

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

May 04, 2004 Meeting Summary

Farmers and Traders Bank Building - Double Springs, Alabama

www.ces.ncsu.edu/NRLI/Bankhead.html

Liaison Panel Members:

Charles Borden, Forest Resident
Ron Eakes, Alabama Wildlife & Freshwater Fisheries Division
Randy Feltman, Logger and Local Resident
Mike Henshaw, Alabama Cooperative Extension Service
Randall LouAllan, Lawrence County Commissioners
Vince Meleski, Wild South
Mary Lee Ratliff, Recreation Interests
Bill Snoddy, Treasure Forests
Jeff Still, Recreation Interests (Alternate)
Keith Tassin, Nature Conservancy
Faron Weeks, Bankhead Cultural & Historical Society

Interested People/ Other Attendees

Walter Arrey, AM&M University
Peggy Armstrong, Local Resident
Bobby Ayers, Local Resident
Allen Edwards, Local Resident
Connie Edwards, Local Resident
Vicki Gerstman, Local Resident
Anthony Hood, Local Resident
Stuart Horn, Wild South
Rory Frazer, AM&M University
Daw Frazer, Huntsville Resident
David Kelly, NATRA
Richard Linholm, Local Resident
Dennis Robertson, NATRA
Joe Tankersley, Local Resident
Athel Wilhite, Local Resident

USFS Bankhead National Forest Personnel:

Glen Gaines, Bankhead District Ranger
Mike Cook, Trails Specialists
John Creed, Bankhead Ranger

Facilitators:

Mary Lou Addor, Natural Resources Leadership Institute
Steve Smutko, Natural Resources Leadership Institute

Meeting Agenda May 04, 2004 5:30pm - 9:30pm
† Open House
† Welcome/Meeting Orientation
† Update on Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
† Update on Monitoring Groups <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Past Activities- Starting New Groups
† Approaches to Deal with Missed Timber Stands
† Presentation: Bankhead Trails
† Next Steps: Meeting Dates and Agenda
LIAISON PANEL AND MONITORING WORK GROUPS

May 04 Handouts Provided
• March 20, 2004 Meeting Summary.
• Updated Monitoring Work Groups Contact and Description Information.
• Example of a Monitoring Effort in Montana: Collaboration for Community and Forest Well-Being in the Upper Swan Valley, Montana.
• Bankhead National Forest Outdoor Recreation Opportunities
• Executive Summary: Bankhead National Forest
• Final FY 2004 Sale Plan
<i>May 04, 2004 MEETING SUMMARY</i>

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

Meeting Dates:

1. **Timber and Thinning Monitoring Work Group Meeting:** will meet Thursday, May 10, Double Springs, Alabama, from 12:00 - 6:00pm. The group met at the US Forest Service Headquarters, 12:00pm, and then at 12:30pm, Brushy Lake. Expected to attend are members from each of the Monitoring Work Groups. A member of this group (John Creed, Ron Eakes, Randy Feltman, Glen Gaines, Mike Henshaw, Stuart Horn, Vince Meleski, Mary Ratliff or Jeff Still, Keith Tassin, and Faron Weeks or someone else) will report out at the July 8 meeting. Members will also decide on dates to meet in June and July for the other sales.
2. **Recreation Monitoring Work Group Meeting:** will meet Tuesday, May 18th, Madison, Ala at the Greenbrier BBQ beginning at 6:00pm. Expected to attend: Mike Cook, Connie or Allen Edwards, David Kelly, Mary Ratliff, Dennis Robertson, and Jeff Still. The purpose of the meeting is to consider trail needs; consider the needs of other users in the proposal as well as potential impacts to the forest; and sources of funding to support any proposed changes. During the July 8th meeting, a member of this group will report on the discussions and proposed ideas.
3. **Liaison Panel and Monitoring Group Meeting:** Thursday, July 8th, Moulton, Ala. Community Recreation Center from 5:30- 9:00pm. **Proposed Agenda:**
 - a. **Meeting Orientation: 5:30-5:45pm**
 - Review of Meeting Objectives
 - Review of Meeting Ground Rules
 - Review/ Approval of May 4th Meeting Summary
 - b. **Recreation Monitoring Group: Presentation and Discussion on Trails 5:45-7:30pm**
BREAK
 - c. **Timber and Thinning Monitoring Group: Presentation on May 10th and June Meeting and 7:30-7:45pm**
 - d. **Update on Forest Health and Restoration Initiative. 7:45-8:30**
 - † Status of Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
 - † Status of potential list of questions regarding impacts of prescribed burns on soils. *Stuart Horn*
 - † Status of project to determine how market value is determined for loggers and the USFS: what are the differences, if any? How might this differences impact the bidding process? Site performance? Other concerns? *Rory Frazer*
 - d. **Schedule sequence of topics for future meetings, including next meeting and agenda. 8:30-9:00pm**

Format Key:

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

I. WELCOME/MEETING ORIENTATION

A. Welcome

1. Mary Lou Addor and Steve Smutko (Natural Resources Leadership Institute), introduced themselves, 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 and Liaison Panel Notebook distributed at the meeting.

B. May 4th Meeting Objectives

1. Provide a brief welcome and orientation.
2. Continue to encourage attendance by anyone who has an interest in the Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative to attend the meeting.
3. Provide an update on the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
 - a. Present areas where timber stands were missed during current EIS
 - b. Explore mechanisms and approaches to deal with the missed stands.
4. Provide an update on Timber and Thinning Monitoring Group Reports
5. Discuss ways other Monitoring Work Groups can begin to engage with each other.
6. Review presentation on Bankhead Trails:
 - a. What is a trail
 - b. Types of Trails (uses)
 - c. Support needed to maintain trails
 - d. New Trails (demand for; maintenance required; environmental considerations; support facilities; and how to deal with illegal activities.

C. Review of March 20, 2004 Meeting Summary

1. Meeting Summary approved with changes and posted on the NRLI website at: www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html
2. The March 20 Meeting Summary was approved with the following changes: page 3, section titled Implementation Phase, point #1 will read:
The initial timber thinnings are out for bids. Bids are due by 9:30am on March 30, 2004 in the Bankhead National Forest District Office (bid is for one sale of 107 acres- was initially 150 acres but sale takes into consideration streamside management zones, bluff zones, and areas damaged by SPB that are not operable).
3. Mary Lou briefly introduced the monitoring report written by members of the Timber and Thinning Monitoring Field Team. The report describes activities of a monitoring field trip held March 9, 2004. It is attached to the March 20 meeting summary.

II. UPDATE: STATUS OF BANKHEAD FOREST HEALTH AND RESTORATION PROJECT - John Creed

A. Status of Current Timber Sales (refer to handout on FY 2004 Sale, Appendix A):

1. John Creed provided a status report on timber sales scheduled for 2004 on the Bankhead.
 - a. Compartment 148: Operator started work on Compartment 148, first timber sale.
 - b. Compartment 157: scheduled for bids on May 11, 2004. (26acs total).
 - c. Compartments 15, 16, & 17: marking crews have completed sale prep work on Compartments 15,16, & 17 and are working on three other sales. Suggest the Monitoring Team look at the preparation these compartments because these are the first sales in Area 1. One of the stands will be converted to Hardwood with this treatment. (Most of the pines will be removed).
 - d. Field work continuing on hardwood prepared acres to determine where the most need is and what approach to take on the ground to improve the oak/hickory component.
 - e. Preparing 300 acres for a drum chopping contract this summer with planting to occur this winter.
 - f. Shortleaf on most sites, longleaf on one site.
 - g. Coordinating work with Alabama A&M and the Southern Research Station (Callie Schweitzer) on research projects to make comparisons between: thinning in stands with burning; thinning with out burning, and controlled burn.
 - h. FY 2004 Final Sale Handout (Appendix A): Changes - Compartment (C) 32 is rescheduled for 2007 and C159 for 2008. Compartments 94/95 and C104/116 reschedule for 2004.

B. Discussion: Questions, Comments, Responses.

Q: How does shortleaf pine fit into this? Why are we working to bring shortleaf back? It surprises me - did not realize shortleaf was a naturally occurring species in that area.

R: Area 2, as we discussed last year, will be restored to shortleaf pine where southern pine beetle infestation was a problem. We spent several meetings discussing restoration of shortleaf pine. Out of 300 ac to be planted, about 240 will be shortleaf. Eventually, about 7% of the forest will be restored to shortleaf or about 1,000 ac.

C. A thinning sale is planned in Compartments 15, 16, and 17 for June 2004. Suggest the thinning monitoring team look at the sale prior to its sale. Stand 11 in Compartment 15 will be converted to hardwood. This is something that you have not seen before.

C. How did the bid go last month? We had two bidders and one bid was successful. The pulp market dropped just the week before, making the bidders a bit wary.

III. UPDATE: TIMBER AND THINNING MONITORING WORK GROUP - Randy Feltman, Mike Henshaw, and Vince Meleski.

A. Timber and Monitoring Work Group Presentation: Team Leadership - Randy Feltman, Mike Henshaw, & Vince Meleski

1. Attached to the March 20 Meeting Summary is a report from the Timber and Thinning Work Group regarding the March 9 timber sale.
2. PowerPoint presentation provided with pictures on both the March 9 and March 20 monitoring field trips. (See Appendix C for presentation). Vince and Mike provided narration to the presentation and took time to address questions others had.
3. Vince reminded the group that Rory Frazer from Alabama A&M will be working on a project to look at the economics of USFS timber sales

B. Engaging Other Monitoring Work Groups (Refer to Monitoring Work Group Handout, Appendix B). Mary Lou

1. Mary Lou described the monitoring work group program and using the timber thinning performance work group as an example.
2. The Timber and Thinning Work Group requested that the other monitoring groups begin to engage and look at the restoration sites to be sure that wildlife, cultural, desired future conditions, and recreation objectives of the plan are upheld. These groups need to organize and get working now.
3. Comments and Suggestions Organizing the Other Monitoring Work Groups:
 - a. These other committees need a little time to get together and talk about what they are going to do, possibly with the help of the Forest Service (FS) personnel, but remaining independent of the FS. The thinning work group, for example, met before attending the field trip to determine its goals.
 - b. The other groups need to get out now, before the sites are cut or burned. All groups can tour the sites together, each looking at our own specific topic areas.
 - c. Monitoring needs to occur on the burned areas - a pre-inspection and a post-inspection of each burn.
 - d. The Recreation Monitoring Group may need to look beyond the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative, broadening their scope to other FS activities in the Bankhead that impact recreation. For example, they could address the unauthorized use of trails and other unauthorized activities
 - e. The Cultural Monitoring Group also has a role in these restoration sites to coordinate with the FS and oversee the activities. These site visits are open to the public and are publicized. Also the Wildlife Monitoring Group also has a responsibility. There was a good turnout on March 9. If all monitoring groups send one representative to each potential activity date - this should work. Also, need to continue to publicize these outings and monitoring events so that others in the community feel that they can join and contribute in identifying concerns or providing suggestions.

4. To provide an opportunity to structure the Work Groups, those in attendance agreed to meet again on May 10th and then determine the next dates to meet in June and July for the upcoming sales.
5. Discussion occurred on how to inform people of monitoring activities. The FS will continue to mail announcements to those on its database and publish announcements in the newspaper. In addition, as long as the Natural Resources Leadership Institute (NCSU) is part of this project, NRLI will continue to send out emails and faxes with distribution of the meeting summaries.

C. Other Comments and Suggestions

1. Recreation users need current information in order to know which trails are open.
2. Recreational pressure for motorized use is growing tremendously, though the use is concentrated in one small area. Overuse is starting to degrade the trails. Clubs are managing trails on private lands.
3. Enforcement of regulations is another issue. For instance, motorized vehicles are using areas they are restricted from using. In addition, noise is a problem.

IV. ADDITIONAL THINNINGS - John Creed

A. Presentation on Additional Thinnings

1. During the March 20 meeting, the group discussed thinning stands that did not make the FHRI EIS for various reasons (refer to the March 20 Meeting Summary for further detail). The additional stands refer to Compartment 92, Stands 4 & 28, and Compartment 116, Stand 6. Presentation slides depict location of compartments on the district. Sales are already planned for Compartments 92 and 116 this year.
2. Need to determine whether to include the additional stands with the upcoming sales or with future sales. The FS would like to get a sense from those in attendance this evening as to his or her preferences. Suggest using the direction the EIS set for Desired Future Conditions to assist with the decision.
3. Because the stands were not covered during the recent Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), a NEPA process is required. There is a NEPA vehicle called a Categorical Exclusion (CE) that can be used for projects like this. With this process, we would scope the proposal with the public; conduct a Biological Survey and Cultural Resource Survey; and prepare a Biological Evaluation and Cultural Resource Report. Based on the scoping comments, the outcome of the surveys and reports, a decision would be made in a timely fashion (though it cannot be appealed).
4. Compartment 116, Stand 6: Large portion of Stand 6, Compartment 116 was left out. The EIS accounts for 24 acres, but in reality another 69 acres need to be included in sale. This portion of the stand is significantly overstocked and needs to be thinned.

5. Compartment 92, Stands 4 & 28: Compartment 92, Stands 4 and 28 were not included in the EIS, but need to be. Need to open up these areas for wildlife. Thin to 60 sq. ft. basal area as specified in Alternative 5.

B. Discussion: Questions, Responses, and Comments

Q: if you have a stand at 80sf basal area, and thin to 60sf, that seems to be a losing operation.

R: this stand is not at 80sf, it's closer to 100 sf. The idea is to reduce the risk to southern pine beetle.

Q: How many total acres?

R: Stand 4 is 60 acres (actual treatment area is 55 ac), and Stand 28 is 75 acres (actual treatment area is 65 ac). The preference is to include these stands in the adjacent sales to avoid reopening roads.

C: Because these stands were not included in the EIS, we have to go through the NEPA process. Some key decisions about these stands are included in the EIS. Hence, these may fall under a Categorical Exclusion (CE). In the CE process, we would scope the proposal to the public (a normal NEPA scoping process) and receive public input. At the same time, undergo the biological and other surveys and reports. This information is used to inform FS decision.

C: The current stand is predominantly loblolly. What FS is proposing to do is a thinning, with a desired future condition of hardwood. The primary species would be oak and hickory, with longleaf and shortleaf being the primary pines. The same prescriptions as the other stands.

Q: When the FS marks the original stands for thinning, how did the FS treatment acreage compare with its planned acreage under the plan?

R: It was less in all cases. Right now, the FS is running about 30% under projected treatment acreage specified in the plan. The FS was hoping for 1,000 acres in 2004, but will be only get 700 acres.

Q: We were talking about opening up some of the areas for wildlife. Are we still planning to do this? Will this proposal add to that?

R: Yes. The areas will be opened for wildlife. These stands will add to actual treatment areas but will not increase treatment areas over the original 9,452 due to acres being set aside for Stream Management Zones, blufflines, etc.

Q: Is the FS asking for recommendations on this? If so, though the CE process has been quite controversial, as long as this process is not being abused, then suggest including stands as part of current sales. It seems to make sense.

C: There is opposition to using the CE, because it takes the public out of the process (although part of NEPA process- a CE cannot be appealed).

R: The FS intent is not to abuse the use of CE, that is why the FS is requesting to have a

sense from those in attendance as to whether the proposal to include with current sales makes sense.

C: CE could be abused in some circumstances, but does not appear to apply here. It directly coincides with the restoration plan, and gets the areas to the desired future condition.

Q: What is the possibility of finding more missed stands?

R: More stands will be found. Missed stands are often located during the planning of a sale, when the FS gets to the micro level of working with the site prep of the various compartments. The FS probably will propose the use of the Categorical Exclusion (CE) process on other missed stands. The CE process seems to be the most efficient method to meet NEPA requirements on missed stands that will fall within the context of this EIS. The FS wants to keep each annual sale in front of the public. In the future, FS will get ahead of future sales and have more time to plan for missed stands.

C: It may be advantageous to encourage wildlife at some point in the future and FS could go in and clean some of these stands for that purpose without using the CE process.

R: Yes, that is right, FS can probably do that.

C: Remember, this is only a 5-year plan, so that we will be operating under another EIS in the future.

C: We all need to be thinking about the next steps beyond the 5-year plan. The Desired Future Condition Monitoring Group should be thinking about the loblolly pine stands over 40 years old. These stands have the same inherent risk for southern pine beetle infestation as the current high-risk areas. There are about 25,000 ac in this condition.

C: This kind of situation seems to be what the CE is used for. If you had not missed these stands when doing the initial assessment, they would have included them in the first place. It makes sense to be using the CE process for this.

C: Please inform the public, the Monitoring Groups, and the Liaison Panel of each one as they come up in order not to agree to a blanket categorical exclusion.

C: Also - this kind of decision needs to go before the large public as much as possible so others are aware. The Monitoring Groups, members of the community in attendance, and the Liaison Panel contribute to informing decision-making - but so should the public as much as possible.

V. BANKHEAD TRAIL SYSTEM - Mike Cook

A. Discussion: Questions, Responses, and Comments

1. Mike Cook provided a presentation on the Bankhead Trail System. Handouts and fact sheets provided on recreational trails in the Bankhead. (Refer to Appendix D for presentation handout).
 - a. What is a trail
 - b. Types of Trails (uses)
 - c. Support needed to maintain trails
 - d. New Trails (demand for; maintenance required; environmental considerations support facilities; and how to deal with illegal activities).

B. Discussion: Questions, Responses, and Comments

Q: Could you put trail closures on the FS website? Sometimes users travel a far distance only to find the trails closed.

R: FS has asked website folks in Montgomery to be more current. It is a challenge. It is not in the District hands to make the website work. The best thing to do is to call the district ranger office before traveling to the site. The district ranger office has hired someone who works on Saturdays just for this purpose.

C: Please inform the Montgomery Office to date the information loaded to website, so people can decide whether to call or use the information on the website.

R: FS also encourages clubs to post this information on their own websites.

C: Several comments were made about how to maintain motorized trail safety: mostly around width of trail and speed of vehicles on Flint Creek Trail.

C: Request that the Recreation Monitoring Work Group meet to discuss how to handle topics such as current use of trails, new trails, and ideas on how to deal with restricted and illegal activities.

VI. Future Topics of Discussion -Mary Lou (Did not have time for)

A. Topics for Future Discussion: (not listed in order of importance- see criteria for determining how to schedule topics of discussion)

1. Trail needs on the Bankhead (Horseback Riding, ATV, Hiking)
2. Updates on scientific research projects and studies
3. Unmanaged Recreational Activities (illegal use)
4. Management of stands not included in the current EIS
5. Next steps toward Desired Future Conditions: Hardwood Component and other loblolly opine stands.
6. Looting of Cultural Resources
7. Wildlife Habitat Plantings
8. Road maintenance, access and decommissioning
9. Safeguarding property rights
10. Sustainable economic development
11. Anticipating Emerging Issues
12. User Conflicts
13. Invasive species
14. Oil and gas extraction; coal mining
15. Expanding Community Outreach

B. Determination of Topic Schedule

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

VII: Next Meeting: July 8th, 2004, Proposed Meeting Agenda

Listed on Page 3

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
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

Appendix A: FY 2004 Bankhead National Forest Timber Sale Plan

Compartment #	Planned Acres	Actual Acres	Remarks
148	150	107	SOLD
157	32	26	Bid Date May 11, 2004

15			
16			
17			
Sale Acres	215	178	Planned Bid in June

68			
92			
124			
Sale Acres	424	182	Planned Bid in Early July

163			
164			
Sale Acres	150	71	Planned Bid in Late July

94			
95			
Sale Acres	397	195	Planned Bid in August

104			
116			
Sale Acres	207		Planned Bid in September

Note: FY 2004 Final Sale Handout (Appendix A): Changes - Compartment (C) 32 is rescheduled for 2007 and C159 for 2008. Compartments 94/95 and C104/116 reschedule for 2004.

Appendix B: Monitoring Work Groups, Activities, and Participants

BANKHEAD FOREST HEALTH AND RESTORATION INITIATIVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION WORK GROUPS: WORKING DRAFT MARCH 20, 2004

Monitoring Work Groups and Interested Parties: A brief description of the monitoring group goals, the five monitoring work groups, and individuals, who have indicated an interest in participating in the work group, follows. The following guidelines USFS, in consultation with the Liaison Panel and other parties who indicate an interest, are establishing procedures and leadership of the work groups for determining the final composition of work groups and other aspects of work group operations.

Monitoring Work Groups Goals:

- a) Monitor progress and performance of the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative;
- b) Identify and confirm what the USFS said it would do;
- c) Develop an ongoing learning process with community members;
- d) Attend meetings/ field trips;
- e) Document learnings and monitoring observations;
- f) Follow through on action items;
- g) Establish operating structure for accountability such as co-leadership;
- h) Members may come from Liaison Panel and beyond (anyone interested - come and go).

Co-Leadership Criteria for each Monitoring Group:

1. Willing to develop group agendas;
2. Provide meeting summaries, notes, or observation checklists;
3. Forest Health and Restoration Initiative Experience and Knowledge
4. Interest and willingness to contribute and learn;
5. Interest and willingness to engage others in contributing and learning;
6. Communication and Group process skills;
7. Willingness to collaborate;
8. Organized - ability to have a vision, a plan;
9. Resourceful;
10. Divergent thinking; and
11. Committed to public outreach expansion and education, and not just one's own constituency

Monitoring Groups Points of Concurrence on Expectations and Format:

1. **Participation:** subcommittee members or anyone who chooses to - can become involved in monitoring to whatever level they are willing and able to do so. It is each person's responsibility however- to check in about upcoming schedule of activities. Currently- folks can contact the FS or the co-leadership about upcoming activities for the Timber/Thinning Work Group, and read the announcements in the newspapers.
2. **Progress:** Keep monitoring work groups an open process -will not deter the efforts of those who participate more frequently. Those who wane decide to be involved on a less frequent basis need to take the time to catch up with the efforts of those who are participating more often. It is expected that monitoring group results will be posted on the website, made available on the local library, and through local email.
3. **Activities:** Monitoring Work Groups will engage in more hands on activities to encourage learning and participant, and perhaps focus on topics for discussion.
4. **Co-Leadership:** co-leadership can initiate the agendas, plan the trips, and maintain the summaries. The FS has the database to provide meeting notices as well as the facilitators of

the meetings. Work groups can be as informal while at the same time having a sense of long-term and some short-term goals.

TIMBER / THINNING PERFORMANCE WORK GROUP: CO-LEADERSHIP - MIKE HENSHAW, RANDY FELTMAN, VINCE MELESKI. USFS CONTACT: John Creed.

Work with the US Forest Service to ensure thinning are conducted per Best Management Practices (BMP's) and contract specifications. Monitoring group will look over thinning operations and work with USFS to develop approaches to overcome challenges and achieve least environmental impacts.

Interested:

Mike Henshaw	205-489-5376	Jason Nelson
Vince Meleski	256-974-6166	Anthony Hood
Randy Feltman	256-292-3257	Bobby Ayers
Pat Vail		Ted Kuzma
John W. Tidwell		Richard Zinholm
Bennie Kryle		

What To Monitor

- A. Stream protection, runoff erosion
- B. Layout of Plan - What is designated to cut
- C. Mixture of trees to be left.
- D. Roads - Condition
- E. Ground disturbance - skidder ruts
- F. Finished quality of timber and trees left.

How to Monitor

- A. Determine guidance - check against
 - B. Is it laid out like the plan
 - C. Species, meet guidelines of the prescription basal area
 - D. Compare to baseline
 - E. Approved roads, erosion, mta???- water off road, drainage, location
 - F. Ditches, quantity, bare ground (minus duff
-

DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS WORK GROUP: CO-LEADERSHIP - KEITH TASSIN, ????. USFS CONTACT: GLEN GAINES.

Work with USFS and academic partners to monitor restoration activities, burning impacts, pest and disease treatment areas, monitor health of plantings and success of Oak Forest and woodland transition.

Interested:

Bill Snoddy	Mike Henshaw
Keith Tassin	Gwen Warren
Andy Hood	Pat Vail
Peggy Armstrong	Jason Nelson
Vince Meleski	Randy Feltman
Stuart Horn	Athel Willite
Rory Fraser	Wallace Tidwell
Myra Ball	Gene Gold

What to Monitor:

- 1) 5-year (immediate) activities
- 2) Effect of prescribe burns
 - a. E.g. on Canyon areas

- b. Flora and fauna (e.g. H/W (?) regeneration)
- c. soil impact (soil inventory)

- 3) Understory species in burned areas
- 4) Are things changing? Are the results "desirable".
- 5) Monitor H/W health.
- 6) Monitor each forest condition
- 7) How: Established base conditions (wildlife, soil, flora, & fauna)
- 8) Invasive Species
- 9) Monitor Long-term effects

WILDLIFE WORK GROUP CO-LEADERSHIP - RON EAKES, ? USFS CONTACT: TOMMMY

Work with USFS to monitor impact of restoration activities on wildlife. Develop approaches to protecting wildlife and enhancing habitat.

Interested:

Ron Eakes
 Peggy Armstrong
 Charles Borden
 Sue Sparks

Gwen Warren
 Pat Vail
 Ben Vail
 Jason Nelson
 Anthony Hood

Joe Tankersley

Monitoring:

1. **Monitor:** percentage of area converted to early successional
2. **How:** Indicator species associated with early successional
 - a) Quail
 - b) Meadow lark
 - c) Deer
 - d) Turkey
3. **Monitor:** Impact on streams
 - a) **How:** Water Quality
 - † Ex. Dissolved Oxygen
 - † Sedimentation
 - † Water Clarity
 - b) **How:** Indicator species monitoring
 - † Mussels, water dog
4. **Monitor:** Riparian zones
 - a) Plant and Flower distribution
5. **How:** Baseline data collection and compilation
 - a) Plants
 - b) Animals - birds
 - c) Soils composition
 - d) Indicators
6. Air Quality

CULTURAL AND HISTORIC WORK GROUP: CO-LEADERSHIP -FARRON WEEKS, GENE GOLD
USFS CONTACT: JEAN

Assist USFS staff with survey work; will help USFS monitor impact of restoration activities on cultural and historic sites.

Interested:

Faron Weeks
Gene Gold
Gwen Warren
Pat Vail
Jason Nelson
Anthony Hood

Peggy Armstrong
Bobby Gillespie
Jim Patterson
Sheila Uptain
Myra Ball

What is it we want to monitor?

1. Monitor schedule of any/all sites to be harvested/restored.
2. Monitor Archaeologist report of plans, activities of any/all sites to be harvested/restored. Request opportunity to participate.
3. Need opportunity to participate in any decision on actions to be made in the event a site with cultural/historic properties is discussed.
4. Monitor/ obtain list of criteria that would be used to declare a site as archaeological significant.
5. Monitor/obtain list of criteria that would be used to declare a site as having cultural significance.
6. Monitor topo maps depicting areas and schedules for scheduled work.
7. Monitor all ground disturbing activity.

What will tell us we are getting there?

- 1) A new site has been found and preserved.
- 2) All discussed and existing "known sites will be documented but not publicized.
- 3) Sites will be monitored to prevent looting or defacing.
- 4) Forest Service/community establishes neighborhood watch program with focus on historical/cultural sites.
- 5) Forest services posts contact information for reporting of any detrimental activity.
- 6) Monitor sites found and discovered for increased activity.

RECREATION WORK GROUP: CO-LEADERSHIP -MARY LEE RATLIFF, JEFF STILL, & GARY WHITE
USFS CONTACT: MIKE COOK

Work with USFS to monitor restoration work's impact on recreation sites and users. Help to notify recreation users of restoration work. Develop approaches to mitigate negotiation impacts on recreation users and sites.

Interested:

Mary Lee Ratcliff 256-350-7363

Jeff Still 256-739-5985
Gwen Warren
Pat Vail
Jason Nelson
Anthony Hood

Myra Ball
Johnny Warren
Sheron Ball
Gary White

What is it we want to monitor?

1. Trails
2. Water Quality
3. Multi-use of Trails
4. Role of mitigation (mitigation banking?)
5. Camp Sites

What will tell us we are getting there?

1. maintain visual quality of the trails
2. maintain safety of the trails (i.e., no debris on trail)
3. maintain and enhance water quality
4. maintain trails for multi-use: hikers, horseback riders, hunters, low-impact recreational users)
5. follow-through on mitigation steps