

**Forest Service Summit, Collaboration Meeting April 1, 2006**  
**Facilitator – Sandy Gill**  
**Group Discussion**

Working Group Rules

- Don't interrupt.
- Get to the point
- Don't judge till you understand
- Ask questions
- Be open
- Be respectful
- Focus on common interests
- Individual commitment with proxy for occasional back up
- Agree to disagree but seek out the reasons why

Where we agree

Multiple economic activities should exist in the forest

We have a range of Perspectives around What those activities should be and Where they should be

The summary below captures the essence of what was discussed. We didn't revisit the points to determine where we could reach agreement. That needs to come later.

Several items were identified as needing further discussion, they appear with \*\*\*\* in front of them.

**Discussion about the Interrelated nature of the 4 primary topics**

- Economics
- Forest Health
- Recreation
- Wilderness & Roadless

Forest uses are interrelated uses.  
Everything is based on ecosystem or forest health. If that is not a strong foundation, nothing else will work. Consider forest health the bottom of a triangle. Forest Health influences Economics and, Wilderness and Recreation, etc.

Planning gives people security so that people know what to expect.

\*\*\*\* Topic for future discussion:

Forest Plan Summit Meeting Notes, Chewelah Peak Learning Center

Facilitator: Sand Gill

Page 1 of 14

As the area becomes more populated, we must address the influx of people. Should there be a buffer zone around the forest?

Example – Gila Wilderness in New Mexico – economic benefit may or may not exist.

At this point, the people that enjoy roadless areas are primarily locals having a picnic in the forest for a day. There is not a strong tie between wilderness – roadless – economics, in one opinion. Connection may exist, but might not be as visible.

Wilderness, back country values – people move here and invest in the community because of these values.

Hunting from an economic point of view – Real economic benefit is when hunters, campers, etc, use the forest. For example, biggest sales month for merchants is October – hunting season.

\*\*\*\* Topic for future Discussion:

Economics is not the most important element – although all elements feed into economics. Should economics be a top priority for the national forest? Should we elevate economics so that basic needs in the forest can be met (i.e.: maintenance needs can be paid for)?

**Review process - start broad – see what areas we have agreement in – focus on them.**

If we do not have a sustainable forest, we must look at the impact that it has beyond this region, beyond this country. The demand for lumber will go elsewhere, to places that don't have the protections that US forests have. Example – clear cuts that are allowed in BC to bring lumber to build homes in our communities.

Visitors from many areas come to the forest – tourists – all have economic impact.

All of the areas that we have decided to focus on are key. That is proof that our efforts have been successful so far.  
Use the forest wisely and ensure it is sustainable.

**Question 1. What economic activities exist in the forest right now? Re-written from What about this topic should stay the same? (economics)?**

Change the question to, “what economic activities that are occurring in the forest that we agree with?” Or, “these are the economic activities that are occurring in the forest right now.”

Consider each topic such as Economics as a whole on the Colville National Forest – what is appropriate in one area may not be appropriate on another portion of the forest.

*\*\*\*\*\*At this level, we all agree with multiple activities, but we need to narrow that down as we gather details and information.  
[More discussion is needed to expand on WHERE to allow WHAT Activities]*

Hunting (some aspects)

Logging

Ski hill & other facilities

Livestock grazing (some aspects)

Preserve Recreational Trails – existing routes – keep opportunities.

Keep the inventoried roadless areas (IRAs), roadless

Other special uses

Boating fishing

Mining-Mineral Claims (some aspects)

## **Question 2. What would you like to see change?**

*[This is a list; No agreement was reached on these items]*

Logging (more fuel reduction products)

Recreational activity areas – becoming populated – we need to develop different areas so concentration does not destroy a particular area. Well known areas are very congested.

Special uses –

What should stay? Air Force Unit. Restrictions in MA6 and 8 (winter range).

What changes? Road use restrictions – difficult to get emergency routes during winter, there should be fewer restrictions so that it is easier to access certain areas in winter. Allow opportunities to be better stewards of the forest – isolated concern.

Church camps – other recreational camps – there are different special uses that should still be allowed to remain.

Elevated emphasis on economics – change so that it is emphasized more.

There is an economic benefit to roadless areas – keep the inventoried roadless areas roadless. (There is one objection to this. Identify areas to allow this to happen).

Example - County struggles because of reduced contribution from forest – if this trend continues, the forest must increase its economic contribution.

If trend does not change, we will continue to see a downward spiral in the communities in this area.

Economics/social/ecological impacts exist in all three areas – forest health, recreation, wilderness and roadless. We have elevated economics. We have created a common vision. Talk about each of the topics this way: at this point, economics is the orange among three apples.

Economics is a subset of all of the three areas. Where circles intersect, all topics feed in. The “inner circle” is where we find a balance.

Economics got pulled out as a subject because of timber management. Timber management is done for economic reasons.

Apply all other three categories to economics – then do the same with social & ecological sustainability. Make connections between categories by applying each topic that we agreed upon in to these three overlapping circles.

Details about the activities that exist right now

If logging is happening now in certain areas, it should continue.

There should be more fuel reduction projects – particularly in Wildland Urban Interface.

Do we want to encourage tourism? Group answer – yes.  
More trails. More visitors.

Mineral claims – mining – some aspects should remain the same.

**Question 3. If relevant, what are the KINDS of places where these should be encouraged? Describe and paint a picture.**

Logging – in WUI areas

Air Force – Hunting Closure

Question #3: we are talking about one small piece of Colville National Forest for Air Force – hunting closure.

“Stay the same” is an “economics” list. This refers to the list of activities we created in response to Question 1.

*We are trying to reach agreements – we all have different backgrounds – we do not all necessarily feel comfortable with the list that we have developed.*

\*\*\*\* More discussion needed about elevating the level of economics.

More tourism, trails, visitors, logging

\*\*\*\* More discussion needed about inventoried roadless areas remaining roadless.

Wilderness and roadless – some feel that they should remain connected now.

Suggestion – separate wilderness and roadless – since they are treated differently. To refer to them as the same creates confusion. Management techniques are different within both areas.

Work towards more bigger game habitat – will bring in more income.

Our forest resources are limited – we need to consider future generations as we go through this process. What will our decisions do for them?

**Question 4. If relevant, what kind of places should these activities NOT be encouraged**

No logging in all IRA - inventoried roadless area.

What is our mission statement for these few days?

Identify work groups, get to know each other, thirty-thousand feet level on all 4 topics if possible.

Is our intent for this weekend to stay at 30,000 feet with all topics? Yes.  
Reasonable goal is to get through all subjects at 30,000 feet this weekend.

Is there enough flexibility to change questions? Yes.

We need to discuss the things that happen at the lower level.

This is an exercise in understanding each other, understanding the topics.

**Forest Summit Collaboration Meeting April 2, 2006  
Sandy as Facilitator**

The summary below captures the essence of what was discussed. We didn't revisit the points to determine where we could reach agreement. That needs to come later.

Discussion centered around the great potential for many, diverse uses. The strength is the size of the Colville.

Discussion covered all 4 topic areas. We now need to revisit what we covered in each area to determine where we agree. We will need to get into more detail to do that.

Rather than looking at where we are in agreement right now, we spent our time learning about the interests and perspectives of people in our group.

One Recommendation that we should start with is whether we agree with the following:

*Our philosophy & attitude to each other's interests: There is an abundance – some areas for everyone.*

A Potential area of agreement regarding the Value of Roadless Designation & the Need to Protect It.

Can we agree on this?

We want assured future protection for designated roadless areas – such as solitude, remoteness, limited development. This would allow some increased access but without all of the restrictions of a designated wilderness area.

A Potential area of agreement

There are areas where logging is possible and agreeable with the other interests, users, etc.

### **Recreation Discussion**

**1) What is good about recreation in the Colville right now, specifically in:**

- a) motorized,**
- b) non-motorized,**
- c) developed recreation facilities**

Hunting can be used as an example in each of these areas. We'll deal with Hunting as a separate topic.

In general (apply with all 3 areas)

In terms of recreation, it is good that there are designated areas for each activity. In most areas, activities are separate. Designated areas for each.

Improvements being done on existing facilities – that is good.

Good to have a mixture of facilities – both primitive and developed.

Good that they are separated.

Good mix of roaded and roadless areas.

This is a good foundation for all three areas – but there needs to be improvement in all three areas.

Special Interest Clubs, formal groups, are a way to monitor use, ensure environmental awareness – this allows education, peer pressure to keep activities within the rules/laws.

Colville NF has so much usable ground, favorable terrain, soil, natural resources, U-shaped valleys and accessible areas – little erosion. This allows more recreation potential with fewer impacts.

**a) Motorized:**

Good cooperation for winter trail maintenance (County, State, Federal, Air Force).

Grooming trails, maintenance “designates” activity areas.

Sight seeing is a popular activity – regardless of how people access the forest (vehicle or non motorized).

Some people can not access more remote areas without some sort of mechanized vehicle or other form of assistance, such as a horse.

We all use roads to get to where we want to go in the forest. Most visitors use roads and roadless areas. Transportation options.

**b) Nonmotorized**

Good trail system for non-motorized and adequate trailheads.

Non-motorized trail associations and other private citizen groups – they are involved in trail maintenance, good cooperation, a lot of volunteer work being done – this is all good.

**c) Developed recreation facilities (ski areas, camp sites, trail heads)**

Trailheads, parking areas, etc, should remain.

There is a good mix of recreation facilities.

**What changes?**

Some areas are still closed, there needs to be more connection between existing trails – both motorized and non-motorized.

**a) motorized.**

Fewer road restrictions in the motorized area – example: push the 1.5 mile limit that is in place right now to get deeper into the forest.

When designating motorized trails, consider effect on grazing allotments. County should have some enforcement capabilities in these areas, also, education. Many visitors just don't know the limitations.

Pend Or. River – better access for boating.

We need more motorized trails for specialized uses. There is a difference between motorized trails and roads. We all use motorized trails. There are several levels of motorized traffic – primitive roads – there is a difference between motorized vehicles – there is so much traffic that we are impacting the environment.

There is a specialized trail group – trial competitions – some groups go very slow – this group’s first concern is that these primitive road areas need to be sustainable.

Trail system can be better – better connections in the system

**b) nonmotorized**

Trail system can be better – better connections in the system

Non-motorized: would like to see more back country shelters for day or overnight use on some of the long loops (snow shelters).

Historic range trails (on ridges) – there is still an opportunity to reconstruct some of these for non-motorized routes. Recreate historic pack trails. Old roads that are being abandoned now can be utilized somehow – explore different uses.

More Nordic ski trails in Ferry and Stevens Counties

Re-open closed trails; add more trail heads.

**c) Recreational facilities**

There is a concern about losing existing recreational facilities - we would like to see more facilities (trails better maintained, reopen old trails, more trail heads, more management responsibility in dealing with conflicts in recreation). Some related to budget concerns.

Would like to spend less money on developed facilities and have more facilities that are less elaborate. Some of the current ones are very elaborate.

General Recommendation:

USFS needs to take more responsibility to help these user groups get through the conflict. Example of conflict between different uses: cattle in Kettle Trail area, cattle run the area. Flip side of this: motorized use in cattle allotments. Education can be helpful for this – about the limits of each kind of use.

Our philosophy & attitude to each other’s interests:  
There is an abundance – some for everyone.

Role of the forest service

Not realistic to say that there will be no conflict. But we can try to minimize conflicts. Forest Service can take the lead in dealing with conflicts – individual groups should not be responsible for having to address each other.

Provide enforcement, education, systems to address concerns should capture concerns or complaints, be a clearing house, suggestion box, somehow ensure that your concerns are heard.

USFS needs to recognize that recreation is growing and as uses increase, they need to be managed and we need more budget for that.

Broad Observations about Recreation of the future:

As we age, our back country experience changes – less likely to hike, more likely to use some sort of a vehicle to access back country. Recreational trends and uses are changing – we must recognize that.

When building new motorized & non motorized trails, develop trail systems that are connected to economic centers, as opposed to a lot of remote areas (trail heads close to town so that people will stay in hotels and feed into the economy). These should dovetail into county recreational plans.

Trail systems should go from town to town – that is, if new trails are developed or if old trails are improved.

Explore uses of abandoned roads.

**Wilderness and Roadless Discussion:**

**1. What is the value of**

**a) Designated Wilderness (3% of forest)?**

**b) Recommended wilderness?**

**c) Roadless areas (16% of forest)?** (clarification – we have inventoried roads, roadless – semi primitive or non-motorized)

Preliminary Points to help Understand the difference between the types. [*Need to check these for accuracy.*]

????Current roadless areas meet the criteria for Wilderness

????Map of (? \_\_\_\_\_) was grounded in truth – what we have now is a “best guess” of what meets the criteria for Wilderness, Recommended Wilderness & Roadless.

**a) The values of Designated Wilderness:**

Solitude (valuable in each area)

Watershed

Wildlife

Permanently protected – the best protection we have (designated Wilderness)

Primitive hunting and fishing opportunities

Grazing

Peace and quiet

Challenge to access these areas – that is a good thing – not many places left where you have to push yourself.

Spiritual values

Protects a Legacy, the last remaining remote wilderness.  
Has name recognition – becomes an attraction  
Putting a name on a wilderness area (ie: “XXX” Wilderness area) makes it more of an attraction and helps to protect the legacy of this area.  
Wilderness preserves a tradition, such as packing and sharpening x-cut saws, hand tools.

**b) The values of Recommended wilderness=**

Recommended wilderness opens an opportunity for more discussion, consideration & debate.  
Potential protection for the future.  
Economic value for wilderness – real estate, people will purchase/live nearby to have access to recreation, beauty, clean air and water.  
Solitude  
Primitive hunting and fishing opportunities  
Habitat for native flora and fauna.  
Trout Unlimited has done studies – healthiest species are in wilderness/roadless areas.  
Watershed protection  
Challenge to access these areas – that is a good thing – not many places left where you have to push yourself.  
Spiritual values

**c) The values of Roadless Areas**

Solitude  
Many “roadless” areas have abandoned roads that are not highly visible or recognized as roads.  
Primitive hunting and fishing opportunities

**Values of all Three**

(designated Wilderness recommended wilderness & roadless).  
Solitude  
Primitive hunting and fishing opportunities  
Habitat for native plants and animals  
Big Game species & healthy fisheries are here  
Watershed protection

**2. Changes you would like to see:**

**Changes for All three types:**

Better trail maintenance; roadless trails are disappearing.

**a) For Designated Wilderness**

Would like to see trails in Wilderness (an opinion – currently, not allowed by law).  
This creates a challenge because trails need to be maintained. Perhaps, at a certain designated time, allow chain saw use for trail maintenance

because current budget may not allow suitable maintenance in these areas. Otherwise there is a potential loss of trails.

Would like to see more Wilderness and protect the last remaining wild places.

Wilderness may get more priority, such as funding for trail maintenance, if it is designated.

Discussion about fire in wilderness areas – does it increase fire risk to designate an area as wilderness? Both views expressed – some felt it increased risk, others felt that it did not. Concern for the potential of fire with the expansion of Wilderness areas. Some fire is allowed. What if it reaches beyond the Wilderness area?

Increase the treatments between Wilderness and other areas. For example, (WUI) around wilderness.

Improved fire fighting strategies and fuel reduction. Reduce fuels to minimize insect infestation in road areas – this, in the long run, will minimize damage in wilderness areas. Allow treatment to protect integrity of old growth areas.

Information Needed:

Suggestion Gain a better understanding about Wilderness and Roadless designations For example: what alternatives are there? What does it all mean? What is a wilderness vs a roadless area? and what does it all mean? We need more information from the specialists such as fire ecologists, economists, etc. Updates on the costs of maintenance.

What are the trends/predictions for large fire activity on Colville NF? We need this information.

**b) Changes for Recommended wilderness**

Concentrate on a designation that's one step short of designated Wilderness. One that protects roadless areas – more assurance of protections for the values of solitude and remoteness.

Why designate Wilderness if Roadless is what we want?

**c) Changes for Roadless areas**

Improved fire strategies, fuel reduction & restoration strategies.

How do we measure the value of an area? Is it based on usage (number of users)? On trends?

Discussion on the Value of Roadless Designation & the Need to Protect It.

Why designate an area as Wilderness if roadless can do the same? What are the differences? Wilderness offers more protection. Some protection has come through citizen involvement. Administration can determine what activities occur in roadless – this changes with each Administration.

We need to protect a legacy. What will roadless areas be like in 100 years? Consider how the country has changed in the past 100 years. There are more and more demands on the land.

Wilderness= permanent protection.

Roadless= not protected. Logging, various treatments are allowed. We like the variety of current uses. But want the protection to keep this diversity of use.

### Potential Area of Agreement

Can we agree on this?

We want assured future protection for designated roadless areas – such as solitude, remoteness, limited development. This would allow some increased access but without all of the restrictions of a designated wilderness area.

### **Forest Health Discussion:**

#### **1. What's good about Forest Health in the Colville right now?**

##### **a) Logging**

##### **b) Ecological sustainability**

##### **c) Community impact**

#### General Comments:

Fire protection; Insect protection

Fuels must be reduced to eliminate risk of large fire activity.

##### **a) Logging**

We have basic resources, infrastructure, good road systems.

Better communication between agency and community and public = collaboration.

Good transportation outside of forest service -- highway, railway, communities.

Allows the economy to function.

##### **b) Ecological sustainability**

Improved stewardship treatments that are supportable by the public, such as less offensive bug treatment. This means treatments that are less offensive to the public, public would consider it a reasonable approach –

A higher level of consciousness about ecological issues.

We still have a number of the same fish and wildlife that were here during Lewis and Clark – implies that we have done a good job managing forest resources.

**c) Community impact**

Strong environmental community to monitor forest management. Example, helping convince the timber industry to raise the level of awareness and modify practices.

Local timber industry cares about the community, wants to do sound practices that help community, Maintain jobs.

**2) What changes would you like to see?**

**a) Logging**

Logging must be more sustainable. We need to understand the process better. Example: Deschutes – understand how to do sustainable logging, better logging practices.

More predictable harvest level.

Better logging practices that achieve sustainable harvest. Example, harvest of Slash, fuel.

Agreement needed – on the many areas where logging is possible and agreeable with the other interests, users, etc. Some Forest Service projects would be good for community protection, good sustainable yield.

**b) Ecological sustainability**

Better Education of the Public. Economic Realities– people need to be better educated about how or why the forest service has to do certain things to maintain forest health – what are the restrictions or limitations that the Forest Service is working under?

Better noxious weed control.

Better control of bare areas along roads – seeding/revegetation.

**c) Community impact**

Implement community fire plans, WUI.

More predictable harvest level for the community – get away from feast or famine cycle. Determine health of forest and sustainable yield. Tie the yield with health of the forest.

Regular employment,  
Increase tax base.

More efforts to involve town officials and community members in forest service processes. Better communication between agency and public.

Reduce exportation of problems that supports poor land management & logging north of the border, etc.

**Wrapping up the discussion:**

Group comfort level with each other is strong and we are “well on our way to collaboration”. We have a better sense of where we’re at.

Let’s focus on the positive, our common interests, that which we agree upon.

Agree to disagree. It is okay to have disagreements. Let’s remember to listen to each other and be respectful of each other.

Note why you disagree on certain topics.

Important to expedite the meetings. Would like a “homework” assignment. Would like to know what will be discussed in future meetings and if there should be research ahead of time. Others – no homework wanted!

But we do want the data/information needed to make an informed and educated decision and to make good use of our time. Get & become familiar with the Wilderness Regs.

Would be helpful to have an agenda of future discussions. That way, each person could be responsible for preparing for that discussion.

Be clear about our focus – What the Forest Service wants to know is what we want to see out there – the big picture. We are laying the foundation here.