

# Olympia Forest Plan Revision – Listening Session April 28, 2015 Flipchart Notes

---

## Table of Contents

Public Engagement.....	1
Plan Revision .....	3
Science .....	6

## Public Engagement

- Keep meetings local/ regional for local/ regional issues
- Include communities that are most affected
- Similar meetings that are focused on specific topics of concern as well as general info
- Plenty of public announcements using TV, radio, alternative newspapers, and other media
- Use contributed emails to update people
- For potentially negative impacting issues make sure there is plenty of communication
- Use FS website
- Use blogs and chatrooms to focus comments and concern that promote ongoing dialogue
- Tell public options for responding to negatively impactful issues
- Make sure to include neighboring agencies and landowners in planning and assessing impacts, such as the National Park Service
- Maintain transparency in the process and what is changing/ occurring with Naval and other issues
- Stay on path of process rather than getting derailed by special interest groups at the last minute
  - Let process occur and progress
- Make sure plan revision process actually reflects input from these sessions
- Explain how decisions and revisions were made to show that diverse opinions were heard and considered
- Include and inform public for any agency actions that could include violence or military intervention
- Local newspapers announce public forum locations – clearly and they should be located in areas convenient for people to get to – not travel long distances, etc.
- Public need to understand about NW Forest Plan. Each community needs to understand what/ how the relationship to the plan
- Article in local newspapers and plenty of lead time to attend the session. Needs press. At least two weeks of lead time.
- Need forums to educate the public about the forest plan and public input process.
- Website to track process and background materials
- Use email list from tonight to keep people updated and all people who have commented on any forest project should receive notification of meetings, forums, etc. Also environmental groups or other groups.



for the greatest good

- Sheets at FS offices for people to sign-up with contact info for updates. Also campgrounds, visitor facilities, National Park visitor centers.
- Inform public what's at risk and/ or what can be gained.
- County governments, Department of Fish and Wildlife engaged in process (impacted by FS lands)
- Meetings need to be held within ½ hour of Sequim, Port Angeles, and Port Townsend
- Sessions closer to local communities. Need to be aware of ongoing, what's occurring.
- Advisory committees for President's plan. Utilize something like this to help keep people better informed and participate. Meetings around peninsula.
- Public should have more of a vote or say. Use news better – key times not early morning. Local newspapers. Not on news during key times.
- Get to know environmental reporters. Give them information often so they are informed and in the loop
- Social/ electronic media, Facebook page, etc.
- Summary pages posted on website or distributed electronically
- When EIS or environmental analysis need public involvement, input needs to be recorded and part of public record
- More citizen involvement
- Public notice listing in papers
- Learning module for 6<sup>th</sup> graders on how to be public stewards
- Provide information at local events
- Be transparent about intent and provide all information at one time
- Let organized groups know about public meetings, tribes
- Let established user groups know about meetings, such as mountain bikers, environmentalists, forest user groups, horseback riders, hikers, etc.
- Engagement at the forest level or below
- Mountaineers, REI, stakeholders are all notified
- Broad engagement including wide media and elected officials to spread word. Getting to affected communities
- Use email addresses to report back to people on next steps
- Update national and regional website to make plan revision process easy to find
- Clarify plan revision process
- Include broad view of region as well as individual forests
- More information and clarity
- Listservs, sign-up options for updates
- Meetings in small communities
- Public notice in classifieds is not effective enough
- More effective stories in media
- Social media
- Rural and urban both have voices
- Keep meetings within reach
- Email participants and others on all meetings, forums that occur
- More sessions in local communities
- Use broad media including non-electronic
- Post it clearly on the website

- Encourage community sharing of information
- Inform public on issues that are pressuring the forest
- Using questionnaires to request information on what issues are of concern to citizens and locals
- Allow open-ended comments to allow people to give full input/ opinions
- Make meetings and feedback as part of official record
- More disseminated notices
- Engage state agencies that are responsible for natural resources
- Emails are working, web informative
- Think more creatively for rural, small communities
- Think broadly about agencies, non-profits, society of American foresters, other stakeholders
- Have educational sessions of how, why, what of what plan revision entails
- Put up agenda and information ahead of time for people to digest and come prepared. For example, June 9<sup>th</sup> summary of science synthesis
- Public hearings for forest plan revision
- Make notices of report that arises from these sessions

## Plan Revision

- Address effects of pesticides, herbicides on wildlife, etc.
- Address road removal to allow fish passage and improve habitat
- Take good care of our forests
- Will plan list specific trails/ roads etc. or be more general? Especially concerned that foot trails are maintained
- Maintain historic sites (some)
- Revise NWFP first after analyzing changed conditions then move down to forest plans – would help with integration with other agencies
- Individual plans should be consistent within Northwest Forest Plan.
  - Why are some forests further along with revision? And how will that ensure consistency with NWFP, etc?
- Fire response should be part of revision, especially related to jets with toxic coating
- Coordinate/ engage with DOE, especially on 401 certifications on mines
- Non-forestry/ non-ag private uses of forest service lands need to be permitted by DOE (if water quality)
  - EPA new guidelines
- Stop/ prevent pollution of soils/ water – use of biosolids on forest lands with heavy metals, etc.
- What can agency do to stop the Navy dumping chemicals and starting fires on national forest?
- Navy activities will disrupt wildfire/ birds – how will FS consider this?
- Plans should address change (e.g. forest growth, fire) and how FS will achieve goals over different time scales
- Make sure FS is working with other agencies and landowners, conservation entities to make sure they work together (activities, management, etc.).
- Multiple use – solitude should be considered – ensure there is some quiet recreation
- Use restoration methods – mushrooms and mulch to restore or include as a tool/ process, i.e. erosion, regeneration

- How will FS fix the roads?
- Will plan/ assessment address wolves?
- NWFP
  - LSR – make less of them, increase age threshold to more than 80 years
  - LSRs are incompatible with what they overlay in some forests
  - Still need to be managed to develop old growth
- Provide more blow-down/ salvage sales on forest, small-business sales, etc.
- Planning for wildfire prevention
- Adaptive management – we didn't use that properly with NWFP, missed opportunity to learn something; only got halfway through, didn't test hypotheses
  - New planning rule requires
- Road plan needs to address future forest management
- Concern there is no science supporting Navy proposal
- There should be a public forum about the Navy proposal
- Concern that revision would destroy old growth because NWFP provided blanket approach to protect ecosystem and without NWFP, piecemeal approach
  - Want NWFP strengthened and enhanced due to stressors
- NFMA – forest by forest planning is what is required
- Concern about degradation of wildlife, fish, water quality, preservation of old growth, etc.
- Ensure habitat corridors between forests
- Limit disturbance, chainsaws, etc. in corridors
- Provide habitat clearings for wildlife, not just through thinning – do bigger openings
- No militarization of national forest (Olympic)
- Concern over electromagnetic effects on wildlife
- Seek middle ground – win-win
- Need consistent (RAN?) across ecoregion to ensure protection of endangered species
- Social and economic impact
- Multiple use mandate is not being fulfilled – revenues from harvesting not being utilized. Diverse habitat from management
- Importance of early seral forests – not just focus on old growth
- Gifford Pinchot – acquisition of private lands is not preferred, wanted with plan revision
- Is revision needed? If so what's the science?
- How will FS maintain/ repair roads?
- Concern that NWFP is “a given” because it was a failure and should be tweaked
- Don't want new wild and scenic river designation
- Matrix lands have not delivered (NWFP). Failure
- Lands for the people (recreation, hunting, etc.) has become low priority – shouldn't lose sight
- NWFP 2.0 – not all old growth focus, all seral stages, range-wide – tier forest plans to it (not amend)
- GP – re-designate Cispus River – redraw post-disturbance
- Horse recreation/ trails/ new trails – trails are disappearing
- No naval installation on forest and park
- Do not take horses off narrow trails and limit them to roads
- If trails were recorded as open, keep them open – endangered trails – keep them open (GP)
- Weed-free hay issues – not caused by horses

- Normal horse hay is high quality, not so with weed-free (poor quality)
- Electronic magnetism/ noise not good for humans, animals
- Road closure in way that restores habitat
- Tough to manage recreation with decreased staff and funding
- Private and state landowner protections contingent on NWFP on forests – very concerned NWFP will be eroded
- Do websites have the current forest plan?
- Forest plan should be specific but link back to larger principles
- Forest plan should take precedence over national security and the military
- Existing projects should not be fast tracked during the forest plan revision process
- Late-successional reserves should remain and stay intact in forest plan revision
- Interests of adjacent lands and homeowners need to be addressed
- Make sure forest plans consider new species like wolves, etc.
- Air quality from geo-engineering of skies should be considered
- Keep forests for water, habitat, fish, recreation; not a source of timber products, i.e. thinning. Habitat preservation as #1 priority.
- Should be a public advisory committee for forest plan revision for long-term public input
- Develop NWFP 2.0 – consider all seral stages. Develop this first and tier forest plans to it.
- Start with NWFP revision then individual forest plans
- Look at what has worked with NWFP including science and monitoring and adjust it accordingly; also include stressors like climate change.
- Need definition of ecological integrity with measurement and standards, monitoring.
- Scrap the NWFP because it hasn't met community and industry needs and forest health issues. Revise individual forest plans
- Economic analysis of user fee structure
- Maintain the integrity of national forests and what they provide to all interests. Everyone needs need to be considered. Consider needs of all communities
- Large-scale habitat conservation plans (HCPs) rely on the NWFP and protections provided. Concerned about erosion of protections
- Consider need of unique and sensitive habitat, ecosystems, Olympic NP – surrounding forest
- Analysis of the effectiveness of the guiding principles implemented in the ROD of the NWFP
  - Identified and measured
  - Were the outcomes met?
- More research and funding for all the other species besides owls, murrelets and anadromous fish; look at plant life too, like huckleberries
- Purpose and need should include: forest health, community stability, industry infrastructure
- No net loss of access
- Use best available science (PNW) to manage riparian buffers
- Use best available science to address climate change effects on plants and animals, connectivity corridors, climate change; reduce environmental stressors – dams, recreation, roads; high quality habitat as refuges.
- Manage for all species; manage for intact ecosystems

- Forest plans should not offer anything less than current protections and management guidelines provided by NWFP, e.g. late successional reserves and Aquatic Conservation Strategy, riparian reserves.
- Research on effect of jet noise on people and species – aquatic and terrestrial
- Alternatives should consider the NWFP, what is the need for change? Value added with a regional plan.
- NWFP flaw – litigation reform on FS management to enable management; fearful of litigation
- Financial and social effects on communities in and around the NF should be considered and look at what happens

## Science

- Don't reinvent the wheel; use existing science.
- Consider science outside of Forest boundary
- Public access to existing science which dismantles NWFP; independent research for different uses on forest (navy aircraft).
- Public/ agency engagement for synthesis questions
- Adaptive management; riparian literature
- HCP with state and ripple effect with changes. Forest plan
- Need to consider effects within local area, watershed, across land ownerships
- Consider all science
- Climate change is a huge driver
- Transparent independent research/ peer-reviewed
- Olympic is a unique/ fragile land
- How has logging affected water quality/ rivers on the Olympic?
  - Review of NEPA and science review; better environmental review (thorough) with public input
- Continue road closures to protect old growth
- Air pollution, noise, climate change, multiple uses
- Full environmental review (science review on plants, birds, water quantity and quality, wildlife)
- Focus more on restoration practices as job creation
- Olympic NF needs to consider larger role to restore water quality and habitat; look at watershed outside forest boundary, urbanization, industry use
- Revision needs to consider climate change with water especially (hydrology)
- Geoengineering effects on water quality and soil especially barium, aluminum, and strontium
- Make science available to public during revision (transparency throughout process)
- Proper staffing to do revision
- Public input on mitigation
- Use unbiased research
- What are the scientific goals of revision?
- Where are we going to get science? Will it be back by timber industry, or Navy? Needs to be unbiased.
- There needs to be integrity, accountability and full transparency

- Concern about electronic warfare impacts without adequate scientific research; concerns about noise and electromagnetic radiation
- Where is the science?
- How do we incorporate new science in plan revision and after plans are revised?
- Can we do next plan revision sooner than 20 years?
- Need to update periodically with new science.
- How is science chosen/ decided as “relevant”
- Need unbiased research and review of FS science
- Need long-term conservation strategy for all seral stages
- Needs to incorporate ability to be responsive to new science
- Public needs to see what science decisions are based on
- Public access to science needs to be clear to research station, regional office, etc.
- Hold public meetings where scientific basis for plan revision can be described verbally, by scientists themselves.
- Science can unify communities
- FS should have a publication about what’s going on in the FS.
- Visual presentation of the science
- Would like to see the FS get more money for science
- How does the Forest Service incorporate new scientific information from non-FS sources? And who do we send it to?
- Need an EIS on the Navy’s plan; needs to look at best available and most recent science
- Make a commitment to using best available science
- How will modes of change affect goals
- How change (disturbance, climate change, etc.) will affect the future and long-term goals
- Science needs to be broader and encompass change
- Managers need to test science on the ground
- Incorporate species-specific monitoring data (esp. barred owl)
- Science and monitoring specific to climate change be incorporated as a priority as to effect on habitat and species
- Late Successional Old Growth science findings Nov 2002 – would like to see continued.
- Can’t lose sight of original forest plan and work information that was put into it
- Weed free hay rules for horses should be removed
- Urge FS not to accept inadequate inaccurate research from the military
- Needs to be an acceptance and acknowledgement that science is not going to be able to provide all the answers that everyone wants. Don’t use “do more research” as a fallback (e.g. survey and manage list)
- Need to be all analysis of prescriptions that have been used over past 20 years to determine if ecological goals have been addressed (i.e. has what we’ve been doing been working?)
- Go back to good judgement and common sense
- Practices have not been improved due to lack of management
- Use social science – how plan will affect small rural communities. Don’t just consider biophysical science
- Ensure adequate science is used to ensure minimum viable populations of all species (moving beyond spotted owls and murrelets)

- Assess role of fire in natural forest ecology
- Assess role of global climate change
- Assess role of diversity and abundance of insects in overall forest ecology
- Evaluation and assessment of economic impact of NW forest plan on rural communities including impacts to local government, libraries, etc.
- Allowing independent researchers to conduct research instead of industry funded research (including Navy)
- Need analysis of good fish habitat to why there are no fish in it. Lot of effort goes into creating habitat
- More emphasis in creating the full diversity/ range of habitats in the Olympics
- Forest is not static, change happens
- National Forests do not become dumping grounds of Frankenstein military experiments
- Monitor the Aquatic Conservation Strategy to document conditions, health of wetlands, riparian areas and fisheries compared to baseline conditions.