focused on specific objectives
- Bring inspiration to the discussions

Possible Topics

- FPFO 2011
- BOF Indicators
- 2010 Assessment
- Land Use Issues