MEETING SUMMARY | Dinkey Collaborative Full Group

January 19, 2012

Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project, Sierra National Forest

Table of Contents

Action Items 1
1. Welcome and Introductions 1
2. Leadership Conversation 2
3. CBI Revised Proposal 4
4. Opportunity to Support Sierra Foothill Conservancy Proposal 7
5. Landscape Planning Part 1 - Overview 7
6. Landscape Planning Part 2 – Management Plan Action Categories 9
7. Landscape Planning Part 3 – Initial Sorting of Management Actions 10
8. Landscape Planning Part 4 – Conclusion and Next Steps 11
9. Work Group Updates 11
10. Attendees 12

Action Items and Agreements

1. **DAN JIRON** to send information on the Southern Sierra Fisher Strategy.
2. **DORIAN** to schedule a full collaborative landscape planning webinar for the month of February.

Agreements

1. Members signed the letter of support and indicated their level of support for the CBI proposal. Mr. Hanson and Mr. Kangas opposed the CBI proposal. A full list of signatories and reservations is provided in the text below.
2. Members signed the letter of support and indicated their level of support for the Sierra Foothill Conservancy/Cold Springs Rancheria proposal. A full list of signatories and reservations is provided in the text below.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Mosé Jones-Yellin, Deputy District Ranger, High Sierra Ranger District (HSRD), Sierra National Forest (SNF), welcomed all participants to the full Collaborative meeting and reviewed the agenda. Mr. Mosé Jones-Yellin also thanked Mr. Dan Jiron, Mr. Scott Armentrout, and Mr. Ray Porter for their attendance and participation with the Collaborative.

All meeting materials are posted to the group's site on Databasin.org.

2. Leadership Conversation

The Dinkey Collaborative began by welcoming key leaders from the Forest Service: Mr. Dan Jiron, Deputy Regional Forester Region 5; Mr. Scott Armentrout, Supervisor, SNF; and Mr. Ray Porter, District Ranger, HSRD, SNF. Before comments and questions for the guests began, the group was to consider the question, "what would you like the leadership's perspective on?"

Mr. Porter commented that the DLRP Collaborative is making progress, and expressed that Dinkey North and South are positive products from the Collaborative. He also stated that the Collaborative process is slow, and he further expressed a desire for the group to accelerate the planning process. Mr. Armentrout applauded the group for handling issues and the continued leadership engagement. He thanked Mr. Jones-Yellin for meeting the needs of the collaborative, and congratulated him on a job well done. Mr. Armentrout noted that the input from the Collaborative shaped the current projects being implemented. He also stated that members cannot agree upon every issue fully, but there can be progress made without litigation.

Mr. Jiron also thanked all the members for their commitment to the Collaborative, and continued to emphasize the progress that is made by learning from one another. Mr. Jiron stated that Mr. Armentrout delivers the DLRP Collaborative reports, and he is regularly informed of the group's progress. Mr. Jiron expressed the importance of issues such as Sierra Nevada Ecosystem Project (SNEP), owl, fisher, and budget. Mr. Jiron stated that SNEP has concerns about funding, and expressed that the Region's commitment to acquire funds through aid from the Forest Service and the State of California was still on going. He also commented that budget decisions are a challenge when attempting to consider the right investments. Mr. Jiron expressed that the spotted owl will continue to receive support, and noted that there is encouragement among scientist to analyze data for future use. He noted that the fisher will also continue to receive funding, and would like to see collaboration with the Fish and Wildlife Service to assist with Forest Plan revisions. He explained that he has contacted the Fish and Wildlife Service, in Washington and Oregon State, for future fisher collaboration. Mr. Jiron expressed the importance of revising Forest Plans to reflect the current data analysis. Mr. Jiron touched on the recent budget issues. He explained that the budget is unpredictable due to the threats of government shut downs. Mr. Jiron said that he is working on keeping the budget a priority for the Dinkey Collaborative, and further stated his hopes to gather a budget earlier in the year to ease the Collaborative's decision-making process.

- Mr. Steve Haze asked about the future of the Kings River Experimental Watershed (KREW), and stated his interest in the future environmental impacts of the project.
- Mr. Stan Van Velsor inquired about the route of funding to the CFLR budget, and if the money received from Washington D.C. will be direct, as opposed to going through the region. He also asked when the budget would be available.
- Mr. Craig Thomas noted the importance of Mr. Jiron's funding work, and wanted Mr. Jiron's help to work out the issues on fisher management.

- Mr. Armentrout addressed Mr. Haze's concern about the future of KREW, and stated that the project is a high priority for funding. Mr. Porter added the watershed experiment portion and the research of KREW would be advancing forward.
- Mr. Jiron responded to Mr. Thomas about considering the best approach to the fisher management issues. Mr. Jiron noted that there is communication with the Fish and Wildlife Service and Jane Hayes, deputy director, to aid with complex issues due to fisher management. Mr. Jiron stated that there is no concrete answer when entering decision making for management issues.
- Mr. Jiron answered Mr. Van Velsor's budget question, and stated that getting funding direct from Washington is not possible. Mr. Jiron conveyed that Region 5 feels the Collaborative is a priority, and will receive funding. He continued to state the importance of implementing the work completed in collaborative meetings, and suggested the budget completion be in early spring.

- Mr. Mark Smith inquired about how proceed with the fisher strategy, and how Mr. Jones-Yellin would be able to convey the status on the Southern Sierra fisher conservation strategy to the Dinkey Collaborative group.
- Mr. Kent Duysen commented that there will be a fisher strategy released.
- Ms. Pamela Flick inquired about the priorities in the Sierra Region and if the region had interest in other collaborative groups.
- Mr. Armentrout asked Mr. Jones-Yellin on his status of reaching information on the Southern Sierra Fisher Conservation Strategy. Mr. Jones-Yellin replied he recently talked with Barney Gant and the response was supportive of the Southern Sierra Fisher Conservation Strategy. Mr. Jiron noted that he would share available information on the Southern Sierra Fisher Strategy with the members of the DLRP Collaborative.

ACTION ITEM: **DAN JIRON** to send information on the Southern Sierra Fisher Strategy.

Mr. Jiron suggested that to move forward with the planning process, the group needs to find harmony among the issues. Mr. Jiron proposed that plans should be adapted to emerging science and data collected. He also expressed that the forest plans are unique to each site. Mr. Jiron stated to ensure adaptive measures, analysis on each site is important to avoid failures. Mr. Jiron addressed other important areas in California that need attention such as projects featuring Southern California chaparral, Lake Tahoe basin, and the Quincy Library Group.

Mr. Ron Goode expressed his liking for the Collaborative meetings, but also felt that little work is achieved. He also said the money should be allocated from the meetings to field work, and he felt that more should be happening in result of the Collaborative meetings.

Mr. Jiron responded by commenting on many projects currently in the implementation stages. He also stated the desire to increase the acres treated, but did agree with Mr. Goode that more needs to be done. Mr. Jiron expressed his interest in working with community groups. Mr. Jiron further commented on the need for more to be done, and highlighted the unity and efforts of

the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG). Mr. Jiron added that the collaborative cannot fix every problem but suggested that a collaborative needs to define their role within the local community.

Mr. Haze noted that the DLRP is looking at working landscapes, and is currently compiling a communication plan. He asked how to get the local community involved because they are not aware of the developing plans. Mr. Armentrout responded to Mr. Haze by noting there is a commitment to increase involvement through better communication. Mr. Porter added that the Forest Service pre-work has changed, and collaborative decisions are significant in project implementation. He also agreed with Mr. Goode in regards to wanting more projects implemented.

Mr. Chad Hanson noted that most of the discussions in the meeting are focused on restoration and resilience, and there is not much conversation on the differentiation between categories. He also raised concern with not identifying the difference in treatments ecologically, and further expressed that he has not seen credible information. Mr. Hanson questioned how to evaluate biodiversity.

Mr. Jiron noted that this topic was a large conversation, and meetings could be held on solely that one topic. Mr. Jiron stated that there needs to be an analysis to identify the type of monitoring approach, and then understand what can be done within budget. Mr. Jiron felt it was important to work together in creating a monitoring process, but also recognized that no decision is final due to emerging science. Mr. Jiron noted the need for the forest to function properly with the role of fire. He continued to comment on the importance of reintroducing fire in the forest for restoring ecosystems. Mr. Jiron stated concerns with prescribed fire issues and the direct effect to the air quality in California. He commented on the importance of working with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to balance fire in the landscape with negative impacts of air quality and health concerns. Mr. Armentrout noted there is not a consensus on the diameter issues of trees. He suggested continuing to advance the decision making process, and try to produce a consensus. Mr. Porter appreciated Mr. Hanson's insight, and suggested that expressing opinions and listening is the best way to work together to produce a project.

3. Conservation Biology Institute (CBI) Revised Proposal

The Conservation Biology Institute presented a revised proposal handout to the DLRP Collaborative with intention of gaining the group's support. (The initial proposal was presented in December, after which a special webinar was held to provide further feedback, and the revised proposal distributed a week in advance of the meeting.) Ms. Susan Antenen and Mr. Wayne Spencer, via telephone, reviewed the written proposal handout. A letter of support was offered to members of the Collaborative, and members were able to choose the desired level of support for the CBI proposal.

Mr. Craig Thompson explained that the CBI is proposing a framework for a fisher decision making process, and stated his support for the proposal. He also stated that the Fish and Wildlife Service faced the same questions in regards to fisher management.

Mr. Hanson noted that there was no option for opposing the proposal, and also stated his concern for his opposition going undocumented. Mr. Hanson expressed two main concerns with the proposal. He stated that the proposal assumed high intensity fire results in fisher habitat loss, and commented that the proposal states an inaccurate assumption that trees experience almost complete mortality when a fire burns. Mr. Hanson expressed that the mortality rate was not supported by current data. Mr. Dorian Fougères assured Mr. Hanson that his position would be documented.

Ms. Sue Britting inquired about the application of the proposal for fisher management in the Southern Sierra Region. She followed with stating that the planning framework can help sort areas of concern for fisher management.

Mr. Ramiro Rojas stated that the proposal was a great model, but commented that boundary lines on a map might not accurately reflect or allow for assessments of real field conditions. The model must support implementation. Mr. Rojas also mentioned the importance of using specific measurements and outputs in the fisher decision framework, and the relation of the fishers to fire.

Mr. Spencer responded to Mr. Rojas by explaining the fire modeling was not included in the proposal, and that they will work on defining usable metrics. Mr. Spencer understood Mr. Rojas' concerns about defining boundaries, and the importance of creating a process for fisher management. He also addressed Mr. Hanson's concerns about fisher mortality assumptions, explaining that the proposal did not use the models that Mr. Hanson noted.

Ms Carolyn Ballard stated that she had worked with a former modeler for the Rocky Mountain Institute, and he would like to use the DLRP project as a case study. Ms. Ballard also noted that treatments for fisher management can involve both vegetation and fire.

Mr. Hanson questioned the clarity of paragraphs two and three in the proposal document, and suggested that the information was based on hypothetical scenarios. Mr. Spencer stated the proposal contains uncertainties and is currently evolving. He further explained the mapping characteristics, and stated once the site area is mapped, settings can be manipulated resulting in a clear fisher management decision-making process.

Mr. Haze inquired about the Forest Service's support with the CBI proposal. Mr. Jones-Yellin responded by stating the Forest Service contributed the data, and will continue to work with the Conservation Biology Institute.

RECOMMENDATION: Members signed the letter of support and indicated their level of support for the CBI proposal. Mr. Hanson and Mr. Kangas opposed the CBI proposal. A full list of signatories and reservations is provided here:

List of those who support the proposal

1. Pamela Flick, Defenders of Wildlife: full support
2. Craig Thomas and Susan Britting, Sierra Forest Legacy: full support
3. Stan Van Velsor, The Wilderness Society: full support
4. John R. Mount, interested forester: with reservations (no explanation attached)
5. Richard Bagley, Highway 168 Fire Safe Council and Edison Forestry: full support
6. Kent Duysen, Sierra Forest Products: with reservations
    a. Explanation: Will output matrix be useful for the people who have to make decisions and work in the field? Is the line on the map simply a fisher protected activity center? (Stay out, etc.) As long as Craig Thompson is fully engaged, I would feel comfortable.
7. Larry Duysen, Sierra Forest Products: full support
8. Mark T. Smith, interested forester: full support
9. Steve Haze, Yosemite Sequoia Resource Conservation and Development Council: full support
    a. Clarification that support is premised on the US Forest Service also clearly indicating its support of the proposal

List of those who do not support the proposal

1. Rich Kangas, Sierra Club, Tehipite Chapter
2. Chad Hanson, John Muir Project
    a. Explanation: CBI asked the Dinkey Collaborative Group to comment on its proposal (dated 1/12/12). I oppose the CBI proposal for two main reasons.

        First, on page one the proposal describes wildland fire only in negative terms – i.e., in terms of risk or adverse impacts – with regard to Pacific fishers. There is no scientific basis for this assumption, as it has not been empirically tested, at least not at a sufficiently large spatial scale or without the confounding effects of post-fire logging.

        Second, on page two the proposal says the goal is to create a decision-support framework based upon certain studies, including Thompson et al. (2011). However, Thompson et al. (2011) assumes a 90% mortality level for wildland fire as part of a "what if" modeling exercise. It does <u>not</u> reflect <u>actual</u> wildland fire mortality levels, which average only about 20% over the past 10-20 years. If the 90% fire mortality assumption is used to evaluate balance-of-risks between thinning/logging and fire, it would inaccurately stack the desk in favor of logging, such that only a complete clearcut would be reported as a greater risk than fire under such an erroneous assumption.

        Sincerely, Chad Hanson, Ph.D.

4. Opportunity to Support Sierra Foothill Conservancy Proposal

Mr. John Mount presented the Sierra Foothill Conservancy Proposal, and sought support from the Collaborative group for the grant proposal. The proposal included collaboration with Cold Springs Rancheria and the Sierra Nevada Conservancy. He highlighted the goals of returning the area to include natural native vegetation, fire hazard reduction, and management of grazing. Mr. Jones-Yellin stated that Mr. Mount contacted him with the proposal, and Mr. Jones-Yellin expressed his support for the proposal because he felt the plan contained positive improvements for the site.

Mr. Thompson agreed that a plan should be developed for the proposed site, and added that the site needs a maintenance budget. Ms Britting asked Mr. Jones-Yellin to see the complete management plan to make a decision in support for the proposal. Ms. Ballard stated that she visited the site, and participated in a conversation about fuel treatments. She also suggested a collaborative field visit to the site. Ms. Cindy Whelan inquired about California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), and whether it would affect the proposal.

RECOMMENDATION: Members signed the letter of support and indicated their level of support for the Sierra Foothill Conservancy/Cold Springs Rancheria proposal. A full list of signatories and reservations is provided here:

1. Raymond Laclergue, Intermountain Nursery: full support
2. Steve Haze, Yosemite Sequoia Resource Conservation and Development Council: full support
    a. Clarification that support is premised on the US Forest Service also clearly indicating its support of the proposal
3. Larry Duysen, Sierra Forest Products: full support
4. John Mount, interested forester: full support
5. Richard Bagley, Highway 168 Fire Safe Council and Edison Forestry: full support
6. Rich Kangas, Sierra Club, Tehipite Chapter: support with reservations
    a. Reservation: Use of the term "catastrophic fire" is not needed. It is possible that fire was intense over a greater area than could have been expected because of logging, lack of slash removal, and fire suppression prior to a fire start. Intense fire is <u>not</u> uncharacteristic on its own. Intense fire occurs and is of benefit to ecosystem processes in its own way. Intense fire contributes to heterogeneity across the landscape.

5. Landscape Planning Part 1 – Overview

Mr. Jones-Yellin introduced the framework for the landscape planning by distributing the presentation handout. Mr. Jones-Yellin noted that he was changing his original strategy, the "Big Gulp" approach, for a different approach. He expressed that the previous method increased the opportunity for planning obstructions, and limited the capacity for thorough

project analysis. Mr. Jones-Yellin expressed his hopes for discussing potential boundaries at the next full collaborative meeting on March 15, 2012. He also stated his goal to publish a notice of intent by the end of July. Mr. Jones-Yellin noted that moving forward would entail more communication and agreement on management actions.

Mr. Van Velsor inquired about the content and the defined area that is projected to be included in the notice of intent. Mr. Hanson also questioned the structure for the approving content. Mr. Jones-Yellin explained the contents presented are consistent to the discussions in the collaborative meetings. Mr. Hanson noted that he worked with projects that dealt with thinning of trees, and further expressed his desire to focus exclusively on small diameter trees. Mr. Haze commented that every option is explored in the group's approach, and further explained that it is a process, which requires consensus. Mr. Hanson expressed that he did not want to see the removal of large trees because he did not see the benefits.

Mr. Smith commented that the due to the new approach, there is still value in grouping similar sites together for one project analysis. Mr. Jones-Yellin responded in agreement that if an area of land is continuous, then one National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document is appropriate. Ms. Britting noted that the assessment of a site should drive the action, and did not feel appropriate site assessments were produced. Mr. Jones-Yellin responded to Ms. Britting by stating the process for assessing the current landscape has begun, and explained that the current environment will be compared to desirable conditions. He continued to discuss the importance of tackling issues with the high quality fisher habitat. Mr. Hanson questioned the methods for conducting that conversation. Mr. Jones-Yellin assured Mr. Hanson that a lot of work would be done in attempts to getting that piece prepared for discussion.

Mr. Kent Duysen felt that the future agendas were aggressive, and asked if a webinar could be scheduled for February, since the next meeting was moved to March. Ms. Flick agreed with Mr. Duysen for a possible meeting before March.

ACTION ITEM: **DORIAN** to schedule a full collaborative landscape planning webinar for the month of February.

- Mr. Haze asked Mr. Jones-Yellin if there were disagreements would the decision process stop, and would there be a modification.
- Mr. Thomas asked if Mr. Jones-Yellin will provide boundary options with the proposal.
- Mr. Van Velsor inquired about the previous sites discussed in the meetings, and if those sites will be possible options for the project boundaries.
- Mr. Duysen added that field visits allow clarifications for motives behind restoration.

Mr. Jones-Yellin replied with hoping for an agreement on boundary area by the March 15th meeting, and also stated that treatments will be identified for the agreed upon areas. He noted that if necessary, adjustments to the treatments and boundary areas would be made. Mr. Jones-Yellin expressed that the goal for March is to provide preliminary boundary materials.

Mr. Jones-Yellin assured that the boundaries will overlap the sites previously discussed.

Mr. Haze suggested that there is an opportunity to invite the public to field visits. Ms. Flick noted that the project's parameters are complex, and challenges the effectiveness of bringing the public up to speed with the members of the collaborative.

6. Landscape Planning Part 2 – Management Plan Action Categories

Mr. Fougères allowed time to review the handout, and reminded members to evaluate any missing potentials, categories, or clarifications.

- Ms. Flick pointed out making mixed conifer its own category, and to call out other forest types.
- Mr. Hanson noted changing language for 3D, 4D, and 6C. He noted 6C should read, "...heterogeneity increase habitat quality." Mr. Hanson also felt that the mention of the GTR 220 should be deleted. Mr. Rojas expressed that if you change 6c, as suggested by Mr. Hanson, then the statement would be too vague, and therefore 6c would have to include both heterogeneity positives and negatives. Mr. Smith stated Mr. Hanson's suggestion would also leave out plant species.
- Mr. Van Velsor felt that the categories in the handout were general, and therefore was unable to comment. He expressed that he did not support 3A.
- Mr. Dirk Charley stated the watershed category was missing, and also suggested a remediation category for any illegal crops in the area.
- Ms. Britting suggested breaking categories into aquatics, and also noted adding road realignment and under forest maintenance (maintaining healthy forests by analyzing disturbance levels and species composition). She also stated that many items in the handout were not actions, and noted most were objectives.
- Mr. Rich Kangas suggested on category 2 to add restricting grazing, and to redefine "woody".
- Mr. Goode suggested that action category 1 and 3 should add channel morphology, and under category 4 invasive aquatic species. He noted to remove the word "significant" from category 5, and instead use cultural species native to the area. Mr. Kangas also suggested using the wording restoring historical meadows, instead of saying meadow restoration.
- Mr. Rojas stated youth education and labor are missing categories.
- Mr. Andy Hosford noted under category 1 to add motorized trail maintenance.
- Mr. Hanson followed up by stating category 6c could say improve animal and plant species of conservation concern.
- Ms Flick suggested under category 2 adding aspen restoration for meadow plant communities, removal of livestock, aquatic habitat, and range management.
- Mr. Larry Duysen stated category 10 should include noxious weeds management.
- Mr. Goode noted the importance of creating education opportunities.

- Mr. Van Velsor felt that 5-10 were objectives, while 1-4 were more associated with management actions.

7. Landscape Planning Part 3 – Initial Sorting of Management Actions

The group activity was to decide which management actions were found to have general consensus. The group first focused on erosion control, and Mr. Hosford mentioned the importance of creating water bars, rolling dips, ditching, and cleaning culverts as methods to achieving erosion management. Mr. Jones-Yellin noted there are more strategies not listed. Mr. Goode suggested meadow and stream restoration, as well as planting native plants. The group agreed that no one was opposed to erosion control.

The next strategy the group discussed was channel stabilization. Mr. Van Velsor noted the Best Management Practices (BMP) standards associated with channel stabilization. Mr. Kangas mentioned that streams naturally meander, and he stated that channel stabilization could lead to the "pond and plug" method (digging out an eroded channel, filling in certain sections, and flowing over other sections of the eroded channel). Ms. Flick noted the case for naturally occurring erosion in meadows. Ms. Ballard commented that the strategies for channel stabilization might have to be decided case by case.

Ms. Ballard explained a situation where soil protection is needed. She used the example of soil compaction due to excess moisture. Mr. Hosford added that rocking the road and BMP's aid in soil protection. Mr. Rojas noted another method of ripping soil to loosen compaction. Mr. Van Velsor suggested closing soil sensitive areas to motorized vehicles. Mr. Goode discussed considering trail closure or trail reroute. Mr. Ray Laclergue stated that high intensity fires leave soil vulnerable to erosion near channels. Mr. Hanson noted that high intensity fires are a natural part of the cycle, and is not in support of ceasing the use of high intensity fires.

Mr. Hosford reiterated the importance of water bars, rolling dips, grading and roadside ditch maintenance for road maintenance. Mr. Hanson expressed that he is not concerned with road maintenance. Ms. Britting noted that hazardous tree removal was included with road maintenance, which created controversy and a lack of consensus. Therefore, the group noted that road maintenance was less prone to consensus.

Mr. Smith noted that grouping issues would be helpful. Mr. Jones-Yellin expressed that the exercise was geared to focusing efforts on issues that lacked consensus. Ms. Ballard suggested members create their own categories of issues, and organize them accordingly. Ms. Britting added to concentrate on the issues with general agreement.

Mr. Fougères suggested that ending the exercise as it was leading to further differentiation of minor issues and not helping advance discussions. Mr. Thomas suggested that the group should spend its time on areas where there is clear disagreement, most of which are already

known, rather than trying to identify and sort every possible issue. The facilitator agreed to work with Mr. Jones-Yellin and come back with improved planning material for the February webinar and March meeting.

8. Landscape Planning Part 4 – Conclusion and Next Steps

Mr. Fougères suggested revising the landscape planning process. He also noted the challenges with the sheer scale of the Dinkey site, and identifying the proposed project site. Mr. Jones-Yellin felt that the work presented on March 15 will lead to areas of general agreement. He stated the exercise was to identify issues, and lead to resolution across the landscape. Mr. Laclergue expressed his agreement with Mr. Thomas that every site is unique, but agrees with Mr. Jones-Yellin that some treatments can be identified in advance. Mr. Jones-Yellin explained his expectations for the exercise, and anticipated identifying critical issues for further discussion. He expressed confidence in the ability of specialists to help identify project areas and concerns, and noted that much of this work would be informed by field surveys and Collaborative field visits.

9. Work Group Updates

Regarding fisher research, Mr. Thompson explained that he and Ms. Ballard are discussing locations, which coordinate with the burn plan. He noted that there are many site opportunities. Mr. Thompson stated they were working on analyzing the impacts of low intensity burns and the condition of the cavities.

Regarding monitoring, Mr. Stan Van Velsor presented the monitoring work group handout. He briefly reviewed the document, and identified the long-term and short-term planning process. Mr. Van Velsor stated that he plans to get the monitoring matrix operational. He also updated the group with the socioeconomics proposal, which is being drafted by Mr. Jonathon Kusel. Mr. Van Velsor also noted that they have authorization to hire a part time coordinator for the monitoring group, and they aim to have the position filled by April. Mr. Rojas commented that the monitoring coordinator's job is to analyze and make appropriate implementation decisions in the landscape. Mr. Van Velsor also asked Mr. Jones-Yellin for the Forest Service's 2012 Work Plan for monitoring, so the group can suggest monitoring strategies. Mr. Van Velsor expressed that he anticipates presenting the group with monitoring strategies in March. Mr. Jones-Yellin suggested the monitoring group work with the Forest Service to provide extra monitoring assistance.

Regarding Dinkey North and South, the collaborative members discussed the updates with the Dinkey North and South projects. Mr. Rojas and Mr. Mount expressed their desire to take another site visit. The group discussed plans to set a conference call in February. Mr. Smith noted the importance of inviting Kirby Mollen (spell?) to join the conversation. Mr. Thomas informed the group that Mr. Thompson will be presenting a piece on fisher at the meeting in March.

Regarding ladder fuel marking guidelines, the group continued discussing updates for implementation tools and marketing guidelines. The members suggested that the group make revisions and come to high level conceptual agreement; then present it to the collaborative. Mr. Rojas informed the group that they are investigating latter fuels, and compiling a treatments guide for onsite crews.

Regarding communication and education, Ms. Flick presented the updates for the communication plan, and distributed a handout and fliers. Ms. Flick stated that she was working with Ms. Rebecca Garcia and Mr. Haze on the communication plan. She explained that they added strategies and contact information to the plan. Ms. Flick noted the plan would be updated and ready for review by the group on March 15. Mr. Charley stated the importance of marketing to the local community, and felt that all DLRP Collaborative members market the group's intentions and goals. Mr. Haze commented on creating marketing protocols, so the correct intent of the meeting gets shared with the community. Mr. Goode agreed with addressing and informing the public about Collaborative meetings.

Regarding the evaluation of the 2011 collaborative process, Mr. Fougères briefly went through the summary and highlighted important next steps to improve the process. Important evaluations he mentioned included the following:

1. Continued careful documentation of group recommendations, decisions and agreements.
2. Clarification of the variety of valid information sources.
3. Cultivation of greater comfort with conflicting perspectives and healthy debate, needs for education, greater exploration of interests, and corresponding responsibility for proposing inclusive alternatives.
4. Recruitment of stakeholders to fill key gaps.
5. Incorporation of local beneficiaries in project planning.
6. Continued capacity-building with work groups.
7. Encouragement of executive engagement.
8. Clarification of how field trip discussions will inform project planning.
9. Support of Forest Service project management.
10. Refinement of the joint fact-finding process.

Mr. Jones-Yellin thanked members for their participation and closed the meeting.

10. Attendees

1. Scott Armentrout
2. Susan Antenen, CBI
3. Rich Bagley
4. Carolyn Ballard, USFS
5. Sue Britting
6. Dirk Charley
7. Kent Duysen
8. Larry Duysen
9. Pamela Flick
10. Dorian Fougères, CCP
11. Lisa Garcia
12. Gabriella Golik, CCP
13. Ron W. Goode
14. Chad Hanson
15. Steve Haze
16. Andy Hosford
17. Daniel Jiron
18. Mosé Jones-Yellin, USFS
19. Rich Kangas
20. Ray Laclergue

21. John Mount
22. Ray Porter
23. Ramiro Rojas, USFS
24. Mark Smith
25. Kim Sorini-Wilson, USFS
26. Wayne Spencer, CBI, via telephone
27. Craig Thomas
28. Craig Thompson, USFS
29. Stan Van Velsor
30. Cindy Whelan, USFS
31. Deb Whitall