

NEWFC / Forest Service Bi-Monthly Meeting
Meeting Minutes
January 24, 2013
Stevens County Conservation District

Next meeting: March 21, 2013, 1- 3 PM

Attending Forest Service: Laura Jo West, Craig Newman, Gayne Sears, Eric Trimble, Karen Honeycutt, Rodney Smolden, Mary Rourke

Attending NEWFC Board: Russ Vaagen (president), Ron Gray (vice president), Timothy Coleman (secretary), Maurice Williamson, Derrick Knowles, David Heflick, Jeff Juel, Dick Dunton

Also present: Tricia Woods

A. Agenda:

- 1) CFLRP Monitoring
- 2) Malo Eastlake
- 3) East Wedge Project
- 4) Power Lake
- 5) Walker Project
- 6) Kettle Face South
- 7) A-Z Project
- 8) Staff changes
- 9) Colville Community Forum
- 10) Temp Roads CFLRA & forest wide
- 11) NEWFC / CNF MOU -- Collaboration / Public Involvement clarification
- 12) 60 mmbf budget info
- 13) Parking Lot issues

1) CFLRP Monitoring

Heflick gave updated monitoring team status. Ten percent of CFLRP money is set aside for monitoring.

Q. What capacity does the CNF have to do the monitoring?

A. CNF is looking into it and once a draft monitoring plan is out in spring (April) then we'll open dialog including capacity issues. It's unknown if there will be CFLRA money in 2013. RO assumes there will be funding and told CNF to be prepared. Tom DeMayo regional ecologist will be engaging in CFLR/a planning.

Ron noted that a CFLRA project reports are available on the web.

2) Malo Eastlake

Supervisor Laura Jo West (LJW) talked to Robert. The road construction and snag cutting in question (Unit 37) was a mistake. Across the Forest there is a need to tie analysis issues to implementation and steps are being taken to close that loophole, in particular levels of FS staff responsibility.

David expressed frustration with the fact that Laura Jo had not kept a promise to present a formal response at the January meeting. In the discussion that ensued, David also noted that it wasn't so much an implementation issue as much as inappropriate actions taking place that were in direct conflict with what was agreed to during collaboration. In addition to those comments he asked what sort of mitigation is planned to replace the loss of 200 y/o snags in a pileated woodpecker management unit? Mary noted that cut trees lying on the forest floor also provide woodpecker habitat. **Laura Jo committed to crafting a letter addressing all the issues raised in NEWFC's letter of November 9, 2012.**

Q. How do we make sure contractors don't come in and do such things again?

A. LJW – we need to more fully recognize the level of responsibility. Gayne – perhaps another level of oversight is to check in with the contract specialist for the project.

Rodney noted that lessons are learned and practices are changed as a result.

3) East Wedge Project

As soon as the snow is gone there will be marking crews out marking and sale prep in 2013 and sold in 2014.

4) Power Lake

Staff is working on contract package and stewardship contract that go along with that. The project was appealed and because of that a correction was written to the file to clarify there will be no structural stage 7 entered. The FS IDT will be reviewing Derek Churchill recommendations and review of the PL Decision to see if they fit within NEPA. The Coalition is processing what Churchill sent. Gayne noted there has been much investment into this and expects her team to put about half a day more into it. By February 11 this analysis will be completed. LJW noted that wherever possible Churchill recommendations will be used across the Forest and depending there may need to be a supplement to the EA. Maurice noted that one of things Derek was looking at were issues raised by Alliance for the Wild Rockies in their appeal.

Q. Would you provide feedback to NEWFC?

A. Yes.

Q. Could a conference call be set up between CNF and NEWFC after February 11?

A. An internal CNF discussion will need to be held and after that has happened Gayne will discuss this with Maurice.

5) Walker Project

Contract preparation will be prepared in summer (July).

6) Kettle Face South

Cruises are being finished up and the contract is being prepared but there is some adjustment in contract preparation (designation by description) that is in process.

7) A-Z Project

Solicitation package is done. Next up is a conference call with WO and RO – not a lot of changes are expected. Expect solicitation out in February with award in August. Maurice noted that would be past field season for botany analysis.

8) Staff Changes

The Forest is just about ready to advertise openings for the deputy supervisor and timber management assistance positions. Fire staff replacement will be selected in the next month. Amy Dillon is filling in for Bill Shields so Marcy Rumelhart is stepping up as Newport ID Team leader of the Renshaw Project.

9) Colville Community Forum

NFF grant funding objectively supports expanding greater awareness. The event is February 13, beginning @ 5 PM. Food and drink provided. We are trying to get as diverse cross section of the community as possible to participate.

Q. What are the objectives of the Forum?

A. One objective to support expanding recreation collaboration. Also expanding understanding of what the Coalition has done.

10) Temp Roads CFLRA & Forest-wide

LJW noted the CNF temp road policy is outdated. Currently there is not much distinction between temporary and specified road. It does need to be cleaned up. It is very general: a half mile of road is considered a temp road. The new policy needs to include how a temp road will be closed.

NEWFC has supported use of temp roads to avoid new system roads and its hope is a revised policy will provide a comfort level in that regard. The policy will cover any temporary road and be applied across the Forest.

Q. Has the coalition come up with an agreement about temp roads?

A. Yes. The coalition's agreement is a temp road defined as up to ½ mile of road, and meeting other criteria specified in the CNF Forest Handbook.

Q. Who from NEWFC will be working on this policy?

A. The Taskforce

11) NEWFC / CNF Memorandum of Understanding – Deer Jasper / Renshaw collaboration

Q. How is Deer/Jasper different than NEWFC/FS collaboration?

A. There are several reasons: 1) more “interests” at the table, and 2) FS wants to get out of the middle of the collaboration. Typically there are various groups providing input separately. Groups don't feel their interests are being listened to.

Q. How is this different than scoping?

A. Scoping isn't collaborative.

Q. Won't this further embrace the conflict model of positions versus interests?

A. No it's intended to get beyond that. We are still trying to figure this out. We have to try and figure that out – it is conceptual or not.

Q. Is this instead of or in place of NEWFC collaboration – you said this wouldn't be a unit **by** unit collaboration?

A. Our biggest challenge is educating folks about the process.

Q. Six weeks is a tight timeline?

A. Ideally our collaboration together is working towards getting streamlined that in the long term we will have all this worked out – both NEWFC collaboration and this new expanded format.

David and Russ expressed a hope for improved collaboration and that's why NEWFC supported Churchill coming in and helping development restoration objectives. NEWFC has ten years of success and we want to continue improving collaboration and we've tried to expand community participation in the process. LJW noted that if NEWFC defined itself as a vegetation management part of it there likely wouldn't be any problems – once roads are included problems result. David suggested that forestry prescriptions are broken out into a separate conversation.

Q. It seems there is rub between a collaborative group but that individuals also threaten to appeal – could we meet to discuss this issue?

A. LJW: we need to have some discussion about that.

Tricia suggested that Lunell facilitate the discussion. Heads wag yes.

The group agreed there is a need for this discussion – though that will be difficult – but after further discussing this issue within our groups.

Rodney: it's like we're driving down the road with lots of intersections. It's up to the individuals who are participating whether we are going to go through an intersection and continue moving down that road. Jeff: the problem is if a group doesn't file comments it doesn't have a leg to stand on if it later doesn't like what comes out in a decision.

Q. Will there be a consensus agreement?

A. By the Proposed Action.

Renshaw: first meeting is next Wednesday, Jan 30, 9:30 AM in Newport.

It was agreed that Lunell Haught will be contacted and asked to organize and convene a work session on collaboration communication.

MOU

LJW is working with Lunell and her legal department to come up with either a revised MOU and an entirely different template.

Action: LJW will send out a copy of the marked up MOU to NEWFC.

12) 60 mmbf budget info

Derek Churchill did an assessment years ago (Rick was supervisor) that looked at a cutting budget in the Active Management Zone. Karen found the document. Russ noted the issue was that significant work was done it that seems to have gotten lost in Rick's departure and he is asking that whatever gems are in it be pulled out that might be useful today.

LJW: we can look into this. We talked about accelerating restoration. We will be looking at what it would take to get to 60 mmbf.

13) Parking lot

- a. Glossary Work: David, Gayne, et al have been working on a glossary of terminology. Gayne said they expect to have it ready for the next meeting.
- b. Rodney noted there is a need to address improving understanding of fire policy

End

Filename: NEWFC FS meeting Jan 2013.doc
Directory: C:\Documents and Settings\Administrator\Desktop
Template: C:\Documents and Settings\Administrator\Application
Data\Microsoft\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: NEWFC Board Meeting Minutes
Subject:
Author: Derrick
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 1/28/2013 8:48 AM
Change Number: 7
Last Saved On: 2/4/2013 12:14 PM
Last Saved By: Tim Coleman
Total Editing Time: 72 Minutes
Last Printed On: 9/24/2014 3:58 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 5
Number of Words: 1,461 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 8,332 (approx.)