

USFS Bankhead National Forest Health and Restoration Initiative  
**LIAISON PANEL AND MONITORING WORK GROUPS**

**August 12, 2004 Meeting Summary**

Double Springs Bank Building – Double Springs, Alabama

[www.ces.ncsu.edu/NRLI/Bankhead.html](http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/NRLI/Bankhead.html)

**Bankhead Liaison Panel Members:**

Charles Borden, Forest Resident  
Margret Dunn, Cherokee Tribe of NE Alabama  
Ron Eakes, Alabama Wildlife & Freshwater Fisheries  
Randy Feltman, Logger and Local Resident  
Mike Henshaw, Alabama Cooperative Extension Service  
Quentin Humphries, Winston County Commissioners  
Mary Lee Ratliff, Non-Motorized Recreation  
Vince Meleski, Wild South  
Bill Snoddy, Treasure Forests  
Jeff Still, Motorized Recreation

**USFS Bankhead National Forest Personnel:**

Glen Gaines, District Ranger  
Mike Cook  
Kathy Wallace

**Bankhead Facilitator:**

Mary Lou Addor, *Natural Resources Leadership Institute*

**Interested People/ Other Attendees**

Peggy Armstrong, Landowner  
Bobby Ayers, Local Resident  
Hank Byrnes, Wild South  
Peggy Cobb, Landowner  
Betty Denton, Local Resident  
Tom Green, Alabama A & M University  
Brian and DeAnn Goodwin, Local Residents  
Kevin Holsonback, Alabama Wildlife & Freshwater Fisheries  
Anthony Hood, Local Resident/Hiking  
Stuart Horn, Wild South  
David Kelly, NATRA  
Bob Keener, Local Resident  
Ted Kuzma, Wild South  
Charlie Meek, RC& D Council  
Kozma Naka, Alabama A & M University  
Yolanda Riddle, Landowner  
Dennis Robertson, NATRA  
Wes Stone, Alabama A & M University  
Bob Sullivant, Local Resident  
Joe Tankersley, Local Resident  
Athel Wilhite, Treasure Forests  
Ben and Pat Vail, Local Residents

**August 12, 2004 Meeting Agenda**

Open House: 5:30-6:00pm  
Meeting Orientation: 6:00-6:15pm  
Review of Charter & Group Procedures: 6:15-6:45  
Schedule Future Meetings & Agendas: 6:15-7:30  
Break  
Review Liaison Panel Representation: 7:45-8:00pm  
Facilitation Team Transition: 8:00-8:15  
Forest Health and Restoration Initiative Updates: 8:15-8:30  
Monitoring Group Updates: 8:30-9:00pm  
Evaluation: 9:00-9:15pm

**August 12 Handouts Provided**

- July 8, 2004 Meeting Summary.
- Liaison Panel Ground Rules
- Liaison Panel Group Charter
- Missed Stands: Compartment 80, Stand #16, Vicinity and Scale Maps
- Treatment Area #2 Details
- August 9 Timber & Thinning Monitoring Group Report

## KEY POINTS/ACTION ITEMS/NEXT MEETING DATES AND GOALS:

### Meeting Dates:

1. **Timber & Thinning Monitoring Work Group:** next Field trip is scheduled for August 31 @9:00am, leaving from the District Office in Double Springs to view prescribed burns and have discussions around the topic of prescribed burns.
2. **Recreation Monitoring Work Group:** a meeting will be scheduled prior to the next Liaison Panel meeting to work through Appendix A of the July 8 meeting summary regarding recreation use and needs. The group is also planning a meeting between the USFS regarding Flint Creek Proposal 1 (direction of motorized and non- motorized traffic) developed at the July 8 meeting.
3. **Liaison Panel Meeting Dates:**
  - a. October 19, 2004- Thursday – Location TBD  
Topic: Looting and Desecration of Cultural Resources  
Session Leaders: Jean Allan, Glen Gaines, Margret Dunn, & Gene Gold
  - b. December 9, 2004 - Thursday –Location TBD  
Topic: Future Rec Use in the Bankhead National Forest  
Session Leaders: Mike Cook, Kathy Wallace, Ron Eakes, Mary Lee Ratliff, Jeff Still, Bill Snoddy, & Dennis Robertson.

#### Format Key:

Questions (Q), Responses (R) Comment (C), Liaison Panel (LP), Monitoring Group (MG), Forest Service (FS)

## I. WELCOME/MEETING ORIENTATION

### A. Welcome/Orientation

1. Mary Lou Addor (Natural Resources Leadership Institute) introduced herself, welcomed the Liaison Panel and Monitoring Group members and other guests present. Those in attendance also introduced themselves.
2. Mary Lou went over the meeting objectives and agenda. She also provided a brief explanation of the handouts.

### B. August 12th Meeting Objectives

1. Provide a welcome and orientation, approve prior meeting summary.
2. Encourage public attendance & involvement by anyone who has an interest in the Bankhead National Forest.
3. Review group procedures and make changes if warranted.
4. Determine dates, agendas, and session leaders for future Liaison Panel meetings.
5. Review Liaison Panel representation.
6. Discuss facilitation team transition.
7. Evaluate process management from October 2003 through August 2004.

8. Provide update on the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
9. Provide update on all Monitoring Groups.

### **C. Review July 8<sup>th</sup>, 2004 Meeting Summary**

1. Meeting Summary approved with one changes and posted on the NRLLI website along with presentations and handouts at: [www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html](http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html)
2. Approval of the July 8<sup>th</sup> Meeting Summary with the following changes:
  - a. pg. 12: item #10) Road maintenance, access, and decommissioning  
Status: USFS is working with Gene Gold, Margret Dunn, Faron Weeks, Billy Shaw, and Rob Hurt to decommission part of the road to Indian Tomb Hollow.

## **II. REVIEW OF CHARTER & GROUP PROCEDURES:** Mary Lou Addor

### **A. How to Maintain Open Process to Encourage Public Involvement While At Same Time Maintain Role of Liaison Panel**

1. The Bankhead Liaison Panel meetings have encouraged wider participation of the local community. This increase in participation resulted during discussions of the health and restoration initiative and in particular, during the development of the monitoring groups and respective activities such as subcommittee meetings and field trips. The Bankhead Liaison Panel would like to maintain and encourage this level of participation and yet able to balance what needs to be accomplished at each meeting. During meetings when a majority of the Liaison Panel members have not been in attendance, the local community has contributed greatly to fulfilling the meeting agendas.

The facilitator or session leader will continue to serve as the mechanism that balances public involvement with the activities of the Bankhead Liaison Panel.

### **B. Establish an Attendance Policy for Bankhead Liaison Panel Members**

1. The Bankhead Liaison Panel determined after a brief discussion that the current attendance policy is sufficient:
  - a. absence at the meetings is the equivalent of abstaining (Ground Rule #12).
  - b. members agree to attend all regularly scheduled meetings (Group Charter, V.#1)
  - c. members agree to provide representation at meetings missed if there is a discussion he or she would like to be represented on.
2. The Bankhead Liaison Panel determined that a quorum is not needed to make decisions since each representative has been requested to have alternate present at each meeting or work through an existing member to make his or her views known.
3. One role of the facilitator (or the session leader) is to track attendance (see Liaison Panel Charter, Sec VI II , #9) and to contact members who have missed three or more meetings.

The Bankhead Liaison Panel can take action as deemed necessary.

### C. Discussion on Use of Consensus

1. Concerned was expressed about Liaison Panel ground rule #9- that "consensus means there is no dissent by any member", implying that consensus means unanimity. Consensus does not mean unanimity. Revised #9 to:

To decide, the Liaison Panel will operate by a five finger scale of consensus. Granting "consent" means that each member can live with the decision and support its implementation. (Members hold up the number of fingers to represent his or her level of endorsement of the proposal or decision. "Live with it" means members endorse at a level 4 or higher; at level 3,2, or 1- the group needs to determine what concerns remain for the member and if the group can help member reach a decision they can live with).

5-unqualified yes to the decision. I am excited or enthusiastic about it.

4-I can live with the decision.

3-Concerned with the decision but will not block the group.

2-I think there is a major problem with the decision and choose to block the group's action.

1-It is too soon to make any decision. More work needs to be done before the question can be asked.

\* at the meeting I used a reverse 5 finger scale. Since the Bankhead Liaison Panel used the format listed here during the meetings in 2003, I opted for this format. Either can be used effectively- matter of group preference and familiarity.

### D. Changes to the Liaison Panel Charter

1. Sec I , Mission of the Liaison Panel - will state:

"The USDA Forest Service, National Forests in Alabama, Bankhead National Forest established the Bankhead Liaison Panel in 2000. The Bankhead Liaison Panel is made of individuals that represent a diverse cross section of public interests on the Bankhead National Forest. The goal of the panel is to:

- 1) Learn about forest service projects, plans, health and status of the Bankhead National Forest,
- 2) Communicate clearly with other Liaison Panel members about each others preferences and interests,
- 3) Consider, discuss, act as a sounding board and provide possible solutions to a variety of issues on the Bankhead National Forest".

### III: SCHEDULE FUTURE MEETINGS AND AGENDAS:

#### A. Discussion regarding the number of meetings per year

1. Liaison Panel discussed number of meetings to hold per year.
  - a) In March - those who attended suggested meeting every 6 weeks;
  - b) During the August meeting, several ideas were discussed between meeting every 6 weeks to quarterly);
  - c) Group decided to meet every 2 months or meet 6 times per year. This allows the session leader or the facilitator, the steering committee, and any subcommittees time to prepare for the next meeting.

#### B. Determination of Topic Schedule

1. Criteria to determine scheduling of topics:
  - a) Timing: when does it make sense to discuss topic?
  - b) Level of Bankhead Liaison Panel and public interest
  - c) Environmental need

#### C. Future Meeting Agendas

##### 1. Interpretative Center:

- a) Take about 1 hour
  - b) Provide an progress report on what the center is, what is being done, and anticipated time for completion.
  - c) Include time for questions and response
- **Action:** table topic at this time per recommendation of USFS as not much to report on

##### 2. Looting and Desecration of Cultural Resources

- a) Format: Presentation from the USFS and Tribal
    - What are the types of current cultural resources on the BBNF
    - What damage is occurring to these resources
    - What current actions are being taken to mitigate or prevent the damage?
    - What future actions need to be taken?
    - What course of outreach is needed? Marketing?
- **Action:** schedule for October 19- Thursday - location and time TBD
  - **Action:** session Leaders: Jean Allan, Glen Gaines, Margaret Dunn, Gene Gold

##### 3. Future Rec Use

- a) Discussion Points:
  - A current and timely subject
  - Lot of interest in this subject
  - Stick to one subject for awhile before introducing another one
- b) Format: Presentation from the USFS and Community Leaders
  - USFS present on future use and trends
  - Invite the Alabama Tourism Division to provide a presentation on current recreational demand for the three counties and forecast known trends
  - Suggestion: gather info from vendors, in particular regarding rec use and economic forecasts

- Concern: vendor data may be skewed to a particular industry - need to work with USFS and ATD as to how best to incorporate respective industry data.
- Include presentation on illegal rec use
- Rec subcommittee prepare some strategies to prevent illegal rec use
- Education to prevent illegal use
- **Action:** Schedule meeting for December 9,2004 - Thursday -location and time TBD
- **Action:** Session Leaders: Ron Eakes- hunting; Mary Lee- non-motorized use; Jeff Still and Dennis Robertson- motorized use; Mike Cook and Jean Allan- USFS Rec use; Bill Snoddy;

#### 4. Expansion of Bankhead National Forest

##### a) Discussion Points:

- to meet future rec demand
- to meet other use demand

##### b) Format: Presentation from the USFS and Community Leaders

- Historical perspective
- Proclamations
- Current Rec Use
- Future Rec Use
- Review Boundaries and potential modification of the boundaries
- Land Availability
- Review if current forest is being used/managed to potential - how much of BHNF can be used that is not being used
- Safe guarding property rights

##### • **Action:**

- table topic as framed. If group wants to discuss how to meet current and future rec demand or other use demand- determine what the future use will be and what capacity will be needed to support the respective use. Look at demand then how to approach the demand.

## IV. REVIEW LIAISON PANEL REPRESENTATION

### A. Representation of Interests on the Bankhead Liaison Panel or Through Current Membership (i.e., missing interests; not attending meetings or sending alternates).

#### 1. Discussion Points:

- a) Liaison Panel members are encouraged to have an alternate;
- b) members are encouraged to have some represent them at the meetings if an alternate cannot be designated and let the group know who the representative is;
- c) Jeff Still will represent motorized rec use and still serve as alternate for non-rec use with Mary Lee. Mary Lee will serve as Jeff's alternate.
- d) Anthony Woods will serve as alternate to Mike Henshaw.

## V: FACILITATION TEAM TRANSITION

### A. Local Facilitation Team

- 1) The Forest Service is in the process of determining a local resource to provide process management and facilitation service to the Bankhead Liaison Panel based on the resource list Mary Lou provided. In the meanwhile, session leaders from the Bankhead Liaison Panel assisted by the US Forest Service will conduct the upcoming meetings schedule for October and December 2004.

## VI: UPDATE: FOREST HEALTH AND RESTORATION INITIATIVE - Glen Gaines.

### A. Missed Stand - Compartment 80, Stand 16.

- 1) Based on Compartment 80 vicinity and scale maps, stand 16 was missed as a potential thinning site under the recent EIS. Members of the Bankhead Liaison Panel posed no objections to the Forest Service in seeking a categorical exclusion on stand 16. Information on Stand 16 will go before the public in the formal NEPA process.

### B. Treatment Block #2

- 1) Handout distributed detailing the type of treatment that would occur, when, and to which area and compartment on the Bankhead National Forest. Please refer to handout for further details.

## VII: UPDATE: MONITORING GROUPS - Vince Meleski, Bill Snoddy, Ron Eakes, Jeff Still. & Faron Weeks.

### A. Timber and Monitoring Work Group Presentation: Mike Henshaw, Vince Meleski, & Stuart Horn.

1. The Timber & Thinning Monitoring Group provided a report on the August 9, 2004 field trip. The following recommendations resulted from the trip:

#### a) Recommendations:

- 1) Based on our observations, we recommend to the Forest Service that a training plan or at least a training checklist be developed to inform Forest Service operators of goals, plans and expected outcomes of such projects. We believe the Forest Service would do this rehabilitation differently if they had to do it again. We recommend training all operators before beginning similar jobs. We also recommend at a minimum that they should be informed to pull excess soil (old or new) back onto the field; spread limbs, small trees and brush rather than piling them; mix seed and spread seed according to the desired result; be aware of property lines and

spread material on Forest Service land rather than piling at the line; and not rehabilitate sloped land that will erode;

- 2) The team recommends that the Forest service put in some bars to direct runoff from the sloping road in order to reduce erosion and keep the runoff from flowing through the wild life opening.
- 3) The team recommends to make access roads as narrow as possible; minimizing or defining the size of landing and loading areas; spreading slash evenly over the sight; be careful of damaging remaining trees.
- 4) The team recommends that project leaders should be expected to train operators or contractors in accordance with the information before beginning projects. If on future projects new lessons are learned, they should then be incorporated into the training material so that the mistakes are made only one time.

**B. Recreation Monitoring Group:** - Jeff Still and Mary Lee Ratliff

1. The recreation group is currently setting up a time to meet with the USFS regarding the Flint Creek Proposal 1 discussed at the July 8th meeting. The recreation group is also planning to meet and work out some of the missing details regarding Appendix A from the July 8 meeting summary.

**C. Desired Future Conditions:** - Bill Snoddy

1. The Desired Future Condition group has not met since December and does not expect to until the group is ready to discuss the next phase of the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative.

**D. Wildlife Group** - Ron Eakes

1. The Wildlife Monitoring Group has not met since December and does not expect to. Currently technical monitoring efforts are occurring on the Bankhead which may be more time consuming than the public would like to engage in. The public however can check in with the USFS regarding the status of this effort and to determine if there is a role.

**E. Cultural Monitoring Group** - Faron Weeks

1. The Cultural Monitoring Group met in August with the USFS. Faron Weeks not available to provide a report to the Liaison Panel.

## VIII: ITEMS OF INTEREST:

1. Final Report submitted to the US Forest Service and the Bankhead Community by the Natural Resources Leadership Institute and RESOLVE is online at:  
[www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html](http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html)
2. The National Forest Service provides an online glossary of ecosystem management terms to assist in learning about agency and scientific words. A glossary can assist in facilitating communication between citizens, management, and scientists. The glossary is located at:  
[www.fs.fed.us/land/emterms.html](http://www.fs.fed.us/land/emterms.html)

## Appendix A: Bankhead Liaison Panel Ground Rules:

Developed January 2003 and Revised August 2004

1. Only one person will speak at a time and no one will interrupt when another person is speaking.
2. Each person will express his or her own views rather than speaking for others at the table.
3. No one will make personal attacks or issue statements blaming others for specific actions or outcomes.
4. People will avoid extended comments and questions to allow everyone a fair chance to speak and to contribute.
5. Each person will try to stay on track with the agenda, to respect time limits, and to move the deliberations forward.
6. People should expect, respect, and try to accept different interests, perspectives, and opinions.
7. Everyone will limit sidebar conversations.
8. Members will engage actively – share information ideas and concerns.
9. To decide, the Liaison Panel will operate by a five finger scale of consensus. Granting “consent” means that each member can live with the decision and support its implementation. (Members hold up the number of fingers to represent his or her level of endorsement of the proposal or decision. "Live with it" means members endorse at a level 4 or higher; at level 3,2, or 1- the group needs to determine what concerns remain for the member and if the group can help member reach a decision they can live with).  
  
5-unqualified yes to the decision. I am excited or enthusiastic about it.  
4-I can live with the decision.  
3-Concerned with the decision but will not block the group.  
2-I think there is a major problem with the decision and choose to block the group's action.  
1-It is too soon to make any decision. More work needs to be done before the question can be asked.
10. With the right to offer consent or express dissent as a Liaison Panel member, comes the responsibility of making clear the reasons for dissent and try to offer an alternative proposal satisfactory to other members.
11. Members should remain at the table during deliberations to hear the full discussions so their judgments are informed when decision-making occurs. Members may also choose not to consent on a decision, but to abstain without offering dissent.
12. Absence will be equivalent to abstaining.

## **Appendix B: Liaison Panel Group Charter** (only first page to detail revisions)

Developed February 4, 2003, Revised August 12, 2004

### **I. Mission of the Liaison Panel**

1. The USDA Forest Service, National Forests in Alabama, Bankhead National Forest established the Bankhead Liaison Panel in 2000. The Bankhead Liaison Panel is made of individuals that represent a diverse cross section of public interests on the Bankhead National Forest. The goal of the panel is to:
  - 4) Learn about forest service projects, plans, health and status of the Bankhead National Forest,
  - 5) Communicate clearly with other Liaison Panel members about each others preferences and interests,
  - 6) Consider, discuss, act as a sounding board and provide possible solutions to a variety of issues on the Bankhead National Forest".

The Liaison Panel aspires to develop solutions that are acceptable to all panel members or at least to a large majority of the members. The Panel meetings are open to the public and the meetings provide a forum for the public to come together to learn, discuss and help resolve difficult land management issues.

### **II. A. Short Term Objective (January - December 2003)**

The short-term objective of the Liaison Panel is to provide recommendations to the Forest Service on the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative.

- 1) Learn about Bankhead Forest Health and share information about the alternatives proposed to meet the desired future conditions.
- 2) Discuss concerns and viewpoints about the proposed alternatives and their possible impacts,
- 3) Communicate each other's preferences and interests about the proposed Forest Health Initiative alternatives.
- 4) Identify criteria for evaluating the alternative plans,
- 5) Narrow disagreements regarding Forest Health and Restoration Initiative alternatives,
- 6) Agree on one proposed alternative as a recommendation to the U.S. Forest Service, the agreement will be documented in a meeting summary.



## Appendix C: Timber and Thinning Team Field Trip August 9, 2004

Attending: Tom Counts, John Creed, Glen Gaines, Mike Henshaw, Stewart Horn, Vince Meleski

We met at 8:00am at the USFS Double Springs office. Tom Counts made a presentation of the plan for maintaining wildlife openings in the Bankhead National Forest. He uses a spread sheet to keep up with the status of each location maintained by the USFS. In the Black Warrior Wildlife Management Area, the state of Alabama also maintains many wildlife openings. The goal is to mow openings about every three years when funding is available. If they become overgrown, they are rehabilitated. This is what was undertaken adjacent to the Compartment 148 Stand 46 thinning site. Rehabilitation involves bulldozing small trees and brush no longer able to be cut with a bush hog. This material is moved to the edge of the site and spread out. The process, the USFS plans and pictures of multiple sites were presented.

After the presentation, the group went to Compartment 148 Stand 46 to view the wild life opening. Overall the site was well covered with the crops that had been planted. It had suffered erosion from runoff from the road leading in to the site, which washed across the opening, and from a slope in one corner. The piles of soil and brush along the far side of the field and along the property line were viewed. Also the area where water had accumulated was viewed. Quail, deer, and turkey are already using the opening. We saw the wildlife and their tracks. **Recommendations:** *Based on our observations, we recommend to the Forest Service that a training plan or at least a training checklist be developed to inform Forest Service operators of goals, plans and expected outcomes of such projects. We believe the Forest Service would do this rehabilitation differently if they had to do it again. We recommend training all operators before beginning similar jobs. We also recommend at a minimum that they should be informed to pull excess soil (old or new) back onto the field; spread limbs, small trees and brush rather than piling them; mix seed and spread seed according to the desired result; be aware of property lines and spread material on Forest Service land rather than pilling at the line; and not rehabilitate sloped land that will erode.*

Next we viewed the thinning operation at this location. The results were very good. The slash left covering the bare ground from the logging operation was effective in preventing erosion. Plant growth throughout the thinned area was proceeding well. The dried stream bed at the bottom of a cut slope showed no erosion from the forest Service Project, however erosion was observed coming into the stream below the thinning site from an old clear cut on private land. This clearly demonstrated the benefits of best management practices and efforts to prevent erosion. The riparian zone was not impacted by the thinning. No erosion was seen entering the riparian zone from the thinning operation. The loading area was only slightly vegetated from the wild life opening planting. The USFS commented that they disked the loading area, but that their disc was not heavy enough to break up the compacted soil. The contractor will come in and disc the soil and plant it during the fall planting season. He will also seed any bare areas in the thinned area. The access road entering this site looked as it did before the thinning except that it has eroded more. **Recommendations:** *the team recommends that the Forest service put in some bars to direct runoff from the sloping road in order to reduce erosion and keep the runoff from flowing through the wild life opening.*

We next went to the thinned longleaf site at Compartment 148 Stand 10. The same contractor performed this thinning, but the results were different. The access road was very wide. It appeared to be excessively wide and paved with more gravel than necessary. The landing and loading area appeared to be larger than the area used at Stand 46. It is a significant compacted opening. A major skidder trail lead up a slope to the loading area and we expected to see an erosion problem as a result of its appearance. However the trail moved around a marked ephemeral stream and due to the use of slash over the trail, there was no noticeable erosion entering the ephemeral stream. Vehicles had not passed through the identified riparian areas. We went over and followed the edge of the thinning site that ran along a canyon corridor. The 100ft zone left back from the bluff line appeared to be adequate to provide protection for the canyon and appeared to be providing adequate shade for the stream in the canyon. There seemed to be quite a few more skinned trees than on the first site.

John Creed reported that the contractor had been penalized for damaging trees. Also the duff layer did not appear to be evenly applied. Close to the loading site, duff was more than adequate. Further from the loading site the duff was thin or missing. This site was thinned at a later date than the first site and combined with a closed over-story, did not show the amount of vegetation growth as the first site did. **Recommendations:** *make access roads as narrow as possible; minimizing or defining the size of landing and loading areas; spreading slash evenly over the sight; be careful of damaging remaining trees.*

The last visit was to wild life opening 31-3 near Holmes Chapel. Tom Counts explained that this opening was also rehabilitated this year and was done as desired. There were minimal piles of soil on the perimeter of the field. Brush was spread evenly on the ground going away from the field. The ground cover was good. The site was basically flat. This site indicated that a site can be prepared suitably.

The team felt that there were good lessons to be learned from the field trip on both the wild life openings and thinning sites. We found several things that had not occurred as desired and efforts will be made to do these as planned in future operations. **Recommendations:** *the team recommends that the Forest Service develop a training plan or training check list that will cover items that need to be understood before beginning work on projects so that lessons are not learned from making mistakes. The benefit of past learning can be passed on to Forest Service employees and contractors. As a minimum, each lesson learned in these two undertakings should be included in the training material. It should be documented. Project leaders should be expected to train operators or contractors in accordance with the information before beginning projects. If on future projects new lessons are learned, they should then be incorporated into the training material so that the mistakes are made only one time.*

The team believes that the thinning projects should be implemented with minimum impact to the forest. The goal should be to have quick recovery to worked areas with minimal impact. Also by having a documented training procedure, which can be simple and not complicated, the performance of the Forest Service can be continually improving their performance and not suffering from inventing the wheel over and over again.

Stewart Horn

Mike Henshaw

Vince Meleski