

**Willamette National Forest  
Roads System Transportation Stakeholder Team  
09 May 2013**

Meeting Five -- Meeting Notes

The fifth meeting of the Willamette National Forest (WNF) Roads System Transportation Stakeholder Team took place on Thursday 09 May from 100 PM to 400 PM at the Willamette National Forest Supervisor's Office in Springfield, Oregon.

Participants: Meg Mitchell (WNF), Matt Peterson (WNF), Brian Wolfer (ODFW), Alan Henning (EPA), Greg Wagenblast (ODF), Ginnie Grilley (Eugene District, BLM), Jeremy Hobson (WNF), Julie Watson (Walker Consulting & OSU), Miriah Russo Kelly (Walker Consulting & OSU), and Gregg Walker (Walker Consulting & OSU).

Notes prepared by: Walker, Russo-Kelly, and Watson

Meg Mitchell, WNF Forest Supervisor, welcomed everyone and provided an introduction to the meeting. She noted that:

- This meeting is about the cultural value mapping that has been done.
- The WNF held a session earlier in the week that was about working with the public and engaging parties/stakeholders. This workshop has informed today's meeting.
- The TST can address the public that should be engaged and the social dimensions of the forest.
- Managing the forest in consideration of the many publics out there has a lot of potential.
- People care about roads. Some roads have more value than others.
- There are opportunities to discover shared interests and achieve mutual goals.
- The investment strategy frame seems like a great way to go.
- The WNF needs ideas from this group about where to go and how to get into conversations.

Meg Mitchell and Matt Peterson provided a Roads Project Update. They noted that:

- The WNF is still figuring out what groups to go to for public outreach – working on it – hope to roll out soon
- At the previous meeting we focused on aquatic systems
- Today we are talking about human dimensions; the socio-cultural and economic. Human dimensions include:
  - areas of tribal or cultural importance
  - first foods and places of importance – working closely with tribes to develop this part
- Some other projects going on around recreation will be shared today.
  - Recreation access analysis (see handout)
    - What are the ways roads that provide recreation?
    - GIS information was use to identify this
    - The tiers are developed to rate recreation roads access
      - Tier 1 – recreation fee sites
      - Highly developed rec sites for free
      - Designated OHV areas
      - Scenic byways

- The rest of the roads were rated 1-5 depending on the importance of access.

Jeremy Hobson showed the group relevant maps:

- The road network can be viewed as similar to a stream system
- Values have been assigned and then carried down throughout the network. All roads leading to top tier sites are highlighted
- Some roads provide access to multiple values
- The colors indicate road value

The group discussed how the maps will be overlaid

- Aquatics map
- Cultural values map

This group discussion focused on:

- The coarse versus fine scale
- The fine filter maps the utility - the coarse filter will map the value of a place
- One question considered costs – can costs be applied to the recreation map?
- Matt responded that the maps could show what the estimate annual maintenance costs would be for each road.
- Meg explained that the whole investment strategy approach would need to include the cost associated with the roads.
- The group members learned that some roads are a better value than others – the maps should portray that.

The TST members talked more about timber – one element of the economic value of the landscape (a handout was provided). Issues addressed included:

- considered how to capture future values
- only management areas where harvest occurs
- 4 digit roads and seven digit roads – depends on the number of entrances that the roads have

Jeremy explained that the analysis has started with vegetation data to classify into age groupings, with values assigned to the roads that provide access to the different timber sites.

There was discussion about the language used to describe the valuations – want to make sure that the language will resonate with the public:

- Change timber harvest origin to “stand age” or “last harvested”
- Don’t say “timber harvest allowed or not allowed” say something else

How you frame the issue will impact the tone of the discussion – could be misleading that old growth forest has never been harvested.

Matt explained that the age of the stand does not necessarily represent forest harvest (could have been from fire) and that maybe age should be differentiated if affected by fire or harvest.

Meg asked: “– how specific do we have to get?” She and Matt noted that, at this point:

- We don’t want to get too detailed
- We should focus on what the designation really means, not just how it was

- mapped
- And consider questions about access for fire suppression
- Meg brought in the idea that “public safety” is an important part of the project
- AW question was posed about how management allocations are incorporated

There are areas on the WNF of tribal importance

- Common first food areas should be noted...examples include huckleberries, camas, bear grass, cedar
- Plant association groups may be important
- There was discussion about protecting access to special cultural sites for the tribes
- The WNF does not plan to share these maps with the public, since they include protected information

Tribal considerations include:

- Listed fish habitats,
- Important hunting areas (no enough data)
  - advice is to talk to state police fish and wildlife officers
  - could get blobs that way
  - maybe FS law can work with the fish and wildlife officers
  - there are about 4-5 officers that deal with this forest on a regular basis

There was a question about whether first food really encapsulates the cultural values to tribes.

- Matt intends to work with tribes to consider what is missing that can and should be included
- Meg explained that policies have changed around sacred site – the new way is cultural landscapes – it can be hard to discover
- We are going to invent new ways to talk about this with the tribes
- Tell the WNF where they are and where they are not

Another question was related to cultural sites. Have historic sites have been excluded from this map? What about SHIPPO – Are old wagon trails accounted for? Not in this layer...the cultural site focus considers tribal values

Matt and Gregg asked the group to look at the list on the back of the agenda (general, cultural, economic, social) and asked “what is missing?”

- Disc golf – big deal on BLM land
- Timber harvests- include receipts to the counties (stewardship vs. general timber management)
- Geocaching
- Safety
  - Wildland firefighting -- FS and ODF will need to give input
  - Search and rescue
  - Medic units
  - Life flight reach, landing zones for helicopters
  - State police, sheriffs

- Watch out for creating one way in, one way out situations where there are residents or where there's high recreation demand === loops are valuable (loop analysis!)
- Shooting on public lands - Long distance shooters want to go on private timber, and they say no... no clearcuts, so they go to the power lines
- Utilities (power lines and such)
- Jobs- how do we map that on a landscape?
  - Extractive uses (mushrooms, wreaths, sallough [sp])
  - Tourism, biking
  - OFRI report Feb. '13 (timber related jobs)
  - Socio-economic study (from Sierra Institute) mapping of impact to community of owl listing
  - Could map the opposite of "jobs" by mapping economic depression (e.g. kids who need school lunch benefits)
  - State recreation values for jobs—how valid are these studies?
  - Cassandra Mosley Ecosystem Workforce program (restoration jobs)
  - Local economic development people (Oak Ridge, good example) –

### Human Ecology Mapping

- Matt learned about it 2 days ago (Social Sciences Communications Workshop- Lee Cervený who works at people at PSU)
- How do we map human/cultural dimension stuff?
- The places on the landscape are the things that have value to people
- We are going to test-run it in our group to see how it works
- How do we map jobs, safety, intrinsic value?

Matt guided the group through a short version of the Human Ecology Mapping process.

The group then discussed the tool and how it might be used.

- Could dig further/ask questions about why they value the area
- Orient people to the area better (have more location indicators)
- Maybe ask what places people want to avoid
- Think about how this information can be used at the end
- Have people recording comments while people are drawing on the map
- Maybe have different rounds for detailing different areas
- Have different maps for different values –
- Look for groupings/areas where people circle
- Road management strategies might be related to the types of experiences people are having
- Have a few more questions about how roads factor into the experience of the group
- Be careful about how participants perceive this exercise – it is not voting, be clear about the expectations associated with this
- More valuable at the beginning of the process
- Possibly could mail to people
- This could be a mutual learning activity where appropriate

- Consider what the purpose is..such as Individual feedback or community learning?
- The learning can be done iteratively – do this one at a time to scale it back (considering time) and then go back to the group to share what other groups say
- Consider communication needs and how the mapping can be used to better communicate