

Public Workshop Summary
Forest Economies for the Future

Ashley National Forest: Forest Plan Revision
January 13, 2018 – 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Uintah Conference Center, Vernal UT



Table of Contents

Workshop Purpose and Overview	1
Opening Remarks.....	1
Presentations	1
Panel Question & Answer Session	2
Table Groups – Process and Key Discussion Points	2
Synthesis of General themes / Areas of Convergence.....	3
Next steps	4
Closing remarks.....	4
Post-Workshop Key Observations and Recommendations	5

Attachments

Attachment 1. Workshop agenda

Attachment 2. Workshop Participants

Attachment 3. Synthesis of Panel Question and Answer Session

Attachment 4. Transcribed notes from table groups

Workshop Purpose and Overview

The U.S.D.A. Forest Service (Forest Service) hosted a public workshop for the Ashley National Forest (ANF) Forest Plan Revision process in Vernal, Utah on January 13, 2018. Attachment 1 contains the workshop agenda.

Workshop Objectives:

- Create an understanding of:
 - Forest plans and wood product supply
 - Past and project wood product supply and use
 - Social and economic trends
- Identify opportunities for future Ashley National Forest wood product supply and use
- Suggest desired forest/management conditions to support potential opportunities
- Build capacity for future collaboration in the forest plan revision process.

The Forest Service utilized the ANF Forest Plan Revision mailing list, as well as traditional and social media outreach, to announce the event. Participants included members of the public, local and state government agency representatives, Forest Service staff, and invited speakers. Attachment 2 contains the list of meeting participants who provided their names.

The meeting was facilitated and managed by Susan Hayman and Sophie Cottle, EnviroIssues, contracted by the Forest Service to provide third-party neutral services.

Opening Remarks

Jeff Schramm, Ashley National Forest Supervisor, welcomed attendees and thanked them for participating. He spoke about the forest plan revision effort, and the commitment he and the Ashley National Forest have made to meaningfully engage the public in this effort.

Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues facilitator, welcomed the group and provided an overview of the meeting. She encouraged active participation and said she would provide additional process details at the start of each section of the meeting. Susan then introduced Cathleen Neelan, Forest Plan Revision Team Leader for the Ashley National Forest.

Cathleen shared information about the ANF forest plan and the overall process to frame the workshop conversation. She also introduced other Forest Service staff assisting with table facilitation at the workshop.

After reviewing the meeting conduct guidelines, Susan introduced the presenters.

Presentations

The following speakers were introduced with their stated topics:

- *How forest plans lead to availability of wood products:* Jim McRae, U.S. Forest Service, Ashley National Forest
- *Past and present wood product supply and use related to the Ashley National Forest:* Darren McAvoy, Utah State University Extension & Utah Biomass Resources Group

- *Social and economic trends in local communities affected by the Ashley National Forest's wood product supply:* Don Albrecht, Utah State University & Director of the Western Rural Development Center

Jim presented information on forest plan decisions regarding where timber production is designated, how much timber can be harvested, and the kinds of harvest allowed. Following Jim's presentation, Darren shared information on past and future wood product supply and use. He also discussed a variety of alternative wood products that could potentially be developed from the ANF, such as biochar, cross-laminated timber, and bio-oil. Following Darren's presentation, Don shared economic trends in logging, farming, and other industries. He concluded that rural communities need to diversify their economies and locally add value to products.

Presentation slides are available online at:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd573312.pdf¹.

Panel Question & Answer Session

Following the presentations, Susan convened the presenters in a panel for a question and answer (Q&A) session. Attachment 3 contains a synthesis of the Q&A session.

Table Groups – Process and Key Discussion Points

Susan led participants through a table group activity, each table with 6-8 participants. Three rounds of discussion occurred, plus a gallery walk (independent participant review of Round 2 products). Participants were encouraged to move to new groups with each new round (most, but not all, did so). During each round, groups responded to the following discussion questions. Key discussion points are noted below for Rounds 2 and 3. **The complete set of transcribed notes from Rounds 2 and 3 can be found in Attachment 4.**

Round 1 (discussion only):

- *What was a key takeaway for you regarding:*
 - *How forest plans affect wood product supply and use?*
 - *How wood product supply and use has evolved/continues to evolve?*
 - *How rural economies are affected by wood product supply and use?*
- *What was your reaction to what you saw/heard? Why?*

Round 2 (table notes): *Based on what's been said today, what opportunities can you envision for wood product supply and use from the Ashley National Forest?*

- Supplying materials for alternative wood products, such as biochar, bio-oil, and cross-laminated timber.
- Local production of alternative wood products to add value locally before distribution.

¹ The file size of this document prohibits attachment and email delivery with this workshop summary. If you are unable to download this online, please contact Cathleen Neelan at cneelan@fs.fed.us to receive a copy of the file copied to a flash drive.

- Allowing for commercially viable timber harvesting among other economically viable forest products.
- Educational resources and materials to convey the importance of logging and timber harvesting to policy-makers and the public
- Greater utilization of salvage wood and stumps/slash and allowing people to remove this material through commercial firewood permits or free of charge.
- Greater access to harvestable timber in inventoried roadless areas

Round 3 (table notes): *What should the forest look like/be managed for (desired conditions) in support of these opportunities?*

After completing Round 3 of the small group discussion, four of the seven groups reported their convergent perspectives on desired conditions. Responses included:

Table Group 2:

- Harvest occurs in areas where potential timber volumes are the greatest.
- Aspen stands are restored using prescribed fire.
- Overstory that contains mistletoe is clear cut to reduce risk of disease in timber reproduction and protect future logging opportunities.

Table Group 6:

- The revised forest plan is flexible to adapt to changing climate and economies, and to address questions that can't be anticipated at this time.
- Timber production lands are managed as such (it takes actions to get there), using the best available science.

Table Group 5:

- The revised forest plan actively promotes value-added and alternative forest products.
- The revised forest plan limits impediments to producers and expedites environmental analysis.
- Monitoring is a collaborative process with stakeholders and the Forest Service.

Table Group 4:

- The revised forest plan supports alternative forest products and is flexible to support new products as they emerge.
- The revised forest plan looks at the forest as a whole and considers how to use vegetative management as a tool to keep the whole forest healthy.
- The revised forest plan supports diversification of the local economy.

Synthesis of General themes / Areas of Convergence

From comments expressed during the panelist Q&A and from table group discussions, the following general themes with convergence include:

- The forest plan revision process provides an important opportunity to adjust how much, how, and where timber is harvested on the forest. Participants would like increased timber production on more designated acres on the ANF, using harvest treatments that maximize volume and minimize residual risk from fire, insects and disease.
- Participants are eager for the opportunity to supply developing alternative wood product markets, such as biochar, bio-oil, and cross-laminated timber. They would like the ANF to provide increased opportunities to harvest salvage and other low-value wood for this purpose, as well as allow production facilities to be located on the Forest (e.g. kilns on site) to reduce product transportation time and cost. Creating products in the communities around the ANF will help local economies add value to local products before they are distributed.
- Participants want the revised forest plan to provide wood products and other raw materials that enable and support economically diverse local economies (e.g. domestic and wildlife forage, mining, service/recreation opportunities).
- It's important to educate the policy-makers and the public (including youth) to gain support for appropriate, ecologically and economically viable timber harvest.
- Participants are interested in creating partnerships with local, state, federal, non-government, and private partners to leverage markets, expertise, and funding.
- Participants would like access to treat stands/harvest timber in inventoried roadless areas.
- To compare tradeoffs in the forest plan revision process, participants would like the Forest Service to fully analyze timber suitability and the corresponding potential timber volume from lands currently within inventoried roadless areas.
- Participants seek a forest plan that is flexible and can adapt as technology improves, especially in relation to alternative wood products.

Next steps

Following the workshop, meeting materials will be made available to document the workshop. These materials include a written summary, links to presentations and a Q&A video. They will be available online through the ANF website in the weeks following the workshop.

Closing remarks

Susan thanked the participants for their active engagement during the workshop. She reminded them that all table notes would be included in the meeting summary, and that a video of the presentations and panel Q&A would be available online. Cathleen thanked participants for their time and participation. She noted there would be a second public workshop, tentatively around the topic of rangelands and scheduled for February 24, with more information to come. Jeff thanked participants and stressed again the importance of their continued participation in forest plan revision on the Ashley National Forest.

Post-Workshop Key Observations and Recommendations

The following key observations and recommendations are offered by the neutral, third party workshop facilitator. They are intended to inform future hot topic workshops, as well as future participatory approaches on this specific topic of wood product supply and use.

- It is always a challenge for agencies to decide where to “invest” the public’s time during a planning process. While it is critical that the public have a voice in determining the desired conditions for a national forest, it can be challenging to get specific public input on this – a key observation from this workshop was that many people preferred to talk about near-term opportunities on the Ashley rather than what conditions would be required in the long run to support them. **Recommendation:** Conduct a second hot topic workshop for desired conditions, placing more emphasis on familiarizing participants with what desired conditions are and how they are used in forest planning for the “hot topic” under discussion. Determine whether to continue these conversations after the second workshop, or to pursue public input on desired conditions another way and save topic-specific workshops for another time in the forest plan revision process.
- Participants responded very favorably to presentations by non-Forest Service speakers, though the local Forest Service presenter was also well-received. **Recommendation:** Continue the extra effort to bring in non-Forest Service/non-Ashley National Forest presenters to complement the local Forest Service presenter speaking to forest-specific conditions. Being able to speak authoritatively about the topic while not being in the role of a local forest manager sets a more neutral tone for these science-based workshop presentations.
- While the level of attendance was very satisfying for the organizers, there was limited diversity of perspectives among the participants. And though this resulted in a more comfortable discussion among participants, it was less challenging than exploring the tradeoffs when long-term visions don’t align. **Recommendation:** Continue active outreach to “non-traditional interests” around the workshop topic and ensure the invitation language is inclusive.
- Public interest and engagement in the workshop topic was high, as evidenced by the attendance and the level of interaction throughout the workshop. Most participants stayed and remained active for the full four hours of the workshop. **Recommendation:** Keep the four-hour time slot, reduce from three to two rounds of discussion, eliminate the “gallery walk,” and adjust the presentation and Q&A time to increase group discussion time.
- Some participants expressed interest in having a more structured way to continue the discussion of desired condition regarding wood products supply and use outside of the workshop, both for themselves and for others unable to attend this workshop. **Recommendation:** Explore the use of online platforms that facilitate getting/giving topic-based information for the duration of the relevant forest plan revision step in the process, and that require minimal maintenance by the Forest Service. Visually depict how desired conditions related to wood products supply and use are connected to discussions around timber suitability, management areas, and other forest plan components.

Thank you for being here today!



**Ashley National Forest Public Workshop: Forest Economies for the Future
Workshop Agenda**

Saturday, January 13, 2018 | 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.

Uintah Conference Center | 313 East 200 South | Vernal, UT 84078

- 9:00 a.m. Welcome, introductions, and workshop overview
- 9:15 a.m. Presentations
- How forest plans lead to availability of wood products
Jim McRae, U.S. Forest Service, Ashley National Forest
 - Past and present wood products supply and use related to the Ashley National Forest
Darren McAvoy, Utah State University Extension & Utah Biomass Resources Group
 - Social and economic trends in local communities affected by the Ashley National Forest's wood product supply
Don Albrecht, Utah State University & Western Rural Development Center
- 10:15 a.m. Break
- 10:30 a.m. Moderated panel Q&A
- 11:00 a.m. Small group discussion (instructions provided by facilitator and at tables)
- 12:30 p.m. Suggested desired conditions
- 12:50 p.m. Wrap-up
- 1:00 p.m. Adjourn

For Today...

- Actively participate
- Listen respectfully
- Speak from interests, not positions
- Silence electronic devices

*For more information on Ashley Forest Plan revision, please visit our website at
<https://www.fs.usda.gov/main/ashley/landmanagement/planning>
or email us at AshleyForestPlan@fs.fed.us*

Workshop presenters



Jim McRae

Jim received his B.S. Degree in Forestry from the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point in 1983. His professional experience includes working as a Forester with the Florida Division of Forestry. He completed timber sale preparation and timber sale administration duties with the San Carlos Apache Tribe in Arizona. Jim worked as a silviculturist while employed at the Fort Apache Agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, also in Arizona. He was the District Officer at the White Swan District with the Yakama Agency of the Bureau of Indian Affairs in Washington. Jim became the Forest Manager at Uintah and Ouray Agency in Fort Duchesne, Utah in 2001. Jim has been the Timber Management Officer on the Ashley National Forest since October 2006.



Darren McAvoy

Darren McAvoy is an Extension Assistant Professor at Utah State University, he directs the Utah Forest Landowner Education Program chairs the Utah Biomass Resources Group. He was a forestry consulting and wildfire specialist for Inland Forest Management in Sandpoint, Idaho for seven years. Darren was a saw squad leader on the Flathead Hotshot Crew in Columbia Falls, Montana and worked on the Yaak District of the Kootenai National Forest. He produced The Missing Fires video for the National Park Service for his MS degree in Communications from Utah State University and holds a BS in Forestry from Colorado State University.



Don Albrecht

Dr. Don Albrecht began his role as the Director of the Western Rural Development Center in July 2008. He received a B.S. in Forestry, an M.S. in Sociology from Utah State University and a Ph.D. in Rural Sociology from Iowa State University. He then served as a member of the faculty at Texas A&M University for 27 years where he worked in the Departments of Rural Sociology and Recreation, Parks, and Tourism Sciences. He has researched and written extensively on the issues confronting the communities and residents of rural America. Among the issues explored are natural resource concerns, economic restructuring, demographic trends, poverty, inequality, and education. His most recent book publications include *Our Energy Future: Socioeconomic Implications and Policy Options for Rural America* (2014), *Rethinking Rural: Global Community and Economic Development in the Small Town West* (2014), and *Rural Housing and Economic Development* (2018).

Attachment 2. Workshop Participants

Participants who signed in on the event sign-in sheet are listed below. Note, sign-in was not required, and a small number of participants chose not to sign in.

Barrett Anderson	Salt Lake City	UT	Redge Johnson	Salt Lake City	UT
Bill Ingalls	Vernal	UT	Rick Perry	Tridell	UT
Bill Zanotti	Moab	UT	Ritchie Anderson	Vernal	UT
Brad Huber	Lapoint	UT	Ron Ward	Fort Duchesne	UT
Cheryl Meier	Vernal	UT	Russell Case	Glenrock	WY
Chet Huber	Vernal	UT	Stan Baker	Moab	UT
Clinton Robinson	<i>[unknown]</i>	UT	Tom Elders	Vernal	UT
Craig Calder	Vernal	UT	Tom Harrison	Vernal	UT
Dandy Pollock	Beaver	UT	Trent Bristol	Tooele	UT
Darren McAvoy	Logan	UT	W. Russ Findlay	Provo	UT
Darren Perry	Tridell	UT	Wayne Simper	Vernal	UT
Dave Evans	Duchesne	UT			
David Allison	Vernal	UT	Forest Service		
Dawn Harper	Jensen	UT	Birk Roseman		
Debbie Anderson	Vernal	UT	Cathleen Neelan		
Delbert Larsen	Bluebell	UT	Colette Webb		
Don Hall	Vernal	UT	Dolores Simons		
Floyd Bartlett	Vernal	UT	Jonathan Hopkins		
Gina Wilcken	Bluebell	UT	Jeff Schramm		
Gordon Hirschi	Vernal	UT	Kevin Draper		
Hank Gutz	Manila	UT	Louis Haynes		
Jean Dickinson	Rock Springs	WY	Megan Eno		
Joe Richardson	Bountiful	UT			
Jonathan Ziegler	Rock Springs	WY	Presenters		
Kelly <i>[unknown]</i>	Bluebell	UT	Darren McAvoy, Utah State University		
Kelly Young	Lapoint	UT	Don Albrecht, Utah State University James		
Kelsey Berg	Sandy	UT	McRae, Forest Service		
Ken Ludwig	Fruitland	UT			
Larry Harper	Jensen	UT	Facilitation Team		
Mark Pentecost	Price	UT	Sophie Cottle, EnviroIssues		
Martin Pierce	Vernal	UT	Susan Hayman, EnviroIssues		
Mona Hunting	Vernal	UT			
Nate Barrons	Salt Lake City	UT			
Nathan Hall	Vernal	UT			

Presenters' Panel Questions & Answers (Q&A)

Following the presentations, the three presenters formed a panel and responded to questions from the participants. The following is a summary of questions (Q), comments (C), and corresponding responses (R) from the full group Q&A session.

Q: How do areas become designated as roadless areas? Is this planning process an opportunity to designate more roadless areas?

R: The process began in the Clinton administration and was completed in 2001. No additional roadless areas will be designated through the forest plan revision process. The forest plan revision process is also not an opportunity to re-address the existing designations. Other special designations can be recommended through the forest planning process, however.

Q: How would wood coming from the Uintah basin become cross-laminated wood?

R: Creating cross-laminated wood is a long process. Currently, there are no accepted building codes for the material, which is one of the biggest hurdles to overcome before mills served by the Ashley National Forest could begin supplying wood material for this use. The industry must expand significantly in the United States before this can happen.

Q: Is the size of the lodgepole pine found in this area suitable for this kind of use?

R: Yes, it is. There is a lot of potential material for this product in this area, but the industry needs to be further developed.

Q: Why does the Forest Service leave mistletoe-infested trees in thinning sale areas?

R: The impact of mistletoe varies. In some cases, thinning the trees is an appropriate solution. There is currently a project in the works on the Flaming Gorge Ranger District where there is a mistletoe infestation that we intend to clearcut to remove the mistletoe. That's the more appropriate treatment in that area, and in areas where there is a high risk of mistletoe infesting a multi-age stand.

Q: What is the likelihood that the Forest Service would recommend a new wilderness area within an area currently designated for timber production? How much of any recommended wilderness would fall within an existing roadless area?

R: The majority of any recommended wilderness would likely fall within an existing inventoried roadless area. The Forest Service does not designate wilderness areas; wilderness designation is a congressional responsibility. If an area is recommended for wilderness through forest plan revision, we need to manage that area going forward in a way that maintains its wilderness characteristics.

Q: Have you done an inventory of what acreage inside the roadless area would be suitable for timber production? It seems that should part of the Forest Service's inventory and analysis.

R: The current draft acreage that may be suitable for timber production is 135,000 acres. If roadless was not a designation, the estimated total of acreage suitable for timber production on the forest would increase to approximately 375,000 acres. Timber harvest can occur in inventoried roadless areas, but there are more constraints. Land in inventoried roadless areas cannot, however, be designated for 'timber production'.

C: I feel there are opportunities for timber harvest in wilderness areas and think it would be beneficial to know how much land suitable for timber production exists within the wilderness areas.

Q: I am interested in biochar, it sounds like a wonderful project. Is there a nutrient breakdown, or some sort of brochure available on biochar? How can I get involved with biochar and get it to be commercially available?

R: Biochar is pure carbon, so it doesn't have nutrients. For that reason, it is recommended that biochar be added to soil by first mixing it with compost. Then, the biochar will act as a million little sponges, absorbing nutrients that can be put onto your soil. Biochar is currently available in Salt Lake City, sold by Amaron Energy. Local economic development organizations have resources to help people start commercial businesses.

Q: I have a neighbor heavily involved in compost and mulch from a dairy. Can biochar and compost or mulch complement each other?

R: They complement each other very well.

Q: In this basin, what would you identify as one of the most economical improvement opportunities to add that extra service for someone who is operating in a timber economy now?

R: The more value you can add locally, the better. Rather than sending raw logs out to other areas to be processed, do that work here. That helps create economic activity and adds jobs locally.

Q: When are we going to stop using select cutting as a timber treatment on the Ashley? I think select cuts just thin out the 'junk'.

R: Through this planning process, there will be input and discussion about clear cutting vs. select cutting. Clear cutting is currently allowed in the Forest Plan, but with some limitations. In the recent past, there has been some reluctance to clear cut.

Q: How many pounds of wood do you need to create the crude bio oil you featured?

R: Regardless of the weight, approximately 50% of the weight of the wood material put into the pyrolizer machine comes out as crude oil. The oil that is produced is a 'wet oil' that needs to be dewatered before use.

Q: Will the revised Forest Plan allow the new processes Darren presented to occur on the landscape here (that is, biochar or biofuel processing facilities located on the forest) so that we can add value locally?

R: That is something that can be discussed. If there were risks to other resources from these production facilities, that may not be possible.

Q: Can the Forest Plan revision analyze whether roadless areas should be reduced so timber production can occur in some of these areas? We see that there may be opportunities to harvest timber in roadless areas, but it can't be done if it is not addressed in the Forest Plan.

R: As part of the plan revision process, the Forest Service is required to conduct a NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) analysis that considers different management alternatives. One potential alternative to analyze would be an alternative in which the inventoried roadless areas no longer exist.

Q: I am interested in the potential use of Russian olive trees that you shared. I think there is a great opportunity for this in the basin. Have you thought about creating partnerships between landowners and organizations like the NRCS (Natural Resources Conservation Service) to help reduce the cost of this equipment?

R: The NRCS recently introduced a biochar project, and other organizations are also working on similar concepts. Simple kilns are a good opportunity and have been used in Emery County on Russian olives. We are also working on expanding the size of these kilns.

Q: You showed a photo of a stand of trees that were small with no growth. Is there a plan to take areas of the forest like this and thin them out so that we have a better stand of trees in the future?

R: Up until about five years ago, thinning of these young pine stands was not being done because of a concern over the potential impact to Canada Lynx. There has since been a change in the conservation strategy for this species and the Forest Service has started to thin some of these kinds of areas. The issue is that it's expensive work.

C: My family helped clean up a stand of trees like that in the 1970s. That stand of trees is almost ready to be harvested. The stand of trees across the road from the one we cleaned up looks like the same trees that were there in the '70s (little to no growth, compared with the thinned stand).

R: It is true that thinning helps grow trees. But waiting from the 1970's to now is a long financial investment for a landowner.

OPPORTUNITIES

Table 1 (Birk, Facilitator)

- Focus on marketable timber products.
- Large scale projects that focus on benefiting several different stakeholders.
- Improve access to timber stands in and outside of the roadless areas.

Table 2 (Dolores, Facilitator)

- Product opportunities: pellets (stove), cedar and lodgepole (not good).
- Laminated wood, charcoal filtering sawdust /chipping; biochar
- Laminated trusses from small timber.

Table 3 (Jonathan, Facilitator)

- Opportunity for commercial firewood permits to clean up areas where stumps/slash interfere with access (i.e. improve utilization)) and maximize use of wood products.
- The forest is ripe for biochar/fuel - what have you. We just need the set up and \$\$.

Table 4 (Colette, Facilitator)

- Wood products can be used as a variety of fuels and mulch type products to reestablish soils. [They] can also be married with other biomass [materials] to diversify the product.
- For the Ashley I would like to see more use for biomass or materials. I would like to see clear cuts and stand replacements.
- Put into plan different ways to use biomass so it can be done in the future.
- Forest plan allow char, torrefaction, pyrolysis, gasification or product for cross combination.
- Forest plan allow areas in roadless areas that could be harvested if roadless rule was reduced.
- Diversification of economy should be reflected in Forest Plan. Forest products, forage, (wildlife & domestic) mining, service/recreation.
- Forest plan needs to consider the use of biochar on site to kill beetles and prevent the spread of further beetle kill. Creating biochar on site would allow for economic diversification, improved risk of wildfire from waste wood, and kill off the bark beetle.

Table 5 (Trent, Facilitator)

- Forest on multiple use while maintaining ecological integrity of all areas. Where possible and economically viable, harvest saw timber in a timely manner. If timber is less quality, utilize other commercially viable purposes of the timber such as biochar and oil from timber pyrolysis.
- Education of public and policy makers. Need for management funding, possible products, biochar for oil pad reclamation.
- Mix with biochar.
- Economy of scale - 9.7% of area (for timber production) can't be economically viable. Do analysis now for what might change in future.
- Need areas outside Wasatch Front to grow to help minimize problems with wildfire growth
- Allow people to take dead wood for fuel or poles - why charge people when it's got no value. Being given away elsewhere.

Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

- Watershed values for wildfire from Ashley.
- Look at potential management areas in the event roadless area rules are relaxed.
- Provide forest products readily available to the public.
- Provide for educational resources - get policy makers on field trips.
- Tending and maintenance activities.
- Improve (non-timber) forest products.
- Diversify economic outputs for the area (not just oil/gas).
- Need to help individual groups and stakeholders understand how their agendas overlap and increase collaboration. Need these groups to be open minded to other stakeholder missions
- Forest management is an opportunity to help population growth outside the Wasatch Front. This could help remedy environmental problems with wildfire growth.
- Increase education of general public and policy makers. Need for management, possible products, benefits, need to fund mgt.
- Biochar is a great opportunity to help reclaim oil pads in the basin.
- Improve watershed. Clear cut to increase valuable recreation opportunities (returning visitors to the forest).
- Diversified communities - what do people appreciate about the forest? Solitude, recreation. Opening up areas for more recreation use. Educate at elementary schools.

Table 6 (Kevin, Facilitator)

- Fire management via chainsaws.
- FS/Chamber of Commerce getting together and helping local loggers.
- Kilns on site.
- Can't just look like more timber.

Table 7 (Megan, Facilitator)

- Want future for the community. Biofuel possibly. Improved road system not just for timber.
- Bio-char - local production and distribution and market statewide.
- High interest in oil and char products.
- Local supply and local need.
- Fuel price stability - wave of local production.
- Opportunity or education external and internal (FS staff) on values and benefits of logging/timber as a management tool and ecological benefit.
- Website, pamphlets, easy to share and understand.
- Lots of local interest in salvage opportunities. Benefit to the forest, too.

DESIRED CONDITIONS

Table 1 (Birk, Facilitator)

- Interact within functions; I.e. wildlife/timber/soils for best use of land.
- More things to produce healthier stands.
- Clear cutting followed by thinning projects.
- Secondary uses behind timber projects: Grazing, wildlife values, watershed improvements, recreation, fuel reduction.
- Improve stand conditions in roadless areas across all FS lands.
- Large project goals and areas.
- Flexibility that leaves openings for change in management direction.

Table 2 (Dolores, Facilitator)

- Harvest areas where the timber value is greater. Example - more ponderosa pine, Engelmann spruce, lodgepole pine, and Douglas fir. Subalpine fir not as valuable to loggers.
- Restore aspen stands.
- Fix fire program accelerated across forest.
- Use overstory removal-clear cut when harvesting in lodgepole pine to reduce mistletoe and blowdown.

Table 3 (Jonathan, Facilitator)

[none noted]

Table 4 (Colette, Facilitator)

- Add value added products like biochar; working with O&G through reclamation.
- Look at forest as a whole. Other resource groups would benefit (like habitat) recognizing vegetation management as a tool: timber, wildlife, agriculture, recreation. Diversification of local economy.
- The forest needs less regulations and roadless/wilderness designation that limit access and product availability. The forest should be a multiple use biologically diverse management.
- Forest plan should recognize new technologies that may use wood products and that those technologies may need to be deployed on forest lands.
- Technology changes quicker than the forest plans therefore the plan needs to be as flexible as possible.
- The forest should be managed for the maximum sustainability with environmental impacts being minimized using sound scientific evidence.
- The plan should address all opportunities for production regardless of designation.
- Look at overall picture that can work for all interested parties but maintain a healthy forest.
- Forest plan should allow or analyze new value-added products such as char/soil supplements. Work with oil and gas companies, agriculture (manure) and loggers to create soil supplements for reclamation and sale.
- Forest plan should analyze acreage in roadless areas that could be suitable for harvest. Areas should be identified up from across all management areas.

Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

- Forest plan should utilize the use of a programmatic EIS to consider a forest wide bark beetle kill treatment. This would allow forest service to quickly respond to new bark beetle outbreak. A desired condition should be reduced bark beetle kill.
- Fire management must be part of the forest products plan and prescribed fire must be part of this.
- Increase areas of NEPA evaluations.
- Use federal money to prevent forest fire vs fighting forest fires. Use forest products (labor) - economic development in Vernal area.
- Forest plan should analyze/value diversification of the local economy. Forest products, agriculture, mining, and recreation and hunting opportunities the forest can provide.

Table 5 (Trent, Facilitator)

- A forest that is resilient to disturbance to the point that it is not affected to the extent that forest product production is not impacted due to wildfire etc. Active Rx fire on large scale. Reduced restrictions for producers to their etc. Forest plan actively promotes value added forest products activities, i.e. char, CLT, etc.
- Plan promotes value added forest products: limit impediments, expedited analysis for cyclic products.
- Allow appropriate harvest methods for timber species. Use management as preventive maintenance for catastrophic events.
- Use Rx burns as a tool for habitat management.
- Monitoring is a collaborative process with stakeholders and agency.
- Keep opportunities open, use bio-char to rehab oil pads.
- See how different stakeholder's agenda meet other stakeholder agendas.
- Need to plan out or the distant future and not just near future.
- Forest plan actively promotes value added and alternative forest products. Limits impediments to utilizing these products. Expedites NEPA evaluation for cyclic products.
- Monitoring becomes a collaborate process with agency personnel and appropriate stakeholders. Improve relationships and understanding.

Table 6 (Kevin, Facilitator)

- Need flexibility in plan. A flexible plan is an output-based plan.
- Want plan to provide sustainable level of timber.
- Biochar kilns on site.
- Allow viable use of waste products or enable use on site.
- Use new science/make econ viable.
- Stewardship projects.
- Access to the resource.
- Timber production lands managed as so. Managed with good science.
- The ANF should be managed and used. Specially designated areas should be inventoried and analyzed. The cooperating agencies need to know the acres and limitations and the inventory of what acres are needed to be measured.
- Flexibility in the plan. Adaptive management.

Attachment 4. Transcribed Table Group Notes

- Outcome based plan.
- Protect aspen, conifer, pinion, juniper that needs to be managed.
- No watershed erosion.

Table 7 (Megan, Facilitator)

- Diverse, local industry interests work together to develop and support a bio-based product economy at the local and regional scale.
- Identify areas where appropriate for complete value-added activities/processing or bio-char products.

OTHER COMMENTS

Table 1 (Birk, Facilitator)

- Opportunities are lost due to roadless areas.
- Cost of timber is too high. Government should reevaluate the price of stumpage.
- Cut the red tape on EAs and EISs.

Table 2 (Dolores, Facilitator)

- Process slash on landing for biochar.

Table 3 (Jonathan, Facilitator)

- Does forest plan dictate logging practices? Roadless is killing logging. We had many more mills than we do now due to wood supply decreasing.

Table 4 (Colette, Facilitator)

[none noted]

Table 5 (Trent, Facilitator)

- If many forest products have little to no value and are being given away elsewhere, why charge the public for harvesting them? E.g. posts, poles, firewood.
- Economy of scale with only 10% of area suitable for timber the industry can't be viable.
- Google this: wildfire risk assessment portal.
- Revise NEPA to more modern methods that include economic purposes for the people.
- Didn't discuss fire - return on investment 50 years, burn = return 200 years. Product where fires will be managed that first. Roadside/campground. Convince politicians of need.
- NEPA makes things hard to be flexible. Building codes prohibitive to laminated timber. Other impediments, - dept. of labor workforce.

Table 6 (Kevin, Facilitator)

- Timber tied up in roadless areas.
- Multiple value, not just timber: RFD, Water, wildlife.
- Partnerships/actual programs.
- More of the money off timber needs to come back to the impacted counties.
- Forests and watersheds should be managed to be healthy not for or to a special designation that prevents the proper management of the timber, the water resources, vegetation resource but for the people of the immediate area first and foremost.
- Cooperating agencies need to be listed to and coordinated with.

Table 7 (Megan, Facilitator)

- Oil: price stability vs natural oil price stability.
- Is there information available? Why is it good for forest management? Why is it good for the economy? Wildfire risk? Encourage better growth; utilize public as management tool.

Unidentified

- The Forest Service should stop [withholding] timber. Operate the Forest Service more like a business.