

**Eastern Washington Cascades and Yakima
Provincial Advisory Committees (PAC)
Meeting Notes
4-20-2006**

Attendees: Scott King, Ron Simon, Susan Crampton, Howard Briggs, Bill Ford, June Helbig, Dale Neuman, Annelise Lesmeister, Mike McFeeley, Walt Smith, Jen Watkins, Wes Visser, Arnie Arneson, Lee Carlson, Albert Roberts, Liz Tanke, Saundie McPhee, Barry Donahue, Dick Rieman, Gus Bekker, and Karen Mollander.

Visitors: Mike Anderson (Wilderness Society in Seattle) and Charlie Raines (Sierra Club in Seattle).

Forest Service presenters: Margaret Hartzell Forest Plan Revision Team Leader, Phil Johns Forest Plan Revision Vegetation Leader, Rick Acosta Forest Plan Revision Public Affairs Leader,

Facilitators: Susan Hayman from Boise, Idaho and Paul Hart, Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests.

Information Sharing

Paul Hart

PAC members introduced themselves. Wes Visser, new PAC member representing public at large, introduced himself and shared a bit about his life.

Welcome and Introductory Remarks

Paul Hart & Susan Hayman, Facilitators

Karen Mollander – Thank you for taking the time to be here. Also, thanks to the subgroups for all the work you have been doing. Thank you also facilitators. I feel very optimistic especially with all the work the subgroups have done. I look forward to this meeting.

Rick Acosta – I have the pleasure of working with both subgroups; things worked well and moved along smoothly. Any of the members of the PAC are welcome to be involved with either of the subgroups.

Susan Hayman – This meeting has some significant product time scheduled. Review of agenda.

Objectives for today:

- ◆ Confirm PAC process, products and road map
- ◆ Create an understanding of management themes
- ◆ Validate the proposed management themes
- ◆ Create preliminary desired condition statement, by theme, for recreation and vegetation

Ground Rules

- ◆ Participate actively
- ◆ Listen actively
- ◆ Balance the opportunities for people to talk
- ◆ Be respectful and civil
- ◆ Maintain an open mind to learn from others
- ◆ Silent or vibrate mode for cell phones/electronic devices

Agenda:

9:00	Opening	12:00	Lunch
9:30	Sub-Group Reports: Process and Products	1:00	Preliminary Desired Conditions
10:00	Process Road Map	2:30	Break
10:30	Break	2:45	Desired Conditions—Areas of Agreement
10:45	Management Themes	3:30	Next Steps—Susan Hayman
11:15	Management Themes Validation	4:00	Closing Remarks/Adjourn
11:45	Visitor Comments		

Vegetation Subgroup members include: Arnie Arneson, Jen Watkins, Steve Buck, Scott King, Albert Roberts, and Liz Tanke. Forest Service participants included Paul Hart, Phil Jahns, Rick Acosta, and Barb Fish.

Handout #1 Vegetation Sub-group Recommendations

Albert Roberts: The Forest Service shared with us examples of GIS info, resource layers, and different vegetation types to give us an overall idea of what types of vegetation we are working with. Everyone was very respectful but contributed quite passionately about their interests and situations that are out there, how to address those situations, some tactics, and situations that don't fit within a broad policy so some contingencies are needed.

We plan to continue with the subgroup, we will utilize common grounds, identify areas where we can resolve issues, keeping in mind the priority areas (Wildland Urban Interface and dry forest vegetation types moving up into the mesic forests). Our primary focus was in the white areas on the map, those areas not excluded as wilderness, roadless areas, etc.; areas with current active management. The next meeting is set for April 25 from 10-3, with the location to be announced. If you'd like to join the subcommittee, please add your name to the list of subcommittee members.

Liz Tanke: Kinds of products under management themes--high priority on WUI and restoration of dry forests. Come up with criteria and priorities rather than hard lines on a map. For desired conditions we identified what we would want for dry forest and WUI and the remainder of the area that doesn't have specified direction at this time. Priorities--making decisions on where the most important areas of focus are. A determining factor for this direction is that this forest has been doing this since 1994, those criteria and priorities are already out there, they just need to be prioritized. We need an adaptive management feedback loop. One thing we would like from the PAC, for those not on the subcommittee, they need to make sure their issues and concerns are addressed (send to Rick Acosta?).

Dick Rieman: What is the white area equivalent to? Does it include wet forest and dry forest?

Albert Roberts: Green areas are special interest areas--wilderness, roadless areas, and places excluded from active management. We will start with the dry forest and then work up into the mesic forest. Our focus is WUI and dry site forest types.

Walt Smith: Where does spruce management come in?

Albert Roberts: That goes along with high elevation forests. We are prioritizing the WUI and dry forests which need the most work now for economic and social issues, and high liability issues (fire). Spruce areas are not being excluded; they just are not high priority.

Paul Hart: This was brought up at the subgroup meeting. The group prioritized things in terms of activities that needed to be done first with resources available.

Liz Tanke: Aim towards keeping every ecosystem resilient including high elevation forests.

Gus Bekker: There are some areas that didn't fit policy or the general scheme of management, do you have an example, and what did you decide to do about those areas?

Albert Roberts: An example would be a spotted owl nesting site.

Jen Watkins: We asked "what if?" at our subcommittee meeting. What about WUI that overlap spotted owl habitat; there are a lot of "what ifs?"

Recreation Subgroup members include: Dick Rieman, June Helbig, Barry Donahue, Liz Tanke, Saundie McPhee, Gus Bekker, and Bill Ford. Forest Service participants included Rick Acosta, Linda Fee, Bill Gaines, and Jim Bagley.

Handout #2 Recreation Sub-group Recommendations

June Helbig: General categories were product and process. We met on April 12. We received a lot of information from Forest Service staff. The staff presented a matrix chart that included 24 different types of uses and across the top were 10 mandated management areas (plus 28 other management areas). The staff proposed lumping the total 38 areas into 4 general areas (according to types of uses allowed). We suggested more than four groups or general types were needed. Clarify what areas are open and closed for motorized use with signs or maps, evaluate roads planned for closure. Suitability should include a statement that says not every form of recreation activity can be done on national forest lands...see handout #2 “What activities can occur where?”

At the subgroup meeting there were many suggestions concerning damage from recreation; there was little discussion about enhancing recreation opportunities. The types of comments made and agreed upon reflect the bias of the subcommittee.

Dick Rieman: These are the six bulleted items under process on the handout:

- ◆ Form a subgroup to deal with the recreation management issue
- ◆ Start with the existing Forest Plan, existing trails and existing uses
- ◆ Look at changes suggested by the public to the recreation portion of the forest plan
- ◆ FS folks to filter as to what is really possible...get more changes as suggested by PAC or subgroup and work from there as a collaborative process
- ◆ Identify problem areas,
- ◆ Next meeting is on April 26 from 10-3 at the Forest headquarters office.

Suggestions from PAC members:

Jen Watkins: Did you get a matrix similar to what the vegetation subgroup got?

Rick Acosta: It was the same for both subgroups. During the break we can give you a copy of the chart that we were using.

Susan Crampton: Is there a range or categories on the changes that would be made? How much does change include?

Dick Rieman: We first looked at what the forest has already planned, and then we looked at whether any changes were needed.

Arnie Arneson: You identified problem areas; did you make any suggestions on resolving those problems areas?

Dick Rieman: Yes.

Gus Bekker: Our subgroup came to the conclusion that the four management areas used as a starting point didn't fit all the categories.

Dick Rieman: The trick will be to keep the number of areas to a minimum.

Jen Watkins: A process suggestion...on both committees we haven't identified where we overlap. That needs to be included at some point.

Dick Rieman: Both groups would need to be dovetailed.

Margaret Hartzell: The very last bullet on handout #2 “Evaluate roads/trails for closure—clarify open/closed areas for motorized uses in both summer and winter.” The Forest Plan does not delineate specific forest roads and trails, this bullet needs to be crossed out or set aside for future discussion.

Paul Hart: There is a separate process for travel management planning on the forest that will consider roads and motorized use trails.

Dale Neuman: We also need to consider the hiking community and not focus only on motorized recreation.

Howard Briggs: There will be a lot more information available from those of us who use motorized recreation, we can add a lot to this subcommittee.

Vision Statement subgroup members included: Barry Donahue, Liz Tanke, Jen Watkins, Dick Rieman, Saundie McPhee, and Susan Crampton; Mike Anderson also provided some input.

Handout #3 Vision Statement Desired Conditions

Barry Donahue: The overall feeling of the group is that if you don't know what you want to have in the future then you won't have anything in the end. Desired conditions are not in priority areas, they all need to be included (four items listed under Desired Conditions in the handout). The group had time to read the handout.

Howard Briggs: There is no mention about possible economic benefits, timber harvest or recreation benefits. Also, National Forests are supposed to be managed for multiple use, that needs to be mentioned too.

Wes Visser: I like the third item under desired conditions. There are a lot of things that have gone right over the last 70 years.

Arnie Arneson: This needs to be broadened some to recognize peoples' influences. My vision is broader than what was presented. Arnie distributed *Handout #4 Desired conditions*.

June Helbig: I don't think we have a lot of time to deal with this because this indirectly related to the plan and we have a lot to accomplish. If this is incorporated into the plan then it can potentially limit recreation and all other human uses of the forest. It leaves out the concept of multiple use.

Dale Neuman: The majority of the members on this group represent environmental interests. Wilderness areas are riddled with insect infestations, and law suits are trying to stop anything that would improve and enhance promotion of a healthy forest. I have concerns about what this vision might say.

Process Road Map

Susan Hayman

Handouts: #5 Consolidated Product Recommendations and handout #6 Consolidated Process Recommendations

Proposed changes to the handouts (handouts consisted of items put together from the two sub-group reports):

Margaret Hartzell: The last three bullets about ID team members being at meetings, needs a caveat stating that not all members will probably be able to attend all the meetings.

Margaret Hartzell: All of the consolidated product recommendations could be fit into an element of the Forest Plan.

Gus Bekker: In the consolidated process recommendations handout under the first bullet, it should say that the recreation sub-group is focusing on the same areas that the vegetation sub-group is looking at.

Susan Hayman: The recreation subgroup has a little bit more geography to work with.

Jen Watkins: For clarification sake, what does the product look like that we are trying to put together?

Susan Hayman: All of these products are written recommendations to the Forest Service and include things that couldn't be resolved or couldn't reach agreement on. List common ground items and areas of non agreement.

Saundie McPhee: On the process recommendations, our group didn't state need for change. Are we looking at future pressures for need for change or opportunities for change? This was still fairly nebulous. The number of people coming to the forest was the focus of what our group used.

Dick Rieman: There are some possible needs for changes.

Dale Neuman: What about compromises?

Liz Tanke: What about need or opportunity?

Susan Crampton: Focus on the changing recreation resource. The idea of change is part of what our interest is.

June Helbig: Start with the existing plan, existing trails and uses. Work from there in a collaborative process. See the notes from our meeting.

The group agreed to what June Helbig said.

Susan Hayman: Susan presented a graphic depiction of what the process would look like.



Management Themes	Margaret Hartzell
--------------------------	-------------------

Handout #7: DRAFT Proposed Management Area Descriptions

I was asked to talk about what management areas are, or what management themes are, why they are important in a Forest Plan, and to explain a bit about the four proposed management areas. One of the major pieces of a forest plan is management areas. What this piece does is give a major piece of guidance of where on a forest it is suitable to have a management or an activity. Why is it important to divide up the forest in this way? What we have found is that it is more efficient to provide broad guidance on where you can engage in certain activities so that we can meet requirements for the Multiple Use Sustained Yield act. This leads us to having to divide or zone the forest into areas where we allow activities to occur so that we can continue to have products and services from the forest, and are able to adjust over time to needs and condition changes.

We can't provide all the services and all the products from the national forests (due to natural conditions of the forest). Some social values cannot be met on the same acre (solitude, challenging recreation opportunities, family reunion picnics, mushroom harvesting, grazing, etc.) so some dividing up needs to be done. The Forest Plan makes judicious choices for land management. Some uses and activities may be complimentary to each other and can co-exist well. We don't have to separate every single use or activity; we can have combinations of uses that work well together.

All this comes together in management areas (see Handout #7 Proposed Management Area Descriptions).

~~ PowerPoint presentation ~~

- Draft Proposed Management Area Descriptions chart (same as handout #7)
- Names--we have had divergent feedback about naming management areas, thus we ended up using numbers 1-4.
- These four management areas represent a continuum from undeveloped (management area 1) to highly developed (management area 4)...The first example is from mostly undeveloped and natural in appearance→some development and natural in appearance→developments and changes to appearance may be evident.

~~ End of PowerPoint ~~

How do management areas work? Management areas/themes are not final decisions. The forest plan gives guidance to the forest on what can occur in management areas. They do not automatically exclude a particular activity or kind of use from occurring in an area. The forest plan can be amended.

June Helbig: is a bridge on a trail considered a facility?

Margaret: I don't think so, but you'd have to talk with a recreation specialist or engineer for their input.

Lee Carlson: Is there any guidance on how big or small these management areas should be?

Margaret Hartzell: No, the closest we come to is that we are looking for broad general guidance for the forest, we are looking to the future, and don't want to constrain the flexibility.

Liz Tanke: Are you still open to looking at criteria to making these decisions?

Margaret Hartzell: Yes.

Jen Watkins: A list of open green areas (their description) would be helpful.

Margaret Hartzell: We have a list of all the management areas and a map that we can provide you.

Arnie Arneson: Is your original mapping based on a watershed basis?

Margaret Hartzell: No, that was just a preliminary suggestion that was made to the PAC and subgroups.

[Handout #8: Management Themes Worksheet-Individual.](#)

Paul Hart: The map shows late successional reserves from the Northwest Forest Plan. There are activities that can be done in these areas.

Margaret Hartzell: We don't have the decision space to make any changes to late successional reserves (LSRs) or their boundaries. You can make suggestions about recreation and vegetation management in the late successional reserves.

Karin Whitehall: Light green there is a lot of flexibility for management in the future, in the other color the decision space is very limited. Thus you have chosen to focus on asking for guidance for change in the areas where we have space to make changes.

Dale Neuman: Would you please show the wilderness areas in one color, the late successional reserves in another, and the green areas.

Margaret: We have limited decision space in LSRs by direction from the Regional Forester.

Susan Crampton: It doesn't mean that any of the activities don't or can't occur in those other areas under the NW forest plan

Margaret Hartzell: We have to continue to meet the intent of the Northwest Forest Plan, our Forest Plan cannot change that. When the Northwest Forest Plan first came out a Record of Decision was signed. That Record of Decision amended all the forest plans within the range of the spotted owl, from that moment the Okanogan and Wenatchee Forest Plan was amended to include the Northwest Forest Plan. As we go through plan revision the Northwest Forest Plan is part of the Okanogan and Wenatchee Forest Plan and is open to revision, but we have direction from the Regional Forester regarding decision space for the Northwest Forest Plan.

Liz Tanke: Does this have to result in four different map able areas?

Margaret Hartzell: No. We have to come up with a map, a map of management areas. You can provide us with criteria. We can have a map of one management area for all of that green or for the entire forest.

Jen Watkins: Is there a MOU that we can clearly see what that decision space is?

Margaret Hartzell: We can show GIS areas that show these.

Barry Donahue: Is there a minimum size for management areas?

Margaret Hartzell: No. In a practical sense though, too many management areas create a huge level of administratively management complexity.

Visitor Comments	Facilitated Exercise
-------------------------	----------------------

Charlie Raines: Commenting on the management area documents. One management area is too simplistic. Having 20-40 management areas shouldn't be too complex, we have GIS, etc. Having four management areas is conceptual, mix and match. It is a workable system, it just lumps stuff together until some later project level.

Mike Anderson: I hope you will incorporate a vision into the forest plan; it has to come from somewhere and it seems like this group is a good place for that to come from. Management areas—one or four or forty, another option would be to look at it as a multi layer issue...a recreation issue layer, a fire management layer. Look at a series of management criteria zoning the forest.

Margaret Hartzell: Point of clarification on Handout #9 (tan and green General Suitability Other Areas). These are not reflecting the current management areas in the forest plan, these are information.

Management Themes Validation	Facilitated Exercise
-------------------------------------	----------------------

PAC members divided up into small groups to discuss the Management Themes worksheet-Individual handout. Upon reconvening the small groups reported back on the questions on that handout.

Do these four themes as currently proposed by the Forest Service Work for you?		
Break out group	Why/Why Not	What would you do differently?
1	We could be satisfied with them (four areas) if we were talking from a large scale perspective (big picture) with rigid controls and criteria.	There was a preference that there should be more of these management areas applied at a much smaller scale (a couple acres each). Do-able with GIS tools. Have tighter controls on the ground.
2	Yes and no. No problems with the themes but need subcategories. Too simplistic.	Maybe subdivide areas (for example 4a, 4b, motorized, nonmotorized). Allow for variance in treatment in WUI management areas. Not agreement on uncomfortable with not having exceptions addressed.
3	Margaret Hartzell explained to our group how the four theme areas are an overlay to the existing 28 areas.	We need something visually in front of us.
4	Yes, the four management areas will work but a couple more categories would be appropriate. We may be reinventing the wheel being too specific.	Add a management area for multiple jurisdictions. Add an "anything goes" management area. More than four and less than 40 management areas. General management areas as an overview with secondary layer of criteria or specifics.
		Within general categories, use layers (recreation, fire, etc.)

Margaret Hartzell: *Handout Forest Plan Content Format and Definition.* There is interplay between guidelines. Guidelines are limitations on actions that the Forest Service takes out on the ground. You can have guidelines that apply just within one management area and you can have guidelines that apply everywhere on the forest.

Dick Rieman: You are prioritizing.

Jen Watkins: We can influence or guide those guidelines?

Margaret Hartzell: Yes, if that is what you want to do but that is not what we are asking for, your original charter.

Jen Watkins: Is criteria what it takes to make it a management area?

Margaret Hartzell: How do you arrive at a certain management area, that is the criteria.

Liz Tanke: It would be helpful if we understood the components of the forest plan criteria.

Albert Roberts: Do you have a glossary of forest plan language?

Margaret Hartzell: Yes, it is 54 pages long.

Susan Crampton: It was useful to have names for management areas instead of numbers.

Margaret Hartzell: The ID team does have some shorthand phrases for the management areas but we received input to use numbers instead of names so no predisposed assumptions would occur.

- ◆ Management area 1 is also known as backcountry non motorized
- ◆ Management area 2 is also known as backcountry motorized
- ◆ Management area 3 is also known as backcountry roaded
- ◆ Management area 4 is also known as front country

Wes Visser: We have the horse behind the cart...management involves man and I hear us saying we are trying to figure out what man can do and to control how man can manipulate...I don't see what it is that is there. It would be much simpler to have computer overlays of the two forests. We need information about what is there before we can get to specifics.

Jen Watkins: The CD that Rick Acosta sent me really helped me visualize this.

Mike McFeeley: It is important to be able to see visually what it is we are talking about.

Susan Hayman: Before the subgroups meet it would be very beneficial for the ID Team to understand what products you want from them (CDs, GIS overlays, maps, etc.).

Liz Tanke: Could we pass around a sign up sheet so that we can indicate what form we would like to receive the information in?

Susan Hayman: Yes, we can do that during the afternoon break.

Preliminary Desired Conditions

Facilitated Exercise

PAC members divided up into four groups: two groups discussed recreation, one group discussed desired conditions for dry forests, and the last group discussed desired conditions for Wildland Urban Interface.

The product: Identify distinctly different desired conditions in the four groups. Write down what recreation would look like and what are other kinds of recreation uses that are different from that. Identify unique desired conditions that could occur across the Okanogan and Wenatchee National Forests.

Desired Conditions			
Use bulleted statements to identify the desired conditions for each theme			
Break out group	Describe characteristics of recreation within each theme at a point in time when they are just the way you want them to be.	Do the desired conditions differ from one theme to the next? Should They? In what way?	Determine if additional adjustments to the proposed management themes are in order: What adjustments, if any, are needed and why?
red	Recreation group 1 Backcountry nonmotorized. See comments below.		
blue	Recreation group 2 Backcountry nonmotorized. See comments below.		
	Describe the characteristics of WUIs within each theme at a point in time when they are just the way you want them to be.	Do the desired conditions differ from one theme to the next? Should they? In what way?	Determine if additional adjustments to the proposed management themes are in order: What adjustments, if any, are needed and why?
yellow	Wildland Urban Interface: See comments below		
	Describe the characteristics of dry forests within each theme at a point in time when they are just the way you want them to be.	Do the desired conditions differ from one theme to the next? Should they? In what way?	Determine if additional adjustments to the proposed management themes are in order: What adjustments, if any, are needed and why?
green	Dry forests: See comments below.		

Group 1 Recreation (Red)

This group used the four themes as sorting mechanisms.

- Backcountry nonmotorized:
 - o Want to see wildlife
 - o No developed campsites
 - o See fewer people
 - o Limit number of people and outfitters
 - o See the forest in its natural state
- Backcountry motorized:
 - o Want good views
 - o Want to be able to see wildlife
 - o Motorized trails need to be challenging
 - o Fewer vehicles in this category. Jeeps and high clearance vehicles.
 - o Prefer loop trails
 - o Don't want to hear other forest users close by
 - o Make sure there is access to trails, especially in the winter
 - o Need for scenic views
 - o Challenges
- Backcountry roaded:
 - o Maintained roads
 - o Dispersed camping
 - o Some facilities
 - o View points
 - o Firewood gathering
 - o Outfitter facilities
 - o Separate cross-country ski areas
 - o Snowmobile trails
- Front country:
 - o Maintained roads
 - o Developed campgrounds
 - o Ski areas
 - o Open for snowmobiles

June Helbig: Limiting people on the trails means quotas, unfairness. We already have limits on the wilderness, the solitude areas are huge, we need to allow people to enjoy these areas that are not wilderness.

Saundie McPhee: We wanted to see fewer people, not rules to regulate or limit them.

Group 2 Recreation (Blue)

We started off using the four themes (which we labeled A, B, C, and D) as a sorting mechanism and then modified that to include a new category (category E).

- Recreation group blue
 - o Trailhead within 3-8 miles of desired feature (lake, waterfall, campsites, etc.)
 - o Capacity issue: sufficient potential campsites (primitive, unimproved, non designated sites, legal/allowed)
 - o Sufficient additional trails to disperse and accommodate hikers
 - o Solitude found in “off-trail” areas/locations
 - o No developed facilities (need more info., further discussion is needed on this)
- Recreation group blue Category E
 - o Need to be close (within 5-10 miles) to the community areas/per district
 - o Accessible to families (kids, grandparents, etc.)
 - o Non-motorized year round
 - o Accessible to bikes, horses, etc.
 - o Under 10 square miles in size (smaller scale areas)
 - o No camping allowed
 - o Sense of place (quiet)
 - o No campfires
 - o Day use only/interpretive leader/outdoor education
 - o Active forest management allowed (thinning, prescribed burning, etc.)
 - o Access for people with special needs

Dick Rieman: When you say close to a community, how close?

Gus Bekker: Within a 5-10 mile commuting area.

Paul Hart: What occurred to me is the Icicle Gorge Trail, as an example.

Wes Visser: Under the Day Use Only bullet, it is OK for us to make decisions in this room but how is it going to be sold to the public? Interpretive opportunities need to be available.

Group 3 Wildland Urban Interface WUI (Yellow)

- The management areas didn't apply that well in regards to WUIs. A WUI is ½ to 1.5 miles. The main desired condition is to reduce the risk of high intensity fires near occupied structures and facilities.
 - o Reduce ground fuels and ladder fuels
 - o Reduce risk of crown fire
 - o Strategic and variable fuels and vegetation structure
 - o Use historic range of variability and emphasize fire resistant trees
- Minor desired conditions include
 - o Proper function of streams, soils, and habitat conditions
 - o Minimize introduction and spread of noxious weeds, cheat grass and other exotic species
- Minimal treatment to produce effective results and provide periodic maintenance
 - o Utilize prescribed fire where feasible; use minimal treatment to reduce risk of fire; can use prescribed fire as one form of maintenance
- Appears natural, blends visually and ecologically with surrounding lands
- Adjacent private lands and National Forest facilities need to take reasonable measures to reduce fire risk.
- Other agreed upon items:
 - o Look for opportunities within WUIs to protect wildlife and the people living there
 - o Get multiple benefits from treatments
 - o Within the WUI any treatment or management would vary depending upon proximity of structures that you are trying to protect (variance of management intensity by structures). Variance—difference in treatments, a picnic table and cabin are very different from a home where people are living.
 - o Emphasize protection right around structures and facilities

Dick Rieman: One of the hardest things is maintaining the thinning and clearing work once you have it done. I had it done on my property about 10 years ago and the brush quickly grew back, so now I'm using my mule to eat the buds off the bushes. Have you discussed the use of domestic animals around WUI?

Liz Tanke: That ended up being a lower level item.

Gus Bekker: You mentioned one mile to 1.5 mile what is that? What would be an example?

Liz Tanke: In the Healthy Forest Restoration Act it says that a WUI would occur within .5 to 1.5 mile onto National Forest land for prescription to occur. We look at ways to blend it with other resource needs in that area.

Karin Whitehall: Communities need to be protected from fires coming from the forest; the distance that needs to be treated is from .5 to 1.5 miles. The Act also said that communities could do something to protect themselves (to expedite NEPA to get those projects done).

Susan Hayman: Make sure that the definition of WUI is available for the next meeting.

Scott King: Is there a large amount of money available to do this?

Dick Rieman: Less than there was last year.

Group 4 Dry Forest (Green)

We also used the four management areas as guides for our discussion

- Management tools for all Management Areas:
 - o Timber thinning
 - o Chemical
 - o Pruning
 - o Timber harvest (private and US Forest Service)
 - o Fire (prescribed and let it burn)
 - o Grazing (wildlife and domestic—cattle, sheep, and goats)
- Common themes
 - o Mosaic
 - o Don't want black stumps
- Front country (1/4 to 1/2 mile WUI):
 - o Optimum biological capacity
 - Landscape
 - Soil
 - Surface cover—grass, shrubs, trees
 - o Thinned tree stands-mosaic in age class
 - o Resistant to stand replacing fire
 - o Control fire used
 - o Periodic timber management—selective
 - o Active and intensive management
 - Minimize catastrophic fire
 - Management tools
 - High economic priority
- Backcountry roaded:
 - o Beyond WUI at national forest edge
 - o Optimal biological capacity
 - o Similar management tools as for category #4 (front country)
 - o Less intensive management as category #4—economic
 - o Mosaic of age classes (timber)
 - o Controlled fire use
 - o Opportunity for commercial timber harvest
- Backcountry—unroaded:
 - o Controlled fire used selectively
 - o Natural fire to benefit resource
 - o Selective logging
 - o Mosaic of age classes

Jen Watkins: Were you basing the mosaic on anything?

Scott King: We didn't address anything that technical, but everything seems to have a place to go when you have a mosaic environment.

Dick Rieman: You could have a homogeneous mosaic. In the natural forest it seems to me that there were places where all the trees were killed, similar to a clear cut, there are places where that should occur in the forest landscape.

Susan Crampton: We talked about particular conditions; this was aimed at the overall general picture

Howard Briggs: In MA #1 I didn't think there were roads allowed.

Ron Simon: You can helicopter log or cable log in areas where there are no roads.

If you are not able to be at a subgroup meeting, please send comments or questions to Rick Acosta to incorporate into those meetings.

Assignments for the subgroups:

1. Refine the desired conditions and the notion of management themes
2. Talk about the suitability criteria (how you would recommend the FS make decisions about activities where).

Jen Watkins: I'd like to communicate with my subgroup via e-mail before the next PAC meeting, and not having to go through Rick Acosta.

The group is OK with receiving e-mail messages.

June Helbig: Make sure that all subgroup members are included in the e-mail messages.

Liz Tanke: Would Rick please send an email to the PAC, then PAC members can use that email message a

Scott King: Would Rick please send out a e-mail to the subgroups that includes the dates, times, and locations of the subgroup meeting.

Liz Tanke: Right now the subgroup meeting is set from 10-3 but I'm willing to meet from 9:30 to 3:30.

The group agreed to change the meeting times to start at 9:30 a.m. and end at 3:30 p.m.

Liz Tanke: We could send out desired conditions and suitability criteria out to PAC members

Gus Bekker: I suggest that we have one subgroup meeting (on April 25 for the vegetation subgroup and on April 26 for the recreation subgroup), then meet again as a PAC on May 3.

Paul Hart: It is important to keep folks who were not here today in the loop, so it would be good to keep the May 3 PAC meeting date and the May 23 meeting date.

Jen Watkins: At the end of meetings, can we do a 1-minute recap on where we had common ground?

Susan Hayman: I had hoped to do that but we ran out of time.

Bin List:

- ◆ Map showing wilderness boundaries
- ◆ Additional subgroup folks, please let us know which group you'd like to work on before you leave.
- ◆ Subgroup meeting locations to be determined and announced.
- ◆ Mechanism for collecting input for subgroups between PAC meetings (What "But ifs?")
- ◆ Map of "white areas"
- ◆ Decision on taking-on the vision statement as a PAC product
- ◆ List of current Management Areas and their locations and acreages (maps-hard copies)
- ◆ Links to important documents (especially Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act) intro. page; make sure there is a mechanism on the FS web site to do this
- ◆ Provide a CD of GIS overlays (disk/computer PDFs for home and meetings) of what we are looking at--a layer of zone/MA 1, zone/MA 2, zone/MA 3, etc., to be able to see how and where things are overlapping.
- ◆ Scheduling PAC and subgroup meetings
- ◆ Define WUIs/concepts for subgroup (Phil Jahns will provide this information to the subgroups)

Comments:

- Send your vision statement comments/additions to Jen Watkins by April 28 so that she can combine them all.
- That could be something else we could work on at the next PAC meeting.
- We could do a brainstorming with what is missing from the draft.
- Can Forest Service staff clarify their priorities regarding the vision statement?

Margaret Hartzell: I'd like to see us continue with the suitability of areas question first, then the vision statement.

Susan Hayman: I will send you a short email evaluation and a hardcopy evaluation for those without online access.

Karen Mollander: This is my second meeting with this group. Your focus has amazed me! You too struggled with the same thing that Forest Service folks struggle with in the small group exercises they do. My kudos, congratulations, and my respect for your engagement. Thank you! Keep it up.

Paul Hart: My compliments to you all as well. We have a 50/50 mix of new members and former members; it is good to see you all work together so well.

Closing Remarks

Decide on May 3 if you will meet in June, then set that date.

###