



Background Context

- Bend, Central Oregon has a rich history of logging, mills and forest management.
- The community is broadly supportive of active forest management.
- Community understands they live in a fire adapted ecosystem.
- 50% of Bend population moved here in the last 12 years.
- Deschutes NF (DNF) has been improving it's collaborative skills since the late 1990's prompted by controversy.
- Foundation for collaboration, Deschutes Fire Learning Network, Project Wildfire, PAC, UDWC, etc.
- Large fires have strongly influenced community understanding of the need for active forest management.
- Fire ecologists and fire learning network are key.
- DNF treats 25,000 acres/year, ½ in Timber Sales, ½ in Hazardous Fuels Program.
- Prior to our CFLR, environmental community was well on its way to being a collaborative partner.
- Community Wildfire Protection Plans cover a large part of the DNF.
- DNF identified high priority stands needing treatment (2005).

Developing an Action Map for the Upper Deschutes Basin Step 3 - Treatable Stands This map highlights areas prioritized for restoration and fuels reduction treatments. Thinning and burning treatments in these stands would move the stands from an over-abundance of "closed, mid-successional" to an "open, mid-successional" stage, which would lower the FRCC departure at the stand level for these vegetation types. This map can easily be modified to reflect different priorities. Other inputs, including timber production, fire risk, insect damage, WUI buffers and/or wildlife habitat characteristics could including in future analyses. Ponderosa pine and mixed conifer stands (Fire Regimes I and III). Stands with closed canopy C=40%) that are 2nd growth stands (mid-success 3. Stands that had a stand FRCC of 3 (successional stage was over-abundant historical distributions)¹. 1. Doesn't currently provide prescriptions for treatments. 2. Represents all acres which could be treated, however a subset treated would improve condit class of vegetation types. 3. Not a fire risk map. I. Hann, Wendel, Havhna, Doug, Shlisky, Ayn, et al. 2003. Interagency and The Nature Conservancy fire regime condition class website. USDA Forest Service, US Department of the Interior, The Nature Conservancy, and Systems for Environmental Management [free, gov]. PIPO and Mixed Con.restoration priority Rivers and Streams Highways Hydrologic Units (Level V) 40 Miles Waterbodies Community Wildfire Protection Plan Boundary Upper Deschutes Basin Fire Learning Network: Accelerating the restoration of fire adapted ecosystems While protecting communities from wildfire



How does the Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project Work?

- Most importantly, we all agree we need our Forests, water, recreation, jobs, scenic beauty, fish & wildlife
- We have many values, sometimes there is conflict
- Collaboration is key to developing a shared vision and mutually acceptable solution
- Community values are incorporated into decision making
- Collaborative makes recommendations to the Forest Service. Collaborative understands the USFS Line Officers make the decisions and relinquish no authority

Forest Service Role

- USFS is not a formal member of the collaborative.
- We are present at all meetings, field trips and serve as technical expertise. When appropriate, the USFS identifies or sets side boards, provides guidance.
- ➤ Journal of Forestry article November 2013. Unique role "Forest Service Staff integrated into collaborative procedurally, but agency does not drive the process".

Forest Service Role, cont.

- "Agency employees contribute extensively to dialogue on substantive issues".
- "Forest Service did not sign collaborative charter".
- > "Agency is performing arms length collaboration".
- "Ad Hoc discussion is constant with agency and collaborative".
- "Agency has shown a great deal of respect and appreciation for collaborative recommendations".

In conclusion, "Agency maintains arms length posture procedurally, allows collaborative to make own decisions and develop recommendations on their own.

Forest Service Role, cont.

My Personal Thoughts;

- Collaboration at arms length on process is a productive place for the Forest Service (not all collaboration needs to be the same)
- Tension arises when agency assumes too much of a leadership role within the collaborative.
- The agency doesn't give up any authority, the collaborative process builds understanding and broad community support for our agency decision.
- The collaborative process has really encouraged community voices to surface. Especially the economic and recreation issues, and brought more "science" to the community discussion.

Outcomes of CFLR

- More balanced discussion: Environmental, social, economic – Goals.
- Improved relationships.
- CFLR recommends to USFS, USFS still makes decision.
- CFLR has become very knowledgeable, best science is incorporated into CFLR recommendations to USFS.
- Advocates for landscape scale restoration.

Outcomes of CFLR, cont.

- Community ownership of the CFLR.
- No litigation (yet), appeals resolved more easily.
- West Bend, treat 20,000 acres and 30 mmbf in Bend's backyard.
- Respectfully allow for minority opinions.
- The CFLR (including USFS) support the decisions.
- Community recognizes that active forest
 management healthy forests supports
 timber economy and Bend recreation economy.

Opportunities/Challenges

- SAF Article
- Scale up Forest Plan Revision
- Example of one approach
 - Research going on with PNW/OSU/UW
 - Support for Fire RX
 - Active management
 - What communities value our landscape

Challenges;

Sustainability of collaboration

