

Nisqually Community Forest

Minutes from Advisory Committee Meeting #2

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

12:30 to 2:30 p.m.

Nisqually Wildlife Refuge Visitor Center

Present:

Steve Pruitt-Facilitator

Diane Marcus Jones

Jack Thorne

Nick Bond

Jean Shaffer

Sarah Scott

Joe Kane

Chris Eades

Kirk Hanson

Greg Ettl

George Walter

Paul Crosetto

Deborah Crosetto

Justin Hall

Nicole Hill

Charly Kearns

1) **Introduction, review agenda**

2) **Presentation and Discussion: Draft Vision and Goal Statement**

a) **Vision Statement**

i) Ownership versus management

(1) Issues with statement "*forest owned and managed by the people of the Upper Nisqually watershed.*"

(a) Vision statement should be *inclusive*, and take the entire watershed community into account.

(i) Does this language allow for private ownership?

1. Should allow private landowners to sign on to the management goals of the larger community forest plan.

(b) Also a concern about who will manage the forest.

(i) 501.C.3? Citizen's council?

(2) Better language might be: "*forest managed in the interest of, or for the benefit of the people of the Nisqually watershed.*"

(3) Vision statement to be sent back to planning committee for revision.

b) **Goals**

i) **Goal 1: Create a community institution**

(1) Too vague? Possibly, but better to start with broad goals and develop a business plan later.

- (2) One perspective: need to iterate the value of the forest's integrity. Put the health of the forest above human interests.
 - ii) **Goal 2: Manage for economic and environmental sustainability**
 - (1) How to balance environmental versus economic interests?
 - (a) Some think goals place too high a value on economics
 - (i) Function of financial reality
 - (b) Multiple money streams lead to mosaic of management and multiple landscapes
 - (i) Not necessarily a bad thing- blocks of land dedicated to recreation and viewshed, streams and water quality, wildlife, or timber.
 - (2) It is one thing to make goals, it is another thing to find an available piece of land that fulfills the goals.
 - (a) Great intentions, but we are limited by what exists
 - iii) **Goal 3: Deliver a broad range of products and services**
 - (1) Need to include culturally significant products
 - (2) Should also include integrity of the forest
 - (a) Allow for development of old-growth characteristics
 - (i) FSC management standards promote a "range of forest types that were historically present," including young and old stands.
 - (ii) Include potential for shifting vegetation due to climate change-not always appropriate to rely on historical records.
 - (3) Is this a sales document?
 - (a) Does wording of statement appeal to potential donors?
 - (4) "Tragedy of the Commons"
 - (a) If managed by the community or for the community, best intentions might become 65 year rotation
 - (i) Do we want democracy or benevolent dictatorship?
- 3) **Draft Forest Resources document**
 - a) **Inventory of resources**
 - i) Two purposes: Identify operating costs and potential revenue
 - (1) Operation and management costs might overshadow purchase costs
 - ii) Wildlife species and habitats
 - 5d. Biodiversity resiliency- to disturbance, climate change, etc.
 - 5e. Presence of endangered or threatened species
 - 5f. Other flora and fauna- invertebrates, herbs, etc.
 - iii) Larger geographical context
 - 8a. Value of parcel
 - 8b. Neighbors
 - 8c. Political will
 - 8d. Scenic value
 - iv) Management Issues
 - 9a. Suitability of land to be a community forest
 - 9b. Labor resources
 - 9c. Accessibility, roads, easements.
 - v) Land value
 - 10a. Conversion probability and marketability

4) **Revised Project Timeline**

- a) Next meeting first week in November: Start prioritizing. What do we want to see this forest become?

5) **Adjourn Meeting**