

## **Meeting Summary Update (3/30/2009)\***

\* The only change to the original meeting summary is the addition of Craig Patterson to the list on page 3 of 6.

### **Oregon Roundtable on Sustainable Forest Management**

**9:00 to 12:00p.m. March 6, 2009**

#### **Location:**

**Tillamook Room  
Oregon Department of Forestry  
2600 State Street  
Salem, OR**

#### **Attendees**

Participants: Jamie Barbour, Steve Calish, Ron Cease, Mike Cloughesy, Bob Deal, Doug Dunlap, Mike Dykzeal, Rick Fletcher, Audrey Hatch, Brian Kernohan, Jose Linares, Kristen Magis, Doug Manion, George McKinley, Janet McLennan, Greg Miller, Cindy Miner, Susan Morre', Don Nearhood, Tom Nygren, John Poppino, Keith Reynolds, Gary Springer, Rex Storm, Dan Thorpe, and Sara Vickerman. Mark Harmon, Chris Heffernan, and Craig Patterson participated by phone.

Oregon Department of Forestry Sponsors: Jeri Chase, Cathy Clem, and David Morman.

Mediator: Mike Schnee

#### **Marvin Brown Welcome**

The State Forester, Marvin Brown, opened the meeting by welcoming everyone, thanking them for attending and encouraging them to help the Board of Forestry and the Oregon Department of Forestry (ODF) evaluate and possibly further develop the roundtable concept for use in Oregon.

#### **Presentations**

David Morman described upcoming Board of Forestry projects on the "2011 Forestry Program for Oregon", the "Sustainable Forestry Indicators Project", and the "2010 Oregon Statewide Forests Assessment". Jeri Chase demonstrated the ODF webpage for the Oregon Indicators of Sustainable Forest Management.

David then explained the Board'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. David stated that 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."

He also provided specifics on the purpose and potential roles of a roundtable.

David and Susan Morre presented some perspectives on the National Roundtable on Sustainable Forests that they and other participants in this meeting have been involved in.

David stated that the Board of Forestry projects will require public involvement processes with or without a roundtable. Something to consider today is how the roundtable concept might serve to fill this need while also meeting other objectives.

### **Group Perspectives on the Roundtable Concept**

After the presentations, the meeting participants were asked to express their thoughts about establishing an “Oregon Roundtable”, including the opportunities and challenges such an approach would create.

The flip chart notes from the discussion are attached to this summary. The notes do not perfectly or fully reflect the thoughts expressed by the individuals at the meeting; however they do serve to provide important reminders of the key topics that were brought forward.

Based on a review of the notes, Mike Schnee – the mediator facilitating the meeting, describes the following themes that he thought were expressed, in some cases recurrently, during the discussion. *These are not consensus statements.* They are a compilation of ideas that were expressed:

1. Forums to discuss integrated management for social, economic, and environmental benefits could be beneficial. These forums could examine:
  - specific management approaches being used,
  - new approaches to integrated management,
  - data gathering – data interpretation – data management and use,
  - landscape issues and a more holistic analysis of the aggregated effects of approaches when applied at a variety of landscape scales,
  - different roles and approaches for different ownerships, and
  - how to effectively collaborate among resource professionals, specific interests, and the general public – how to find improved approaches to “learning” and resource management that would result in supportive relationships rather than adversarial.
  
2. Productive communication among resource professionals and closely involved stakeholders, political institutions and the general public continues to be a challenge.

Historically, resource professionals and involved stakeholders have come together to discuss issues and approaches. Some of these forums have been successful and others have not. Good faith dialogs are sometimes hard to establish – it is in some parties’ interests not to come to agreement.

Frequently, there are large disconnects between those who regularly engage in the debates on policies and approaches and the general public and political

institutions. Improved communication in both directions could be beneficial to enhanced understanding across the parties and possibly produce more social, economic, and environmental benefits from sustainable forest management.

Alternatively, the question was raised on the value of yet another forum. Given all the efforts at effective communication to date – is it worth investing more time, money, and effort to do more? Maybe, it is simply time to move forward with implementing the concepts that are already established by law or other mechanism.

3. If a roundtable is considered it must be clearly defined and focused on specific objectives. Group processes are significant investments of time and money. No one can afford to engage in redundant group processes. Don't consider redoing the indicator work or other work, rather use existing work as the starting point.

Consider initially, a proposed roundtable to achieve the needs of the 2011 Forestry Program for Oregon or to “drive action” on the Sustainable Forestry Indicators Project. Land use might also be an issue to consider.

Include a broadly defined public – not just the usual players.

4. Look for an opportunity to bring inspiration to the discussions! One idea - consider using Gifford Pinchot's concept of “greatest good” as a defining measure of sustainability.

If a roundtable is successful it should be a “catalyst” for many to take action to implement sustainable forest management.

### **Volunteers to further develop the concept**

The following people volunteered to work with David to further define a proposal for an Oregon Roundtable:

Jamie Barbour

Ron Cease

Audrey Hatch

Jose Linares (or another USFS Region 6 representative)

Kristen Magis

Janet McLennan

George McKinley

Susan Morre

Don Nearhood

Craig Patterson (Added to list – Meeting Summary Update 3/30/2009)

John Poppino

Keith Reynolds

Gary Springer

**Next steps**

- Distribute a summary of the March 6, 2008 meeting.
- Continued feedback to David is encouraged
- David will frame-up some ideas to share with those who volunteered to work on further development of the roundtable concept
- David will then invite further involvement from those who attended the March 6 meeting and others who have already expressed interest in the roundtable concept.

## Attachment - Flip Chart Notes

### PARTICIPANT PERSPECTIVES ON THE ROUNDTABLE CONCEPT

1. Need for "local," "on the ground," examples of management (integration of) that examines sustainability from social, economic, environmental perspectives.
2. Roundtable may be a mechanism to highlight number 1.
3. Disconnect exists between "public" and the other more involved stakeholders. "Public includes political institutions." Forestry is not doing a good enough job communicating.
4. Place to debate issues we do not fully understand – helps to define and understand. Need forum for these debates.
5. All efforts to date – seem to have failed to effectively communicate – is it worth trying to do more – or should we move forward with just implementation. "Seems like a redundant effort."
6. Value added for a roundtable to discuss broader landscape issues and differing ownerships. It may not be an issue of public understanding.
7. Common ground may exist in communicating different approaches on different ownerships.
8. Considerations:
  - a. To what extent does data enter in? Opportunity.
  - b. Good to move discussion that is integrated . . . includes social perspective.
  - c. Opportunity to learn from public.
9.
  - a. Opportunity to achieve integration.
  - b. Well rounded way to integrate the vast array of metrics understanding.
10. Communication at sustainability in "practice" . . . look at different scales of sustainability in action – find strengths and weaknesses.
11.
  - a. Our forests are at risk.
  - b. Our communication is not understandable to public.
  - c. A new process should be anchored at achieving something specific, e.g., Forestry Program for Oregon.

12. a. Roundtable could serve a role with promoting "indicators" discussion.  
b. Board of Forestry could use Roundtable to help drive action – indicators/strategies. How to drive "actions," what should continue.
13. Roundtable may be helpful in building "social" capital through understanding stakeholder positions, finding common ground, and supporting each other rather than "assassinating" others.
14. Roundtable needs to be clearly defined . . . need public "inspiration."
15. a. Roundtable – if started – need to have a purpose other than simply "common ground." Common ground is not in everyone's interest.  
b. Land use – might be an issue.
16. Means of evaluation of sustainable forest management across all landowners from an Oregon perspective. Holistic view of the aggregation of approaches.
17. "Ditto" on need for inspiration. Greatest good – Pinchot Concept as measure.
18. a. Need Oregon "public" at the Roundtable – not just usual suspects.  
b. Don't retread indicator ground – use as starting point.
19. Roundtable should be a catalyst for many.