

National Forest Advisory Board (NFAB) Meeting

April 21, 2010

Mystic Ranger District, Rapid City, South Dakota

Members Present:

Tom Blair, Chairman; Sam Brannan, Jim Heinert, Everett Hoyt, Nancy Kile, Pat McElgunn, Bob Paulson, Terry Mayes, Hugh Thompson, Tom Troxel, Jeff Vonk, Dan Hutt, Suzanne Martley, & Colin Paterson.

Forest Service Representatives:

Craig Bobzien, Dennis Jaeger, Frank Carroll, Dave Thom, Claudia Hill
Bob Thompson, Steve Kozel, Rhonda O'Byrne, Lynn Kolund
Twila Morris - Recorder.
Rick Cables, John Rupe & Sharon Friedman, Regional Office

Others:

Approximately 10 members of the public and four Congressional representatives; Mark Haugen (Thune - R, South Dakota), Chris Blair (Johnson - D, South Dakota), Rick Hanson (Herseeth-Sandlin - D, South Dakota) and Matt Jones (Lummis - R, Wyoming).

Members Absent:

Becci Rowe, Nels Smith, Craig Tieszen, Jim Scherrer, Bill Kohlbrand, Donovan Sprague

Welcome and Roll Call:

Chair Blair: Quorum present, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. Welcome everyone.

Approve Minutes:

Blair: Are there any changes to the March 2010 meeting minutes? Hearing none, the minutes stand as recorded.

Approve the March Agenda:

Blair: Are there any changes to the April Agenda? Hearing none, the agenda stands as presented.

Housekeeping:

Carroll: Break room in the back. Refreshments are provided by the Boxelder JC. Restrooms are located on both sides of this room.

Comments to the Chair:

Bobzien: Thanks Tom. I would like to welcome the new members; we kicked off with new members last month. Secretary of GF&P Jeff Vonk, welcome, and thank you Doug for your service. Doug will continue on as an alternate.

Welcome to John Rupe & Sharon Friedman. They are our presenters, and leading the round table discussion this evening.

We have several people who are serving as alternate roles in attendance today, thank you for your participation. Thanks to the members, both primary and alternates, for your work on the Subcommittee. A number of people have worked on the CFLRP proposal, and I appreciate your assistance.

The Planning Rule meeting is scheduled for tonight; we'll have a presentation on that later today.

Annual election process will be done today. The Board will do this however they choose. We'll start the election by 4:00 p.m. today. Tom may entertain questions from the public at any time.

Thanks to the members of the public for participating and being here today.

Thanks to the Congressional Delegation Representatives, Matt Jones, Chris Blair, Mark Haugen, Rick Hanson, for your participation and input.

Hot Topics

Blair: I would like to discuss the Rapid City Journal editorial on beetles, but I'll wait till Rick is able to join us.

Rick Cables, R2 Regional Forester

Cables: I apologize for being late. I see you have Mr. Thompson on the board, so I'm sure he's keeping everyone in line.

Bobzien: This is Rick's third trip to the Advisory Board in the five years that I have been here. Rick has a unique perspective because he knows the value of an Advisory Board. We appreciate you coming here today Rick, thank you.

H.Thompson: Good to see you Rick, you've done well.

Travel Management Plan

Blair: We had a wonderful turnout at the Travel Management rollout meeting last month. I felt that it was really a good meeting.

Bobzien: The article in the Rapid City Journal was great coverage. The recommendations that came from the Advisory Board helped build the foundation for the Decision. We had six public meetings, and input from 400 people to develop the alternatives. The Journal story comments are that "the time is now". We asked the public to be engaged, and they were, maybe more than we expected. Norbeck is another decision that you all as a Board helped with.

Kolund: Copies of the ROD for Norbeck have been mailed out. If you need copies, let me know. I encourage everyone to read the main part of the decision. We are now in the appeal period – about 40 days left.

H.Thompson: I would like to comment on the Norbeck decision. I think you dropped the ball on it. This whole group went out and reviewed this project. SD GF&P were there, and they seemed to favor an aggressive approach, and yet I remain mystified that we missed a window – we were told that a decision was going to come out and it would be implemented before another flight of beetles, and it was not. People are tired of the beetles, from where I sit, faced with credible and overwhelming support; you still succumbed to paralysis by analysis, what is the problem Mr. Kolund?

Kolund: That’s a hard question to answer, but if we get appealed on anything, it’s always on our process, we needed to follow the process.

H.Thompson: You were encouraged to declare it an emergency, but you missed the opportunity and did not get it done.

Kolund: We had a review done by the Regional Office on this project; we also have 300 pages of responses to the comments, and analysis to the comments, these are examples of the pieces of it that took additional time.

Blair: The article on the pine beetles are all intertwined and I guess from the Subcommittee that we were talking about; I honestly expected a more aggressive approach as well. I realize that sometimes we are tied to rules, EISs, etc., that sometimes create problems when we try to solve by “paralysis by analysis”. The public comments; and maybe the pine beetle issue, the obvious fireworks at Mt. Rushmore, has brought some of that to a head, it hits in the pocket book. It’s a tradition of South Dakota that we are all proud of. The public would like to see the kind of approach in the Black Elk, and Norbeck, that Custer State Park has taken in the Park. I have not heard from anyone that has said we are actually rushing into this. They want us to become more aggressive.

Mayes: If you look back thru the records, I addressed this issue a year ago. My understanding is there is a way to declare an emergency. If the encroachment of the beetle from Government to private land doesn’t call for an emergency, I don’t know if anything does.

Brannan: We had a Subcommittee working in concert with the Forest Service on this; it was a diverse Subcommittee, and they Subcommittee came up with the same conclusion.

Troxel: I worry that the bugs are staying a step ahead of us, and the Norbeck is part of the problem.

Bobzien: We appreciate your comments, it’s a unique area. The Norbeck Wildlife Preserve has laws like none other in the Country. From the start in developing the options for the project we’ve been focused on getting this accomplished as quickly as possible. I’ve read Lynn’s decision and it is a very good decision. We know that we had people that filed appeals when they provided comments to the draft EIS. We are sensitive to the analysis paralysis; know that that was not the intent. The intent was to do a very high quality job. It was our goal to have the decision out before the beetles flew, but we did not get that accomplished.

Paterson: We are in a mode of reacting to crisis; we have an opportunity to make a change in the way that the Forest is managed. Today we’ll hear about a proposal that will perhaps help take care of threats of fire and pine beetle, and at the same time help the watersheds.

Blair: It's not the intent of the Board to put you on the hot seat Lynn, but it is the charge of the Board that under the hot topics, we have an open format. This Board has diverse views, and I think we would be wrong by not being able to voice our opinions. We do not want you to take it personally. There are times and certain projects to take a longer look at, and this was not one of them.

Kolund: It was always my goal to get there before the bugs flew, that never changed. We won't solve the bug problem by this Decision. One half of that area is a congressionally delegated Wilderness area, which will have no treatment at all except the possibility of some prescribed burning next year. The beetles will run their course in that portion, and we want to make a difference in the remainder. As a Congressionally delegated Wildlife Preserve and Wilderness area it has many different rules to apply to it. My goal was to stay with the process, if we get into appeals; we have a planning record that can withstand it. We had an OGC attorney help with this decision. This beetle outbreak will run its course, and we'll make some difference.

Paterson: May I get back to the Travel Management Decision? Many of us have looked at the ROD and were at the meeting. The TM Decision was made in light of the 11 recommendations that the Advisory Board made, and I wonder if it's appropriate to revisit those guidelines. Do we think that the Forest Service has complied or gone along with our recommendations? There are some things that are a concern, that we hoped wouldn't be an impact. Particularly the High Meadows area that is in Becci Rowe's area. Becci is not here to defend herself, but she is very upset about this situation.

There are other aspects of concern, such as density of trails – one place had six trails within a mile of one another, now does that comply with our recommendation?

Dispersed camping is another concern. It is allowed within 300 miles of a road. We are trying to take care of situations that we are actually creating. I'm not sure if the Advisory Board has a role in making suggestions. I know that we are in an appeal process, and potentially litigation after that.

Is it possible to get this on the agenda at a future meeting?

Blair: I guess I would look to Craig on the Record of Decision. It is Craig's decision, and it has the opportunity for review and changes, and is it timely to do that before it's in the implementation stage or later?

Bobzien: As Colin said, we listened to many diverse interests for over four years. Those were evaluated, and a decision was made. Recognizing that this Board made one of the best recommendations ever. Usually it is interest groups or individuals that make appeals. That process should be allowed to run its course. I would not be inclined to make a change to the decision while the appeal period is going on. We know that it is a dynamic plan that is subject to implementation, and we know how it can change over time. It's also subject to a separate environmental review, and it could be changed every year.

We were very careful about public communities. There are a number of areas that we did not go to intentionally, such as private roads. I believe the road you described is a public road. Our intent was to respect the jurisdiction of the particular road, if we made a mistake, please let us know.

Paterson: There are public rights of ways, but the argument that the dispersed camping is allowed because you want to get away from noise and dust is at issue because individuals cannot move their house out of the noise and dust.

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLRP) Act Subcommittee Proposal

Bobzien: For those that weren't at the last meeting, we have a Subcommittee that has been at work on the CFLRP proposal. Dave Thom our Natural Resources Staff Officer, and does a great job leading that program, will be kicking off the presentation today. Doug Hofer has volunteered to lead the recommendation portion of the proposal. We asked the Subcommittee to bring a proposal back to the Board for a decision.

Thom: Thank you Craig. Everyone should have a copy of the presentation I'll be showing.

The Subcommittee is made up of:

Carson Engelskirger, Forest Products Industry
Doug Hofer, State natural Resource Agency (SD)
Nancy Kile, Archeological/Historical Interest
Bill Kohlbrand, State natural Resource Agency (WY)
Terry Mayes, Dispersed Recreation
Colin Paterson, Regional Environmental Organization
Dave Thom, USFS, Staff Support

Presentations highlights:

- Overview of Black Hills National Forest
 - 1.5 million acres
 - 1874 less forest, fewer trees
 - 2010 extensive forests, more trees
 - Increased fire intensity
 - More people
 - Bark beetles

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program:

- Purpose is to encourage collaborative science based ecosystem restoration on priority landscapes.

CFLRP Proposal:

- Identify and prioritize treatments for 10 years
- Collaborative process
- Analyze cost savings
- Funding
- Established record of collaboration
- Benefit local economies, employment & training,

Objectives from Landscape Restoration Strategy (Phase II Forest Plan Amendment):

- Reduce high fire hazard (open the forest).
- Reduce bark beetle risk.
- Double aspen acres (habitat and fire).
- Increase "late succession" forests.
- Increase young ages, large trees, and variety of sizes, shapes & interspersion.
- Increase grassland and meadow (diversity and fire).
- Increase riparian habitat (wildlife and fire).
- Maintain or enhance hardwood shrubs.
- Reduce weeds.

Hofer: We first found out about this CFLRP opportunity at our last meeting, it's exciting because it potentially brings dollars into things we are excited about here on the Forest, but the deadlines are tight and the deadline is rapidly approaching. The Board directed a Subcommittee to work with the Forest Service this last month to try to get a proposal together. The Subcommittee was to get to a point that we could make a recommendation to the Board to help facilitate and lend our support for an application for critical funding that would bode well in National competition to bring funding to the Black Hills.

The Subcommittee represents the diverseness of the Board itself. It led to a spirited discussion and good insight that represented everyone's interest. It didn't take us long to endorse that whatever we come forward with, it needs to be consistent with the strategies that are in the Forest Plan. The Subcommittee wants to see the project come forward. We looked at four projects, but we have narrowed it down to two projects. One is the *Greater Rushmore Project*, and the other project is in Wyoming in the tornado area and is called the *Bear Lodge Mountains Tornado and Riparian Restoration*. Both projects will be the two best that the Region sees!! They are high profile, and should be funded.

The Greater Rushmore Project has had a good introduction. Hugh suggested that we can't go fast enough on the Norbeck, and later Rick talked about the whole need to find the resources to address these projects. What it amounts to is the epicenter for this project is the Norbeck area, the adjoining State lands, Federal land etc. that is suffering from the beetles. As well as having been working together collaboratively on a plan to improve wildlife diversity. As we look at the CFLRP the whole effort in the wildland urban interface that comes into play with Norbeck and the lands that are being affected, fit the purpose of this very well.

To demonstrate the broader context of what's being affected, we wanted a good title, because it helps people visualize what is being affected – Mt. Rushmore, Custer State Park, Black Hills National Forest, and private. The objectives are very similar to that of what we were seeing in the project needs that are trying to be stimulated in this process.

Some of the partners we currently have are: National Park Service, Custer State Park, South Dakota Department of Agriculture, Norbeck Society, Black Hills Forest Resource Association, Counties and communities, and others. All of the entities are actively engaged.

The second project, the *Bear Lodge Mountain Tornado and Riparian Restoration* project needs to be dealt with because of the fire danger that it has created. Smaller project, but none the less very important.

Both of these projects are urgent in terms of the way our Board views the need to get work done on the ground. There are always two limiting factors, one is getting the NEPA work done, and the other is the funding. In this case, this is related to the funding side, and it is critical. NEPA is done with the partnerships that are already in place, hopefully we can leverage more funding.

The Subcommittee is unanimous in support of the projects and the common interest is to get the treatment done. Clearly the money can be used on NF lands to implement the strategies, as I understand, this is a 10 year program, what pieces of this could leverage funds for State and private land. This is an ecosystem that knows no boundaries, so anything we can do to bring more money to the Forest to get this done would also suggest that if we can broaden the use of it to other lands threatened, that would be a good thing.

With that, the Subcommittee recommends submitting the described forest restoration proposal to the Regional Forester as eligible under PL 111-11 Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009.

Brannan: Did the Subcommittee discuss how many acres are represented between these two projects?

Hofer: Together they are well over the 50,000 acres that is the minimum.

Thom: It would be a combination of the Mitchell Project which is 20,000 acres, the Norbeck Project had 30,000 acres or so, and the boundaries include Mt. Rushmore, Custer State Park and private lands.

Hofer: The project in Wyoming is 4,000 acres.

Mayes: When we started this process I was sure that the whole idea was written with this project in mind, I was pleased that we have the opportunity to submit this proposal. I would like to second the motion to submit this proposal.

Blair: Motion made by Doug, second by Terry.

In the tornado project, the Neiman Sawmill did a lot of the immediate cutting of timber etc. Is private industry able to come in and help?

Thom: We have to explore that more, the purpose is partnerships, there's a partnership relationship with Neiman's and other contractors. The purpose for the money is so that the contracts can be awarded.

Paulson: It seems like they favor multi-year proposals.

Hofer: There hasn't been a quantification of what years 2-10 would be, the numbers here are for FY10 and the projects that the Forest Service is ready to go on. If we can use the money outside the Forest Service, there are additional things that can be done.

Blair: So projects could happen this year?

Paulson: How does this strike you Rick?

Cables: I talked to Craig and encouraged him to submit a project or two, and I specifically mentioned the Phase Two Amendment. The phase two is really about ponderosa pine – it featured fire, diversity, late succession, increased grassland and meadow. I felt like the Phase Two Amendment set up the ability to set up some good projects. I have some suggestions on what you might do in terms of packaging this and sending it in. I think both of them are outstanding proposals.

Paterson: It is great to be on this Subcommittee, Dave did a great job. We came to the idea that in order to deal with fire, beetles, and to help with stream flows to levels that we know existed more than 100 years ago, to open up areas of the forest as meadows is the best thing to do, and it's different than the current strategy. We need to stand out as making a change of how we operate. We had agreed on this strategy, it's good for the timber, good for watershed, and good for the beetles.

Blair: We have a motion and a second on the floor to recommend submitting the described CFLR project to the Regional Forester. All in favor say aye opposed nay, they ayes have it, unanimous.

Thanks to the great work of the Subcommittee, they were pressed into service. This is an ongoing project; don't plan on this Subcommittee to go away.

Paulson: Rick said he had some suggestions for improvement, we should hear those.

Cables: Not improvement necessarily, but thoughts on forwarding this. There would be a letter of endorsement from NFAB. I would ask you to do individual letters that represent your organizations. Would the Governor be willing to endorse these projects, would the delegation be willing to write letters of endorsement? Even if the Black Hills does not end up a winner, I don't think that any of this is wasted work, the idea of

putting a project together that has good objectives is a good thing. The cross section of interests that are supporting this, the industry, the tribes, local government, delegation, etc., which just adds to a compelling case. Accompany the proposal with those kinds of endorsements. This is a brand new process, so my assumption is that I will forward these to DC, and I haven't been told that I have to screen projects from the Region, which may happen later – they may ask for the priority for the Region. The letters of endorsement would be really healthy. I like the name Greater Rushmore Project ... the one with the tornado is a good one too.

Paulson: Could you give us a little more detail on the timing, etc?

Thom: Yes, I'll get you something, we have to put the proposal together, it will be a draft. Proposals are due by April 30. The RF's office then sends it to the Chief's office by May 14, it's a fast process. And your first exposure was one month ago. .

H.Thompson: Should we send our letters of support to you via e-mail?

Cables: If you represent a group, the logo on the letter is nice. Nationally there is one project that will be submitted for long leaf pine restoration; it involves several states, so that's a big project. That just gives you an idea of what will be in play. Make sure the submittal is as strong as can be.

Hofer: The Subcommittee was focused on the concept and flushing it out, and making sure we were all on the same page. What we really didn't spend time on was the amount of money we are actually requesting in FY10. Now that we've approved the concept, I want to raise the concept of if we are underestimating the request. If we were successful, there is a lot of need, and I want to make sure the Forest Service is asking for enough money to cover the need. Between now and April 30, our recommendation doesn't put a limit on the amount of money we are asking for. If it turns out that we need more money, I'm encouraging you to think about that.

Thom: That amount of money is half of the total estimated needs for FY 10 only because we have to match that with other funds. It does look low, and Doug's question is a good one.

Bobzien: When we rolled this out a month ago, we knew we would have to have quick action on it. I really appreciate the Subcommittee that worked so quickly. This is a modest proposal this year because we have about 30 days to turn around the contacts to meet the deadlines. Doug brought up the part of other lands, Secretary Vilsack is really about taking in all lands, and the intent is to apply this to broader lands. We want to stick with the Congressional language for right now.

Regarding the role with tribes, when we look at what is in the law and the application, and look at the Tribal Youth Natural Resource Program, I believe we were modest in what was in this slide show. The potential to include all communities is enormous. You presented the foundation of how to work together and build on it.

Paterson: The concept of making clearings should not be negated by planting trees in those areas. The Forest Service planted 10,000 acres last year. The Jasper fire created a meadow, yet we go back to the same strategy of planting trees, we need to get away from filling in the meadows. I will only agree to the proposal if we stick with our original discussion.

Thom: That number, 10,000 acres, also includes natural pine seeding that occurs; we did plant trees on several hundreds of acres, in some more severely burned areas in the Jasper Fire. Planting is a very small part of the total ponderosa pine regeneration that occurs.

Regular Agenda

Rick Cables Shares With The Board

Cables: I first met Hugh when he was a Ranger in Arizona, and we had a memorable New Years Eve. Good to see everyone. I love to come to the Black Hills and South Dakota; I was telling Dennis that not only the resources, but the people are really the best here. It's great to be here. This Travel Management thing is really something. I want to commend you all on the work you've done. This is a profound decision, with all the private land that is speckled in the Black Hills. I know there are squirmishes yet to be had, especially when implementation is yet to be done. But taking it to the point you have is really exceptional. The fallout from travel management planning is one of the most contentious things we do but also one of the most environmentally friendly. Craig has kept me posted with the State licensing issues, etc. You have done good work.

I do take a bit of pride in this group, and I remember the story before it was formed. I remember Senator Daschle and I remember the dialog. I had an experience with an Advisory Board in New England, and it was good to have an interest where the parties had to talk to one another. I know this has been going on a long time, it's great to see the diversity, and it has changed from the original body, and it is an immense help.

Bark Beetles. My life is bark beetles; in the interior west there is over 17 million acres of mortality. In fact our Undersecretary Harris Sherman, is testifying on a bill titled the National Forest Insect and Disease Emergency Act. I was in DC last week and encouraged the congressional staff to attend this meeting. The pine beetle issue here on the Black Hills is a huge issue. I sat in this room with the Governor a few months ago and the topic was, what can we do about the beetles. But Colorado has this lodgepole system that has 3.6 million acres. It's all dead. NW Wyoming, which are similar in scale and mortality but spruce fur and others, and then the Black Hills, and as much as this issue is bad here, if not for the efforts of this group, and this forest, it would be much worse. I will say that it is straining us significantly in this Region. The Med Bow Supervisor uses the analogy of a quilt, and the quilt is not big enough for the bed. It's a cold night, so when we pull the quilt toward Colorado, then South Dakota & Wyoming is not covered. We do not have the size of resources that we need to manage it. As you well know, we don't have the industry we need. In Colorado there is one medium size mill in the whole state. In Wyoming, we have Neiman's, and a few other small mills. It's difficult, and I've shared with the delegation that we are doing everything we can to keep the funding on the Hills as high as we can because you have the industry, the social license, and the machine in terms of personnel to keep ahead of it. And to not perpetuate that would create a lot larger problem. It will take a concerted effort to continue to push help toward the west. In Colorado and Wyoming, the issue has gone from – "Oh my God, the trees are dead", to "Oh my God, the trees are falling".

The math for the lodgepole pine 3.6 million acres is: At 100 trees per acre x 3.6 million acres is 360 million dead trees. 365 days a year, divided by 360 million dead trees = 10,000 trees falling a day, every day for 10 years. Most of the trees will be on the ground in 15 years.

It's a health and safety concern, the threats to the power lines, ski areas, roads, trails etc. is very daunting. The competition for dollars to help with forest health in the Rocky Mountain Region is very significant. It will take all of us. All the delegation working together to try to keep things intact. The three governors, plus the delegation, all signed a letter to the Secretary last year, and all of those sources helped generate the 40 million we got.

The best defense is a well managed forest, and nowhere can you show this better than here on the black hills. There is a story to be told here in the Black Elk and Norbeck.

Vonk: If you had more resources in light of the lodgepole what would you do?

Cables: Our whole focus at this point in time is on mitigation of effects. The over story is gone. I would continue to ramp up the mitigation to clear the trees from roads and power lines, then I would begin a serious restoration strategy. We have to create some mosaic of species. If we could influence the system to bring diversity, so that we don't replicate this cycle 100 years from now. We're starting this, but it's hard to think long term when the mitigation is so overwhelming.

Paulson: In the several tours we have taken, the thing for industry is the stability of product. Industry does not get enough contract years. It needs to be extended to 15 years.

Cables: I there is a message I hear from industry it is that they need certainty of supply. It has been a message forever. In the past the ASQ was interpreted as a floor that we would not go below, and now it is interpreted as a ceiling that we would not go above. When it was a floor the Agency was more apt to be more aggressive. In this bill that the Undersecretary is testifying on, there is language that extends stewardship contracting to 15 years. The vehicle that gives us the most time gives us 10 years. Timber Sale contracting has its place depending on what you are going to do, and industry is used to it. The best way to get to the extended time frame is with some language around stewardship contracting.

The other thing we are looking at is blended contracting; we are looking at what we like about stewardship, timber sale contracting, etc., and taking the best of each to put into one contract.

Troxel: Rick, as you meet in DC with the delegation staff, and you and I have talked about this is that the Forest Service needs a national strategy on Mt. Pine beetles. It's not appropriate to have each forest fight the beetles out of their own budget.

Cables: Tom and the industry have been really helpful on this. When we were in DC we presented an assessment of the bark beetle issue in Colorado and the dollars that go along with it are very large. Big big dollar numbers to mitigate this event. We gave a presentation to the chief, and others on the event. The Undersecretary asked for a strategy on the 17 million acres. Tony Dixon is on the Team and we are looking at what we can do, a whole range of standards, like the renewable energy standard. They are supposed to have a draft out by the end of next week. Again, what actions can we take? Harris Sherman our Undersecretary is really interested in this. The power of multiple senators, delegations across the states is what will make a difference. We kicked over the can by raising the attention of this.

Blair: As the gas prices go up, and we know what direction that is taking us, biomass, renewable energy, etc. will float to the top again, we have very few opportunities in our life time to help make a change. I had never heard the term until a year ago with Herseth Sandlin, someone used the term, "fuel farms", and they were describing the National Forest, they didn't want the National Forests to be turned in to "fuel farms". My comment was when they all burn down there will be no fuel. If you start an aggressive program where thinning becomes biomass, it benefits all.

Kile: What is my place and how do I influence decisions on this Board? I've come to understand the established motivation of the Forest Service presence here; I hear that we have social license, the timber industry and forest personnel. Not 100 miles from here we have the Oglala Sioux Tribe which are some of the poorest people. How will this affect the people? I want to express my frustration.

Blair: I watched this winter, the "National Parks, America's Best Idea". In that they traced the history of John Muir and Gifford Pinchot, and where they were walking the same trail, in their differences in approach; pristine, and multiple use, over time, society has dictated, our National Forest has dictated that the National Forest become multiple use. Utilize the forest for the greater good.

Break 2:50 p.m.

Planning Rule Meeting

Carroll: We had a brief discussion at our last meeting; we have John Rupe and Sharon Friedman here today to give us a brief overview. We would like to have some volunteers to step forward to form a small panel following the talks at tonight's meeting to share ideas.

Rupe: Everyone has a packet, some extra packets on the table. Enclosed is a flyer with a timeline for revisiting the planning rule. They hope to have it completed in November of 2011. We are currently having round tables across the country, to extend the development of the planning rule to a broad base. Previous attempts to change the planning rule have been appealed.

When the National Forest Management Act was developed the Black Hills was one of the first forests to start working on a forest plan. The planning rule of 1982 is what has been used for every forest plan in the country.

I came to the Black Hills in 1989 to review the plan, we finished it in 1997. We had an appeal, and we were litigated, in a settlement in 1999 we agreed to amend the Forest Plan which led to Phase Two. All of these experiences are relevant to the planning rule. We encourage this Board to participate in the discussion because of the experiences here. Tonight I will make a presentation that summarizes the public meetings, and also we would like a couple of members from the Board to speak of their experiences. We'll break into small groups, and ask the people what they think of forest planning; we'll record the comments, and round up the input and send it to Washington. At the last national round table meeting, it will summarize all of the meetings.

Cables: Usually, we issue a draft rule, and then seek public comment. It's different this time because we are asking the public what should be in there to begin with. We are asking - what are the principals there that should be included. 2005 & 2008 versions were litigated. We were going to limit the expense of planning and spend more on implementation. This is a chance to express what the concepts are that should even be in a planning rule? Not reacting to a plan we suggest.

Mayes: If I were a citizen, I would find it very useful to know what direction you got from the courts about what to do and not to do.

H.Thompson: What direction, recognizing that you all work for the executive branch, what marching orders have you gotten from the administration. Even in the Federal Register Notice, I see some serious overtones of elitism, trying to override the climate change, and that the Forest Service is so good at planning that they should include private lands.

Rupe: That is the decision notice that kicked off this process.

Cables: Whatever overtones you see is the direction we have. This administration has now taken the reins to form the new planning rule, but there is no other – I would say – we have received no other direction that is not apparent in the Federal Register.

Friedman: You recognize those ideas, and those are ideas that are floating around, the hot topics of the day, and the Forest Service is now asking the question; do you think we should incorporate those ideas into the planning rule? This is your chance to give your opinion.

Blair: Frank could you talk a little bit about the actual meeting tonight?

Carroll: The public will come together at 6:00 p.m. in the Rushmore room at the Ramkota Hotel. There will be theater style seating set up for presentations. After the presentations, we'll break up into smaller groups, have discussions, take notes of the discussions and at the end, we'll compile the information and send it up the line.

Rupe: Can we have three volunteers to comment at the meeting? Volunteers: Suzanne Martley, Tom Troxel, and Tom Blair.

Elections

Chairman Blair: We'll take nominations for Chairman:

Nominations for Chairman:

1. Jim Heinert; Motion made by Paterson, second by Paulson
2. Tom Blair; Motion made by Hoyt, second by Thompson

Motion made by Mayes to cease nominations, second by Hutt.

Carroll: Results of voting by written ballot: Seven votes for Heinert, Six votes for Blair. Welcome the new Chairman, Jim Heinert.

Heinert: We'll now take nominations for Vice Chairman:

Nominations for Vice Chairman:

1. Tom Blair: Motion made by Vonk, second by Mayes

Heinert: Cease nominations for Vice Chairman; Welcome the new Vice Chairman, Tom Blair.

Public Comments

Chairman Blair: If anyone from the public wishes to address the Board, please do so.

Ralph Kopp: Currently in the Black Hills National Forest of South Dakota, there is 14 miles of authorized motorized trails on the Centennial Trail. I walked two miles and notice a lot of damage, and with your permission I would like to pass four photos around. There are four different types of damage, one is of unauthorized trails, the two that most disturbed me is a spring with tracks going right thru it, and the last is a no motorized vehicle sign with tracks that went right by it. I have a lot more pictures also.

Carroll: Are those pictures available on a website?

Kopp: No, but I can send you some photos, and some longitudes and latitudes.

Paterson: The point of showing these photos is that this is the circle of motorized trail systems at the current time and how are we doing managing such a small length of trail system? It really is a wakeup call that we need to take care of what we've got because pretty soon we'll have a hell of a lot more.

Blair: I don't disagree, but you've heard the money, money, money speech a bunch of times, and the reason we went to try to adjust some of the regulations in the State. My fear is that we'll be sorely underfunded. We'll have administration, signs, closures, etc., having a need for a whole lot of man power on the ground.

Mayes: From a back ground of law enforcement, when the 55 mile an hour speed limit became law – when you find a perpetrator in violation of the rules, you make an example of it. When we doubled the speeding fines, we had no more enforcement available, but we doubled the fines, which was better than doubling the force. You'll have to make an example. The example of what happened on the Northern Hills and the young folks that paid for what they did there. It will have to be enforced strictly.

Paterson: What other limitations in terms of fines for travel regulations are there, how far can we go so that it will really make a difference?

Bobzien: Normally it's called collateral forfeiture: I'll send some information back out to the Board.

Blair: In the old days, if there was a hunting violation, they would confiscate the weapons and sell it at the state fair. I guess we could confiscate the OHV and sell it at the state fair!!

Bobzien: Magistrates have the ability to do that. LEO's are reluctant to state the law because then people may think – well, if that's all that can happen, I'll do what I want.

Hoyt: Before we close, I would just like to say thanks to our outgoing Chairman, Tom, for all of your effort. Your heart has been in this from the start. The work you've done for the trail system, the work you've done with the State, GF&P, and so much more – you are to be commended, thank you Tom.

Blair: It all started because of that little picture you saw in Dave's presentation – of the Grizzly Gulch Fire. Daschle and Twiss got together and made this thing happen. In the six years that I have been on the Board we have done a lot of good work. A good example is this CFLRP proposal, with less than 30 days notice we are putting forth two great proposals.

Adjournment:

Chairman Blair: If there is no other business to come before the Board I'll take a motion to adjourn the meeting, motion made by Paulson, second by Vonk, meeting is adjourned at 4:20 p.m.

2010 Meeting Dates:

May 19

June 16

July – No Meeting

August – Field Trip

September 15

October 20

November 17

December – No Meeting

January 5, 2011 (Tentative)