

NORTHWEST FOREST PLAN FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING SUMMARY

JUNE 25 - 27, 2024
COURTYARD OLYMPIA
OLYMPIA, WASHINGTON

Introduction: The Northwest Forest Plan Federal Advisory Committee (the Committee or FAC) held its fifth meeting June 25 - 27, 2024, in Olympia, WA. The Committee was established July 7, 2023.

Objectives: Finalize recommendations to the Forest Service to inform the Northwest Forest Plan (NWFP) amendment draft Proposed Action. Discuss the process and timeline following the June meeting, including Implementation and Leadership Commitments.

Attendees: The FAC members, staff, contractors, and the public who attended are listed in Appendix B.

TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2024

Welcome and Land Acknowledgment

Kelly Lawrence, Forest Supervisor Olympic National Forest, U.S Forest Service

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Northwest Forest Plan Amendment Lead, U.S. Forest Service

Susan Jane Brown, FAC co-chair, Silvix Resources

Travis Joseph, FAC co-chair, American Forest Resource Council

The facilitator called the room to attention and welcomed the Committee members, Forest Service staff, and members of the public.

The facilitator introduced Kelly Lawrence, the Olympic National Forest Supervisor, who delivered the land acknowledgment. The meeting of the Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) was held on the traditional land of the Steh-Chass Band of the Squaxin Island Tribe, who have been the land's stewards since time immemorial.

The Designated Federal Officer (DFO), Jacque Buchanan, thanked the Committee for their hard work leading up to the meeting, and dedication to getting the recommendations in a well-rounded place. The DFO feels encouraged going into this week's meeting and believes the Committee will walk away with group consensus.

The Deputy Under Secretary also expressed excitement about the meeting and acknowledged the thought, energy, and collaboration the Committee has put into these recommendations. The Forest

Service is looking forward to the consensus recommendations and their impact on the forest landscape, climate, and relations with Tribes.

The Committee co-chairs gave opening remarks. The co-chairs thanked everyone who helped get the recommendations to where they are today, including the public who provided input. They also thanked the support received from The DFO and the Deputy Under Secretary throughout this process.

Public Comment

The Committee heard from nine (9) public members during the time for public comment and received 16 written comments. The public comment period closed on June 17, 2024. Themes from oral testimonies include:

- The Committee should consider the recommendations for salvage operations, as salvage can help protect forests and keep them healthy. The forest product industry is prepared and eager to assist the Forest Service with this work and believes they could play a significant role in this solution.
- Mobility and accessibility issues, along with managed roads, should be included in the amendment recommendations. Public lands provide a diverse platform for all to come together and recreate, and everyone should have access.
- Recommendations should be science-based, and experimenting should not be conducted on ancient forests. Protection should be considered before active management.
- Comments expressed excitement to see the Tribal Inclusion recommendations, including Treaty rights, co-management, and protection of first foods.
- Need to restore endangered wildlife species through riparian reserves as these affect other species like salmon and orcas.
- There needs to be more engagement in forest rejuvenation, especially after forest fires.
- Climate change and carbon management should be addressed in the amendment.

The facilitator thanked attendees for their comments and for sharing their lived experiences. The Committee was then invited to share reflections about the field trip, public comments, or feelings coming into this week.

A member of the Committee shared highlights from the field trip to the Olympic National Forest. The Committee members began the day at the Skokomish Tribal Center, where they received a warm welcome and listened to Tribal members discuss how they have been impacted by the Northwest Forest Plan. The Committee then visited an old growth stand and a Late Successional Reserve (LSR).

One committee member emphasized the continued importance of meeting with the Forest Service staff responsible for carrying out the updated NWFP in the field. This allows the Committee to understand firsthand the possible impact of their recommendations.

The Committee members expressed their gratitude to the Tribe and Forest Service staff for sharing their knowledge during the field trip, their experience in managing the land, and their willingness to consider stakeholder and public feedback to help identify and finalize the recommendations.

All committee members agreed that the Tribal Inclusion recommendations will have a positive impact and represent a good initial step toward improving the relationship between Tribes and the Forest

Service. A Committee member representing Tribal interests shared with the group that these recommendations are integral to the way of life for Indigenous people and expressed hope that the Forest Service will genuinely uphold meaningful inclusion in the future.

The DFO and Deputy Under Secretary appreciate the Committee's willingness to engage in open and honest discussions and encourage all to continue sharing as the group works through voting this week.

Process Review and Getting to a Consensus Decision

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Northwest Forest Plan Amendment Lead, U.S. Forest Service

The facilitator reviewed the FAC process, highlighting steps the Committee has completed and discussion process for the week's meeting. The goal of the meeting is to review and formally vote on the recommendations for the amendment proposed action. The Committee will discuss all amendment recommendations and confirm the level of Committee consensus for final recommendations.

After the Olympia meeting, the Forest Service will draft the proposed action and oversee the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) process. Before sharing the DEIS with the public, the Committee will have the opportunity to review the document and ask questions. Once the draft is shared with the public, the Forest Service will gather public and Tribal feedback to consider and implement. Committee input on the DEIS will be the focus of the next FAC meeting, planned for September 2024.

Once recommendations are finalized, the Committee will work to develop "Leadership Commitment" recommendations that the Forest Service will use to help guide future decisions for NWFP implementation, monitoring, unit-level plan revisions, and staffing/program management approaches.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

- **Q:** Based on the public comment period and implementation, will the Final EIS (FEIS) be completed in 2025 or 2024?
A: The turnaround time depends on the number of comments the Forest Service receives and how long it takes to implement the changes. Anticipated timing is Spring 2025.
- **Q:** Will there be additional summer Tribal engagement? Will Tribal representation be included in drafting the DEIS?
A: Yes, the Forest Service will offer engagement sessions to Tribes. Two Tribal representatives are currently on the proposed action writing team; they are both presently engaged and contributing substantially.
- **Q:** How do the Leadership Commitment recommendations look in practice? Will the Committee sign off on them?
A: The Forest Service and the facilitation team have been tracking Committee ideas for Leadership Commitment recommendations over the last few months. The Committee will have the opportunity to draft and approve these recommendations.

- **Q:** Will the Committee finalize the preamble language that accompanies the recommendations this week?
A: No, only the recommendations will be finalized. The Committee will have two weeks after the meeting to finalize the preamble for each section.
- **Q:** What will the consultation process with other agencies be like?
A: The proposed action must be finalized before it can be sent to other agencies for consultation. There is a national Endangered Species Act (ESA) and consultation meeting in July, during which this part of the process will be prioritized.

The facilitator introduced the recommendations voting process to the Committee. The voting process consists of five (5) levels of agreement Committee members can choose from:

1. Endorsement: "I like it"
2. Agree with Reservations: "I can live with it"
3. Stand Aside/Mixed Feelings: "OK with what the group decides" or "I have no opinion"
4. Formal Disagreement: "I don't like this, but I don't want to hold up the group"
5. Veto "I veto this recommendation"

The first two days of the meeting will be dedicated to discussing each of the eight recommendation sections. Formal voting will take place on the third day.

National Old Growth Assessment DEIS and Overview

Jennifer McRae, Assistant Director for Planning and Public Engagement, U.S. Forest Service

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Northwest Forest Plan Amendment Lead, U.S. Forest Service

The Committee heard a presentation on the National Old Growth Amendment (NOGA) DEIS, starting with the areas of agreement and the concerns. Areas of agreement included support for the need to steward old growth forests, local and condition-based decision making and implementation, and a clear role for Indigenous Knowledge informing management. Concerns included that the timeline will not allow for meaningful engagement/input, impacts to local economies, top-down approach limits local input, desire for a more restrictive alternative, which includes management restrictions on mature forests, and amendment could detract from the Wildfire Crisis Strategy implementation.

The Committee then reviewed the changes to the NOGA Notice of Intent (NOI), proposed action alternatives, the modified proposed action, and what changed. The next steps for the NOGA include publishing the DEIS, the 90-day comment period, reviewing and analyzing the comments (including the Endangered Species Act dialogue), and finalizing the EIS in winter 2024/2025.

The facilitator thanked the Assistant Director for the presentation and invited questions or comments from the Committee.

Discussion/Question

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

- Q:** The NOGA should not get in the way of treating fire frequent forests. Does the Forest Service feel there is sufficient protection?

A: NOGA recognizes an overarching interest in managing old growth forests and is informed by what is being experienced at the local level.
- Q:** How will accelerated attempts to cut old growth be handled before this amendment?

A: These types of projects are currently under review and will either be approved or further clarification will be requested.
- Q:** So far, there has been no direct conflict between the NOGA and the NWFP. How will conflicts be handled in the future?

A: The Forest Service is working hard to ensure they do not conflict. Once the NWFP plan recommendations are finalized, the Forest Service can identify potential conflict areas and adjust as needed.
- Q:** Are there any lessons learned that can be shared with the Committee?

A: The Forest Service is currently compiling areas of missed opportunities and wins. One that stands out is ensuring the clarity of intent.

Discussion and Recommendation Approval

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Northwest Forest Plan Amendment Lead, U.S. Forest Service

Tribal Inclusion and Honoring Tribal, Treaty, Reserved, Retained, and Other Similar Rights and Trust Responsibilities

The facilitator reviewed the survey results for section 1, Tribal Inclusion and Honoring Tribal, Treaty, Reserved, Retained, and Other Similar Rights and Trust Responsibilities. This section received three (3) general comments and proposed minor edits to six (6) recommendations. The recommendations that required additional discussion are highlighted below. Draft recommendations can be viewed here:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

General comments:

- Q:** There is concern regarding the number of recommendations in this section. Will the Forest Service be able to track and implement so many recommendations if they are adopted? Is there an area to consolidate or eliminate redundancies?

A: The Committee has already consolidated recommendations and removed duplicates where Committee capacity and expertise allows. It is the Forest Service's responsibility to identify how to implement these recommendations in the proposed action and streamline where needed. There could also be a Leadership Commitment around Forest Service implementation of these

recommendations. The Committee also acknowledged some recommendations may be possible with current policy, in which case it is reasonable for those recommendations not to show up in the amendment.

- **C:** “Indigenous People regardless of treaty status” should be clarified in the recommendations. This term is not defined and may cause significant confusion during implementation. Recommendations 1-1 and 1-74 include this language.
- **C:** The Committee will include this in the glossary and agrees that the intent of these recommendations applies to Indigenous Peoples in the Pacific Northwest.

1-5 STD: Forest units shall coordinate with Tribes to ensure privacy and confidentiality is maintained for sensitive topics such as cultural practices, locations, and traditional cultural use species.

- **C:** This recommendation is currently in the desired conditions section and should be moved down to the standards section.

1-22 DC: Forest staff are operationally familiar with and have received training on the Forest Service Manual Chapter 1563 (or any successor Chapter) that sets out the USFS Final Directives on American Indian and Alaska Native Relations.

- **C:** This recommendation is a duplicate of 1-14 and should be deleted.

1-49 STD: Commercial collection of special forest products shall not be permitted if the relevant Tribal governing body identifies it would result in limiting Tribal member access to treaty, reserved, or retained resources. This determination shall be reviewed annually in coordination with relevant and interested Tribes to ensure treaty resources are adequately conserved and stewarded.

- **Q:** How will this be implemented? There is a concern that this recommendation may disproportionately affect underserved communities other than Tribes that rely on special forest products for their livelihood.
A: The Committee discussed that the impact of this recommendation will be assessed in the DEIS.

1-72 STD: The Forest shall provide the fiscal, personnel, and other resources necessary to engage in meaningful, early partnership and consultation with Tribes regarding Tribally-proposed projects or management activities, which directly support Tribal rights and ability to co-steward as consistent with applicable federal law.

- **C:** This is out of the amendment's scope and should be deleted. However, this idea is important and should be tracked for Leadership Commitments.

1-76 STD: Provide opportunities to practice traditional cultural and religious activities such as plant gathering and ceremonial activities to help sustain their way of life, cultural integrity, social cohesion, and economic well-being.

- **C:** Replace “provide” with “Support Tribes’ opportunities,” and “economic well-being” should be replaced with “culturally appropriate stewardship economies.”
- **C:** “Culturally appropriate stewardship economies” should be added to the glossary.

1-83 GDL: To facilitate Tribal community workforce capacity, the Forest should work in meaningful engagement and consultation with relevant Tribes to identify areas of common workforce needs, prioritize training, workforce development, and the offering of a steady to increasing packaging of contracts and agreements, as determined through the Government-to-government and Tribal roundtable processes, for associated forest stewardship, construction, fire management, and wildlife and vegetation monitoring to Tribally owned or operated businesses and organizations.

- **C:** This could also include a Leadership Commitment recommendation related to monitoring.

1-114 MONT: In cooperation with, and as led by relevant and interested Tribes and/or their designees, co-develop monitoring thresholds or triggers and adaptive management pathways that incorporate Indigenous knowledge into management or mitigation responses while protecting Tribal data sovereignty and culturally sensitive information.

- **C:** This language is identical to 1-115 and should be removed.

Support Economic Opportunities and Sustainable Communities:

The facilitator reviewed the survey results for section 2, Support Economic Opportunities and Sustainable Communities. This section received one (1) general comment and proposed minor edits to three (3) recommendations. The recommendations that require additional discussion are highlighted below. Draft recommendations can be viewed here:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

2-8 OBJ: The Forest will continue to monitor socioeconomic conditions in local communities and infrastructure every 5 years to better understand trends and opportunities to foster economic development supported by the National Forest System. This monitoring will be revised in alignment with the NWFP revision, to better capture the more contemporary social and economic aspects of community-agency engagement, and the workforce(s) connected to NWFP management. This includes tracking timber sales, contracting and grants and agreements to understand where and how businesses and organizations are working on NFS lands and changes over time.

- **C:** Minor wordsmithing, “revision” should be replaced with “amendment.”

2-11 GOAL: Maintain and expand contracting and partnering opportunities with local governments, businesses, and organizations. Develop partnerships that leverage different sources of funding to support opportunities to contribute to the economic and social sustainability of local communities.

- **C:** Tribes should be included in this recommendation.

2-12 Establish a staff position on each National Forest to foster partnerships with colleges, K-12 education, and local organizations to create and expand comprehensive fire-related student training and learning opportunities.

- **C:** This recommendation could be a Leadership Commitment since the goal is to add capacity. Edits included changing “staff position” to “staff positions”, added Tribes to the list of partnerships, and natural resources to the learning opportunities.

The co-chair of the Support Economic Opportunities and Sustainable Communities subcommittee will review section two, finalize the language, and present the updated section to the Committee on Day 3.

Forest Stewardship:

In preparation for discussion on Day 2, the facilitator reviewed the Forest Stewardship key areas of discussion:

- Section V: Clarify restrictions for dry forest restoration for shade tolerant and intolerant trees.
- Sections V and VI: Select 10- or 20-year targets for dry restoration and moist plantation treatments.
- Section VIII: Language on if there should be any form of permissible salvage in moist advanced mature and old. “Exceptions” language.
- Section XI: Confirm ages in table aligns with intent and narrative.
- What to do with plan component-style content in this section.

The facilitator invited the Committee members to share any additional areas they would like to discuss. These include:

- The recommendations should not treat dry forests and all LUAs the same.
- More direction is needed for the initial characterization of moist and dry forests. Land managers will be the ones making this decision on the ground and should be provided with as much guidance as possible. One option could be using plant associations.
- More clarity should be identified on whether old growth forests return to being treated as matrix lands post major disturbance.

Closing Remarks

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Jacque Buchanan, Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

The facilitator recognized the committee's progress on the first day and invited the DFO and Deputy Under Secretary to share closing remarks.

The DFO and the Deputy Under Secretary acknowledged all the Committee accomplished on the first day. The discussion was thoughtful and tenacious, and everyone was willing to work towards reaching consensus. They are both excited to continue the discussion on Day 2.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Pacific Planning Service Group, U.S. Forest Service

Susan Jane Brown, FAC co-chair, FAC co-chair, Silvix Resources

Travis Joseph, FAC co-chair, American Forest Resource Council

The facilitator welcomed the group to Day 2 of the Federal Advisory Committee meeting. The facilitator invited the Committee co-chairs and the Forest Service to reflect on Day 1 and give opening remarks.

The Committee co-chairs are grateful for the work and discussion on Day 1 and are looking forward to the day's discussion.

The DFO expressed appreciation and gratitude for the thoughts and comments on Day 1. The Deputy Under Secretary agreed and acknowledged the hard work in continuing the discussion on a substantive topic for Day 2.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

- **C:** The FAC was invited to share their own reflections. All mirrored the same sentiment of gratitude and appreciation for the thoughtful discussion.
- **C:** For one FAC member, a comment given by a member of the public stuck out: the Four-Wheel Drive Association and comments about veterans and access to the National Forest. The Committee has not discussed veterans and people with disabilities in detail and hopes the Forest Service takes such comments into account.

Recommendations Discussion

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Pacific Planning Service Group, U.S. Forest Service

Forest Stewardship

The facilitator opened the discussion by reviewing key topics flagged by members of the Committee through a survey completed prior to the meeting. Discussion guidelines were provided to help clarify ideas and concerns, which are highlighted below. Draft recommendations can be viewed here:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

- When sharing ideas, clarify if referring to **moist or dry forest type**.
- Note **specific Land Use Allocations** if applicable.
- Keep focused on the topic at hand, add additional topics to “parking lot” as needed.

- Express level of support throughout discussion.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

Overview of Forest Stewardship Recommendations

- **C:** Remove the reference to Community Protection Areas (CPA). CPAs are not referenced in Forest Stewardship as there is a recommendations section dedicated to CPAs.
- **C:** The overview speaks to older moist forests but does not refer directly to the definition of “mature.”
 - **C:** #1 states “older,” which is intended to encompass “old” and “advanced mature.”
- The Overview will need to be revisited after further discussion of recommendations.

Table summary of management and age classes for moist forests in Matrix/AMAs and LSRs

A committee member shared an overview of the two-day working session in May.

- **C:** During the May working sessions, conversation revolved around basing management direction on two factors: origin of stand age and Land Use Allocation. If in Moist Matrix younger than 125 years old (1900), active management is permissible. If in Moist LSR management would follow a more passive regime with some active management allowed.
- **C:** The table reflected the agreement developed during the May working sessions of retaining old and older mature forest but otherwise, early mature in Matri and Adaptive Management Areas (AMA) where appropriate will be managed using ecologically based silviculture.

Discussion revolved around the age criterion and the use of born-on dates versus age for moist forest management across Matrix and LSRs.

- **C:** A member of the FAC supported 120 years (1905) instead of 125 years (1900) for established age/date of origin for forest management in moist forest Matrix/AMA and LSRs.
- **C:** If only concerned with ecological values, then the FAC can suggest up to 125 years; however, the FAC cannot get in the way of encouraging the growth of older trees, hence the adoption of an age-based recommendation. The vision of a managed forest landscape should include complex stands that are multi-age and include old and young trees. There will be over 3 million acres of young forest committed into growing into Old Growth Forest in Late Successional Reserves (LSR).
- **C:** It will be important to include clear narrative language that explains the decision-making process for why the Committee is proposing old growth forests are assessed by origin date in Matrix and AMAs and by stand age in LSRs. . This distinction arises from the purpose and need of the Matrix lands, which include a timber harvest component. If age were used instead of a date, there would be a continual shift in the threshold, potentially leading to a situation where younger forests suitable for harvest disappear over time. Thus, the current approach aims to balance maintaining a viable timber base to support communities while also safeguarding older and mature forests by treating these areas differently.

- **C:** Currently, the NWFP does not prohibit managing stands over 80 years old in the Moist matrix. The key issue is whether more access should be allowed in the young moist forest LSRs so the Forest Service has more opportunities to accelerate treatment.
- **C:** The decision on 80 years in the original NWFP was decided based on the untested belief that silviculture could accelerate structural development of old growth forests. These forests need to be managed more aggressively and upping the cap to 120 years will allow further management, especially in plantations.
- **C:** Shifting the recommendation to 1905 captures the stands from the 1902 burns, which produce very well.
- **C:** A FAC member is concerned about the level of analysis and real-world implications but does not see a major flag between 1900 or 1905.
- The table was edited to reflect the change of 1905 with the concerns captured within the narrative.
- **Q:** Indigenous peoples and Tribal entities do not look at forests using defined age. Will this restrict cultural practices?
- **C:** There is language around co-stewardships agreements with Tribes being factored into implementation.
- **C:** A FAC member requested further discussion as a Leadership Commitment regarding a scenario where Tribes are managing land with the Forest Service and if the current plan components aren't effective and there is a need for project-level plan amendment, how those issues can be addressed promptly.

<i>Restrictions on dry forest restoration</i>

- **C:** Point 1 – established year of 1850 or before would mean the trees are 175 years old. More comfortable with 1875, which would be 150 years old.
- **C:** There are instances when Doug Fir stands were established post-contact and the Tribe or local community wants to restore an oak woodland and may need to remove some trees established after 1850, would prefer to not move to 1875.
- **C:** A FAC member suggested the distinction between shade tolerant and intolerant trees be eliminated and accept that Mature is 150 years and Old is 200 years.
- **C:** Support the removal of distinction as this may add an unnecessary barrier.
- **C:** Suggest combining Points 1 and 2 to read “Protect from harvest trees older than 150 years,” which would provide consistency across other Forest Service language in Region 6.
- **C:** This may be the section to include Tribal allowances.
- **C:** Preference for tree age versus origin date.
- **C:** The concern over 150 years is that on-the-ground practice would really mean 125 years. Preference is to give as much leeway to silviculturists as much as possible, understanding that silviculturists will be more restrictive in their practice.
- **Q:** Will the needs of the landscape be met by adding this restriction and how will that be implemented in an efficient matter that won't require coring every tree?

- **C:** Can stand aside with 150 years but would like to ensure there is a mechanism in the future that allows for ecosystem restoration.
- **C:** Ancient trees should never be sacrificed for the protection of 150-year-old trees.
- **C:** Concerns were raised about encountering dense, mature dry forests where no actions could be taken. There was also concern that setting a specific date might lock in a population of mature and old trees without providing protections for mature forests that are being developed. Propose adopting an age and adding a clause.
- The recommendations in this section should not be exclusive to fire-resilience treatments.

Section II; Site specific implementation

- **C:** Add “and Tribal cultural uses.”
- **C:** Tribes’ process of getting an old growth cedar tree for cultural uses was cumbersome.
- **C:** Access is included in the Tribal Inclusion section; the group can cross walk the language.
- **C:** Add stand density in dry forest.

Goals for dry forest restoration

- **C:** Add a fifth goal or expand on Goal #4.

Expectations for dry forest restoration

- **C:** The DFO is unsure of the ability to commit to ten years. The recommendation reads as having 1/3 done in ten years.
- **C:** The intent of the recommendation is to communicate a sense of urgency.
- **C:** 20 years is more realistic, with a strategic plan.
- **C:** Disagree. Dry forests do not have enough time for a plan, to plan approach.
- **C:** Suggest removing “expects,” change to Objective and increase to 15 years.
- **C:** The workforce issue is a critical component.
- **Q:** Could the EIS have alternatives analyzing the effects of different paces?

Expectations for planted stand management

- **C:** There is less experience with plantations compared to dry forests, where the knowledge base is stronger.
- **C:** The Olympic National Forest provided charts and data showing the locations of plantations and their accessibility (approximately 85,000 acres in plantation conditions). Currently, about 2,000 acres are being thinned per year.
- **C:** A sustained yield plan/strategy is needed. A barrier to consider is the survey and manage requirement. Variable Retention harvest also requires Survey & Manage.
- **C:** One of the purposes of managing plantations is for wood production, in addition to other goals. This should be reflected in the goals of managed stand management.
- **C:** Change “Expectations” to “Recommendations.”
- **C:** Add:

- Planted stands: Aim for at least 1/3 of extant planted stands over the next 10 years.
- Moist Matrix/AMAs: Set a goal for sustainable wood production, with a sustained yield goal of 10% every 10 years.
- LSRs were included due to the goal of "across at least one third of extant planted stands in 10 years." This ambitious goal wouldn't be flagged for Moist Matrix.

Committee Co-Chair, Travis Joseph, offered to work on updates to the Forest Stewardship section in the evening to incorporate points of Committee discussion and resolve inconsistencies. The Committee would review the updated language for voting on Day 3.

Anticipate Climate Driven Shifts and Maintain Ecosystem Integrity

The facilitator opened the discussion by reviewing key topics flagged by members of the Committee through a survey completed prior to the meeting. Draft recommendations can be viewed here: https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

Preamble

- **C:** Include private forest landowners.
- **Q:** Would the FAC be open to including the narrative of working forests and wood products capturing carbon?
- **A:** Yes.

4- 15 GOAL: Forests work with Tribes and partners such as academia, NGOs, forest collaboratives, and community groups on climate modeling, research, monitoring, and adaptation approaches.

- **C:** Include private forest landowners.

4-9 DC: The transportation network is resilient to the effects of climate change, including the ability to accommodate increased runoff and peak flows that may exceed historic streamflow events. High risk roads and trails are relocated, and appropriately sized culverts and stream crossings are constructed.

- **C:** Add "decommissioned."

4- 14 GDL: To help ensure that climate adaptation strategies and management activities are based on the best available scientific information, forests should consider climate change vulnerability assessments and adaptation options developed by Forest Service research stations and others.

- **C:** Potential duplication with 4-18.
- Delete 4-18.

4- 19 MA: Ensure that site specific projects evaluate stream crossings and ensure that affected infrastructure is hardened against or can mitigate the effects of large hydrologic events.

4-20 MA: Ensure that site specific projects evaluate road conditions and take action to reduce risks of large hydrologic events and associated potential for erosion, mass wasting, and other aquatic impacts. Evaluation of flood risk should consider the best available science regarding potential effects of climate

change. Appropriate corrective action may include replacement of undersized or underperforming culverts, removal of unneeded roads, or other forms of road remediation.

- **Q:** What is the intent? The Forest Service already does this.
- **A:** Climate change is bringing large atmospheric rivers; the intent is to safeguard against potentially new threats.
- **C:** The NWFP does not currently address climate change impacts.
- **C:** The DFO commented how there may be some mention in forest plans; however, it is not tied to climate change.
- **C:** The Forest Service provided new guidelines for the Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS). There may be some language in the ACS that may be helpful to provide as a Management Action or Guideline.

- **Q:** Could this be framed to be more of a priority?
- **A:** This has been a priority for Region 6. The main prohibiting factor is funding.

4- 22 MA: Consider using warnings and other risk mitigation methods other than closures for areas and sites impacted by climate-related disturbances like wildfire and floods. When mitigations by other means does not reduce risk to acceptable levels, try to limit targeted closures to the smallest temporal and spatial extent possible.

- **C:** This seems outside the scope of the FAC. The FAC should not be the ones to inform or suggest emergency response measures.
- **C:** This previously was a Guideline or Standard. It was changed to a Management Approach and language toned down. This is a big issue for the Recreation community and would like to keep as a recommendation.

Support Carbon Sequestration and Storage

The facilitator opened the discussion by reviewing key topics flagged by members of the Committee through a survey completed prior to the meeting. Draft recommendations can be viewed here: https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

5-1 The existence, maintenance, and management of NW forests should position carbon accumulation and storage as an important ecosystem service. Specific forest management recommendations for carbon sequestration and storage are connected to the Committee's overall forest stewardship recommendations for moist and dry forests across land use allocations. For example, the forest stewardship recommendations for moist forests in LSRs to either prohibit timber harvesting (>125 years of age) or to enhance development of late successional habitat (<125 years of age) are also intended to result in a continued rebuilding and maintenance of in-forest carbon stocks. Similarly, the forest stewardship recommendations to focus on ecological restoration in dry forests across land use allocations are intended to "stabilize" forest carbon stocks from catastrophic losses due to uncharacteristic fire. In dry forests, this includes a long-term shift from carbon storage in denser forest stands composed of many smaller, drought and fire sensitive trees to stands with fewer, larger, drought and fire-resistant trees. (See also Forest Stewardship)

- **C:** A better example for moist forests would be the recommendations for maintaining the advanced mature and old forests, such as moist forests in Matrix AMAs restricting timber

harvesting in moist stands. This current example is about LSRs, which the only change is to raise the allowable age for thinning.

- **C:** The intent was to include an example for moist and dry forests, acknowledging that the Carbon recommendations benefits are carried through in the Forest Stewardship section.
- **C:** This recommendation would be clearer if the language directly referenced a specific section in the Forest Stewardship recommendation.
- **C:** A FAC member suggests referencing Forest Stewardship Section III. Protecting Old and Advanced Mature.

Designate and Steward Community Protection Areas

The facilitator opened the discussion by reviewing key topics flagged by members of the Committee through a survey completed prior to the meeting. Draft recommendations can be viewed here:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

A small group of FAC members made wordsmithing edits to the Section 7 recommendations after Day 1.

Preamble

- **C:** The Preamble did not match the recommendations. Edits forthcoming.
- **C:** The intent of this section is to reduce the administrative barriers currently in place across the planning area for the collaborative community-based wildfire protection work that is already ongoing.

7- 3 The Committee recommends the Forest Service develop CPAs based on fire analytic products and frameworks including but not exclusively PODs, PCLs, and CWPPs. The process and procedures for development of CPAs will involve Tribal partners and community engagement, including local governments, and a cross-boundary approach.

- **C:** Include private landowners.

7- 5 Forest stands within Community Protection Areas are actively managed for protection goals if they contribute to a high risk of catastrophic fire that threatens the built environment, and where common silvicultural techniques including thinning and prescribed fire can effectively manage risk.

- **C:** Include a reference to the dry forest restoration language in Forest Stewardship, Section V.
- **C:** Remove "common."
- **C:** Add "as well as old tree retention."

7- 6 Community Protection Areas will be implemented as "Lands of Specific Character", with the built environment as the strategic feature. Accordingly, this overlay would supersede other LUAs.

- **C:** Concerns about the term "supersede."
- **C:** During discussions, the Forest Service referenced its use of "Lands of Specific Character" in the Sequoia National Parks Plan; however, the reference is primarily regarding fire suppression strategies.
- **C:** The intent is that when Community Protection Area (CPA) recommendations conflict with Land Use Allocations (LUA) and guidelines, CPAs take precedence.

- **C:** The Deputy Under Secretary interpreted this recommendation as a management area overlay.
- **C:** Proposed change from "supersede other LUAs" to "be prioritized over other management direction when there is a conflict."
- **C:** This should be a community-led process with robust community engagement.
- **C:** Uncertainty was expressed about the scope and scale. There was a previous question about defining "community." CPAs need to be adaptable to the landscape. Can implementation be expedited?
- **C:** The Forest Service provided examples of strategies discussed which include protection and reducing risks for firefighters, considering flame lengths and fire behavior (4-6x flame length depending on slope), and addressing falling tree hazards. This is the focus of the community buffer element in the Sierra - Sequoia plans.
- **Q:** Query about including road networks in the analysis.
 - **A:** Yes, especially for communities with limited access points, considering evacuation times.
- **C:** Returning to earlier concerns, there may be language in section 7-5 that addresses these issues.

Fire Resilience

The facilitator opened the discussion by reviewing key topics flagged by members of the Committee through a survey completed prior to the meeting. Draft recommendations can be viewed here: https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

3-1 Stewardship of the NWFP landscapes must recognize variability in fire regimes and effects of fire.

- **C:** Provide clearer details on the specific conditions and treatments. This section should explicitly describe mature and old forests in diverse moist and dry habitats, encompassing both open and closed canopy environments. Aim for more descriptive language.
- **C:** Add "including varying proportions of open and closed forests appropriate to the conditions."
- **C:** Add "The Committee recognizes the importance of fire ecology."

3-13 GOAL: Encourage the appropriate use of prescribed fire in designated wilderness areas where prescribed fire is determined to be the minimum tool required to maintain wilderness character. Reduce barriers to the use of prescribed burning, such as through improved public and agency understanding of the historical role of fire, including Indigenous cultural burning, in preserving wilderness values.

- **Q:** Is prescribed fire in wilderness something the Forest Service currently practices?
- **A:** There is a process right now to engage in prescribed fire. It is something the Forest Service wants to move towards having as a tool.
- **C:** If there is current language the Forest Service is using around this, it would be good to crosswalk that language with the recommendation.
- **C:** Flagged for Leadership Commitment.

3-15 The intent of the following set of connected Management Approaches (MA) is to establish broad goals and processes of prioritizing fuel treatments (e.g. strategic tree removal, thinning,

prescribed fire, managed wildfire and coordination with Tribes on cultural burning) to promote fire-adapted landscapes and communities:

- MA: Coordinate with Tribes, State agencies, communities (e.g. CWPPs), PODS/PCLs and conduct IWRAs to prioritize, plan and implement fuels treatments in areas with multiple overlapping social and ecological benefits to ensure community fire protection goals e.g., highly valued resources and assets including recreation infrastructure, and support ecological functions at a landscape scale.
- MA: Prioritize fuel treatments in and around areas where uncharacteristic high severity wildfire poses the greatest threat to sensitive plant communities, critical wildlife habitats and ecological functions of old growth.
- MA: Prioritize fuel treatments in post-fire landscapes that will restore old forest and critical habitat functions, promote fire-adapted stands and increase future fire-resilience at a landscape scale.
- MA: Design and implement fuels treatment prescriptions that account for diversity of forest conditions (e.g., moist, dry, young, old) and land use allocations (e.g., LSR, matrix, etc.) (See Forest Stewardship)

- C: Add “shrub removal” to list of tools for fuel treatments.
- C: Under the fourth Management Approach, add “open and closed” to examples given of diversity of forest conditions.
- C: Add “private landowners” to first Management Approach.
- C: Recent research points to the need for fire in moist forest (ex: huckleberry patches). This need is not explicitly stated in the recommendations.

3-17 MA: When implementing fuel treatments (forest thinning, prescribed fire), vegetation treatment prescriptions shall be implemented to protect fish and wildlife habitats. The Forest Service will consult with state agencies and Tribes to plan treatments areas to avoid adverse effects to fish and wildlife habitats. If adverse impacts to fish and wildlife habitats are unavoidable, the Forest Service shall mitigate those impacts consistent with state and/or Tribal recommendations or policies (including Tribal Forest Protection Act).

- C: Wordsmithing – edit first sentence to “... implemented to maintain or restore fish and wildlife habitats appropriate to the biophysical setting” with the intent to avoid constraints in having to keep or maintain habitat.

3-8 GOAL/MA: Expand the strategic use of beneficial fire in areas likely to experience fire to reduce impacts of wildfire. Consider the use of fire within past fire footprints to manage fuels and reduce the impacts of reburns.

- C: Expand past “reduce impacts of wildfire” to include reasons as to why beneficial fire can support wildlife and Tribal cultural resources.

3-10 GOAL: Resources, planning, infrastructure, training, and workforce development strengthen the capacity of communities to prepare for, respond to, manage, and recover from wildland fire. This

includes proactive management for ecological restoration, fuels reduction, cultural burning where desired by Tribal partners, prescribed fire, and wildland fire. This includes recognition and inclusion of diverse perspectives including but not limited to, Tribal communities, timber-based economy communities, recreation communities, and biodiversity.

- **C:** Include “underrepresented communities.”
- **C:** Upon review, fire ecology is not discussed in these systems. It is introduced as a tool, but the systems are not recognized as fire adapted or fire dependent.
- **C:** Strengthen the preamble to include recognition of fire ecology.

3-19 DC: Post-disturbance (e.g., fire, wind, pathogens, debris flows) management in plantations facilitates development of mature and old forests, maintains large snags and downed wood characteristics of the forest type (see Forest Stewardship Section 6), and recruits key non-forest habitats in appropriate locations across the landscape.

- **C:** A distinction may be needed about goals in Matrix and AMA plantations from LSR plantations or some language that ensures this won’t point to all plantations heading towards mature and old forest.
- **C:** Delete in favor of referring to Forest Stewardship.

3-20 DC: Excess surface and ladder fuels (including shrubs and trees) that are uncharacteristic of the ecosystem due to fire exclusion and suppression are removed through strategic fuel management, silvicultural treatments and prescribed burning to reorient stands to fire-resilient species compositions and structures.

- **C:** Add “Post-disturbance,”

3-21 Goal: Collaborate with Tribes to develop co-stewardship agreements covering revitalization of cultural species and associated habitats following fire-related disturbances.

- **C:** Add “and other disturbances.”

3-18 DC: Post-disturbance landscapes are stewarded strategically over time to restore forest composition and structure, wildlife habitat and ecosystem function.

- **C:** Add “(e.g. fire, wind, pathogens, debris flow).”

3-22 MA: Design and implement post-disturbance silvicultural activities such as planting, plantation management, thinning, invasive control and prescribed burning to steward landscape and stands to desired conditions, composition and structure.

- **C:** Add “including upland, riparian, and aquatic systems.”

3-23 MA: Consider prescribed fire in burned areas to manage fuels and restore resilient forest conditions.

- **C:** Concerned over the weight of the term “Consider.”

- **C:** The language was softened over the concern a FAC member had over invasives and using prescribed fire in burned areas.
- **C:** Leave as-is.

3-26 MA: Require rehabilitation of recreation infrastructure during post-disturbance management. Within disturbed areas, prioritize forest health, hazard tree and vegetation removal near trails, slope stabilization around trails, and restoration of outdoor recreation facilities lost in wildfires.

- **C:** As a Management Approach, the term would be to “prioritize” instead of “require.”
- **C:** Edited to replace “prioritize” with “require.”

3-27 Standard or MA: Minimize area and facility closures related to wildfires and other disturbances to the smallest temporal and spatial extent possible. Target outdoor recreation site and area closures to the minimum area and time periods deemed appropriate to mitigate threats and minimize impact to the recreating public and commercial providers.

- **C:** This recommendation should be a Management Approach.

Closing Remarks and Next-Day Lookahead

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Susan Jane Brown, FAC co-chair, Silvix Resources

Travis Joseph, FAC co-chair, American Forest Resource Council

The facilitator thanked the group for their flexibility in going through the recommendations in differing order, knowing that discussion of the Forest Stewardship section will need to continue on Day 3. The facilitator reminded the group that Day 3 is the official voting day and previewed the upcoming outstanding discussion topics.

The FAC member will review the Forest Stewardship section and make suggested edits towards reconciling planted stand management and native stand management, and ensuring the table summary is aligned with the narrative. The Plan Components previously drafted may be removed without sufficient time to crosswalk them with the narrative.

The Co-Chairs recognize how far the FAC has come with the recommendations. The group agreed to begin at 8:30 a.m.

Welcome and Opening Remarks

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Susan Jane Brown, FAC co-chair, FAC co-chair, Silvix Resources

Travis Joseph, FAC co-chair, American Forest Resource Council

The facilitator welcomed the group to the final day of the FAC meeting and invited the DFO, Deputy Under Secretary, and Committee co-chairs to share opening remarks and reflect on Day 2.

The co-chair thanked the other co-chair for their hard work implementing the feedback received on Day 2 in the Forest Stewardship section. They believe the Committee is in an excellent place to discuss recommendations.

The DFO and Deputy Under Secretary expressed appreciation for the Committee's hard work over the last two days and are looking forward to finalizing recommendations by the end of the day.

A committee member wanted to address the group regarding the representation of other underrepresented communities outside of Tribes. While the Committee has worked hard on Tribal Inclusion, the committee member feels that other communities, such as the BIPOC community, could have been better represented. They hope that the Forest Service will keep this in mind while working through the EIS process.

The Forest Service thanked the committee member for bringing this to their attention. They believe this piece should be included in the preamble and will work to integrate this issue into the plan content.

The Support Economic Opportunities and Sustainable Communities co-chair shared with the group that draft plan content from previous working sessions regarding this issue is available. The Forest Service will review and consider the language.

Discussion and Recommendation Approval

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Northwest Forest Plan Amendment Lead, U.S. Forest Service

Forest Stewardship continued:

The Committee Co-Chair shared an overview of their suggested edits to the Forest Stewardship section based on the Committee discussion the previous day. Draft recommendations can be viewed here: https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

The below includes continued discussion on the Forest Stewardship recommendations, which are written in narrative format.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

- **C:** Associate the word “plantation” with “younger age class,” recognizing plantations as an explicit subset.
- **C:** Insert “Plantations should be prioritized” at the top of page 6 of the updated Forest Stewardship document.
- **C:** There are no concerns from FAC about prioritizing plantations.

- **C:** Change “shall” to “should,” shifting from directive to permissive.
- **C:** This change would maintain pressure on the agency.
- **C:** Advocate for a strong directive since the FS will include this in their NEPA.
- **C:** The plan components say “shall,” but the narrative does not include “shall.”
- **C:** If “shall” is used, it will need to be conditioned.

- **C:** Ensure, for example, that young foresters understand that wood production is not the only management objective. It is a primary objective of certain National Forest Lands, but never the sole objective.

- **C:** Clarify the table by addressing the asterisks noting provisions.
- **C:** Eliminate confusion related to the Matrix AMA.
- **C:** Address concerns over the table in general as it appears misleading, particularly regarding dates for Dry Forest.
- **C:** The narrative is more robust; consider if the table should be removed.
- **C:** At least delete the Dry Forest portion of the table.

- **C:** On page 4, replace “a Record of Decision” with “at the time a project-level NEPA decision is signed.”
- **C:** Strike “establishment dates” to “tree age.”

- **C:** On Page 3 – Identifying dry vs. moist, strike “by using one or more of the following approaches.”
- **C:** In all Forest Stewardship content, there is significant discussion needed regarding the dry vs. moist distinction due to its consequential nature.
- **C:** Add a bullet point to acknowledge the potential for new standards based on evolving science: The Committee recognizes that science is always evolving, and new methods of distinguishing moist vs. dry may be developed in the future.
- **C:** Address the omission of using soils as a mapping tool: add this to #3 and include slope aspect and topography.
- **C:** In #2, change “identify” to “initially screen” and add “forest by forest level.”

- **C:** It would be valuable to include language indicating that dry vs. moist distinctions need to be identified at different scales, while the FAC is speaking to stand-scale.

The group reviewed the example Plant Associations list provided by a Committee member.

- **C:** The Plant Association list may not apply directly to portions of California.
- **Q:** Is the Forest Service able to use this in analysis?
- **A:** The FS has models at a wider scale; this list is useful to understand the FAC's perspective.

- **Q:** How does this list align with the rest of the recommendations, and what kind of safeguards does the list provide?
- **A:** It will be included it as an attachment.
- **C:** It seems binding as there are gaps and considerations not addressed.
- **C:** The goal is to reduce potential conflict between stakeholders regarding decisions made by agency personnel. It is not intended to lock anyone in but to reduce disputes.
- **C:** Use "See for example" in the narrative.

- **C:** Add language about recognizing mixed, moist, or dry conditions.
- **C:** There is reluctance to add specific language; prefer to leave this to those on the ground.
- **C:** Ensure decisions are made using an interdisciplinary approach, not just by foresters.

Page 1, Summary of Forest Stewardship Recommendations:

- **C:** In Bullet 1, change "older moist forest" to "old" and add "and modifying management of older mature stands with an origin date of 1905 or earlier."
- **C:** A FAC member did not feel that is entirely accurate as active management in stands is permitted up to 175 years as needed.

- **Q:** Snoqualmie Pass AMA – is this the only AMA managed as LSR?
- **A:** The language says "main exception," which can include others.
- **C:** Change to "Some exceptions include" and add "Oregon North Coast."

- **C:** Clarify these as standards and determine how to package them as such.

Advanced Mature Moist Forest:

- **C:** Move the paragraph "Expectations for timber harvest in advanced mature moist forest" up.
- **C:** Change the title from "expectations" to "guidance." Delete the italicized "expectations for timber harvest in advanced mature moist forests."
- **C:** Emphasize forest stewardship in advanced mature moist forests.
- **C:** Change "timber harvest" to "forest stewardship."

- **C:** Emphasis on Timber production: add "(stands originating after 1905)."

- **C:** Add "(Franklin and Johnson 2012)" Table 4 reference in V. Accelerated dry forest restoration.
- **C:** Make it a guideline by using "see generally" or "such as."

- **C:** Change "allowances" to "accommodate and support."

Guidance on dry forest restoration:

- **C:** Change “allowances” to “accommodations for.”
- **C:** Add “cultural uses and stewardship” to Bullet 1.
- **C:** Page 6, Bullet 4: add “adapt to and recover from.”

Dry forests:

- **C:** A FAC member expressed concern over the section starting with “The committee believes the Forest Service should implement...” down to Bullet 3.
- **C:** The FAC will keep the section.

Section V. Accelerated dry forest restoration:

- **C:** Add “Existing guidelines for silviculture in dry forest LSRs on c-12 and c-13 of the 1994 NWFP should be replaced with new management direction based on these recommendations.”
- **Q:** What does this mean for LSR assessment revision?
- **A:** No implications.

Section VIII. Post-fire Forest Stewardship:

- **C:** Consider changing to "post-disturbance."
- **C:** On Page 7, Section 7 regarding LSR thinning: change to “In order to extend opportunities to restore late successional habitat in LSRs” instead of “ensure that no opportunities to restore late successional habitat in LSRs are missed.”
- **Q:** Concern about transitioning from “young mature” to “advanced mature” and potential issues in classification – does this introduce issues in “binning?”
- **A:** No issue from FAC.

A FAC member provided an overview of the Salvage section.

- **C:** Change “legacy features” to “snags.”
- **C:** Specify “existing system” roads when discussing roads.
- **C:** LSR in dry forest stands – considering some salvage while recognizing the need to remove characteristic wood.
- **C:** The aim should be to reduce excessive fuel burning in dry forest LSRs.
- **C:** A FAC member thinks that salvage should be limited.
- **Q:** What if the FAC considers ecologically driven salvage?
- **C:** The thought should be along the lines of “leave the same structures after the fire that you would have left if you were doing a green treatment in that stand.”
- **C:** There is concern about inaccurate mapping of LSRs.

- **C:** Include language for salvage beneficial to climate, forest health, fire resiliency, communities, etc.:
 - The Committee recommends prohibiting salvage.
 - Include snag retention and wildlife needs.
- **C:** The language should recognize the impact of hazards on firefighter safety and operations.
- **C:** Add public and firefighter safety access in the “Salvage in Matrix/AMAs and LSRs,” second paragraph.
- **C:** Address salvage in drought and large mortality instances (climate forest disturbances).
- **Q:** Is there a fundamental difference from other disturbances?
- **C:** Add language: “The Committee recommends the FS also analyze and develop plan direction if necessary for other types of disturbances based on the above recommendations.”
- **C:** Add “without new permanent road construction.”
- **C:** Concern was flagged regarding any type of road construction.
- **C:** Any type of road construction already needs to follow environmental laws.
- **C:** The FAC member withdraws the proposal to include language regarding roads.
- **C:** The FAC agreed to remove the previously drafted plan components and continue with the narrative.
- **C:** Change “Post-fire paradigm” to “Post-disturbance.”

Remove Barriers for Adaptive Management

The facilitator reviewed the survey results for section 8, Remove Barriers for Adaptive Management. Five (5) recommendations in this section received proposed edits. The recommendations that require additional discussion are highlighted below. Draft recommendations can be viewed here:

https://www.fs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/fseprd1181977.pdf.

Discussion/Questions

Q = Question, A = Answer, C = Comment

8-1: The Committee recommends the Forest Service embrace adaptive management as a broad framework across all land use allocations of the NWFP region. Key priorities for adaptive management include but are not limited to climate change resistance, resilience, mitigation and adaptation; fire adapted landscapes and communities; restoration of non-forested habitats; stewardship of mature and old forests; Tribal co-stewardship for ecocultural restoration; and ecological forestry approaches.

- **C:** “Stewardship” should be changed to “ecological stewardship.” This would also be differentiated from “Tribal co-stewardship.”
- **C:** Recommendations 8-4 and 8-7 include incorrect references to the other recommendations and need to be updated.

8-5: AMA plan components should be replaced with recommended Matrix LUA plan components, except where AMA plans direct management otherwise.

A broad framework of adaptive management is necessary across all LUAs of the planning region, and our recommendation to release the AMAs reflects recognition that extensive procedural requirements associated with AMAs largely precluded successful implementation of active adaptive management in AMAs. Furthermore, the AMAs do not provide an effective and representative land base upon which to implement adaptive management in the manner needed to address current stressors and meet current challenges in land management and adaptation.

- **C:** “AMA” should be replaced with “Adaptive Management LUA.”

8-8: Develop a new “Adaptive Management Program” with engagement from Tribes, communities, agencies, research scientists, and interested parties to collaboratively identify core adaptive management projects and demonstration opportunities in each Forest unit across the NWFP region during Forest Plan revision process.

- **C:** “During Forest Plan revision process” can be removed from the recommendation language.

Review Status of Recommendations, Overview of Voting Process, Final Vote

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Susan Jane Brown, FAC co-chair, Silvix Resources

Travis Joseph, FAC co-chair, American Forest Resource Council

The co-chairs expressed their gratitude to the Committee for their accomplishments over the last two and a half days. They hope the Committee is doing justice to the original NWFP work. They mentioned the Tribal Inclusion components will be monumental, and seeing the recommendations in print and action on the ground will be exciting. The co-chairs also thanked the Forest Service for the extra time to refine these recommendations and get them to where they are today.

The facilitator reviewed the voting process with the Committee. The voting process consists of five (5) levels of support for the plan recommendations:

1. Endorsement- “I like it.”
2. Agree with reservations- “I can live with it.”
3. Stand aside/ Mixed feelings- “OK with what the group decides” or “I have no opinion.”
4. Formal disagreement- “I don’t like this, but I don’t want to hold up the group.”
5. Veto- “I veto this recommendation.”

If a recommendation receives three (3) or more formal disagreements or one (1) or more votes, the Committee can discuss the recommendation further.

The facilitator provided a comprehensive overview of the changes made to all eight sections, which will be the recommendation language on which the Committee will vote. The Committee voted on recommendations section by section, beginning with section 1 and concluding with section 8. A total of 19 Committee members participated in the voting. Highlights from voting include:

Section 1: Tribal Inclusion and Honoring Tribal, Treaty, Reserved, Retained, and Other Similar Rights and Trust Responsibilities

- Endorsement: 19 votes

Section 2: Support Economic Opportunities and Sustainable Communities

- Endorsement: 18 votes
- Agree with reservations: 1 vote

The committee member who voted "agree with reservations" shared that they have reservations about the Forest Service's ability regarding practicality, staffing, and funding.

Section 3: Fire Resilience

- Endorsement: 18 votes
- Agree with reservations: 1

Section 4: Anticipate Climate-Driven Shifts and Maintain Ecosystem Integrity

- Endorsement: 16 votes
- Agree with reservations: 3 votes

The committee members who voted "agree with reservations" felt that opportunities were missed in this section to make climate recommendations more robust.

Section 5: Support Carbon Sequestration and Storage

- Endorsement: 15 votes
- Agree with reservations: 4 votes

The committee members who voted "agree with reservations" shared that this section could have been more robust regarding the potential for carbon storage. Another committee member expressed reservations regarding the potential for unintended consequences.

Section 6: Forest Stewardship

- Endorsement: 5 votes
- Agree with reservations: 13 votes
- Stand aside/ Mixed feelings: 1 vote

The committee members who voted "agree with reservations" and "stand aside/ Mixed feelings" shared that there are missed opportunities in this section, such as natural emissions and riparian reserves. Additionally, there may be unintended consequences, which should be discussed and addressed in the DEIS. A Committee member representing Tribal interests shared that this section is rooted in Western science and would have liked to see more Indigenous science and knowledge incorporated throughout. Lastly, some believe management recommendations by the distinction of dry vs. moist forests will be hard to implement.

Section 7: Designate and Steward Community Protection Areas

- Endorsement: 19 votes

Section 8: Remove Barriers for Adaptive Management

- Endorsement: 17 votes

- Agree with reservations: 2 votes

A committee member who voted "agree with reservations" shared that they wish the Forest Service agency would do more adaptive management but are comfortable with where the Committee landed with these recommendations.

After voting, the Committee and the Forest Service staff congratulated each other on finalizing these recommendations. They expressed gratitude to other Committee members, the Forest Service, and the facilitation team for everyone's contribution throughout this process.

Update on Next Steps, Schedule, and Closing Remarks

Cory Archer, Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative

Jacque Buchanan, Pacific Northwest Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service

Meryl Harrell, Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Forest Service

Priya Shahani, Northwest Forest Plan Amendment Lead, U.S. Forest Service

The facilitator reviewed the committee's next steps and upcoming schedule now that the recommendations have been finalized.

The co-chairs will write an introduction and letter to the Secretary, which will be included in their recommendations report.

Identified committee members will work to finalize the preambles for each section. The committee co-chairs will review and edit them in one voice. Members were also identified to finalize the Tribal preamble and glossary. The Committee will aim to release a final version of their recommendations and report for public sharing within two weeks of the meeting.

The Forest Service and facilitation team have been tracking ideas for Leadership Commitments over the last few months. The Committee will focus on this work leading up to the September FAC meeting.

The Forest Service will publish the DEIS in late August. The Committee will have the opportunity to hear from the Forest Service about the DEIS before it is shared with the public.

The facilitator closed the meeting by congratulating the group on their hard work and is looking forward to the work leading up to the September meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Glossary/Acronyms

AMA	Adaptive Management Area
CWPP	Collaborative Community Wildfire Protection Plans
DFO	Designated Federal Official
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
FAC	Federal Advisory Committee
LSR	Late-Successional Reserve
LUA	Land Use Allocations
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOGA	National Old Growth Amendment
NWFP	Northwest Forest Plan
PPSG	Pacific Planning Service Group
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFS	United States Forest Service

APPENDIX B

Attendance

Federal Advisory Committee (FAC) Attendees:

FAC Member	Title	Location	Committee Category	Seat
Angela Sondena, PhD	Certified Senior Ecologist, Nez Perce Tribe	Idaho	Science	Terrestrial Wildlife Ecology
Ann House, JD	Staff Attorney, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe Environmental and Natural Resources Department	Washington	Government	American Indian Tribes
Betsy Robblee	Conservation and Advocacy Director, The Mountaineers	Washington	Organization	Recreation Organizations
Daniel Reid Sarna-Wojcicki, PhD	Postdoctoral Researcher, UC Berkeley	California	Science	Adaptive Management and Planning
Elaine Harvey, PhD	Environmental Coordinator, Yakama Nation	Washington	Science	Aquatic and Riparian Ecosystems and Species
Heidi Huber-Stearns, PhD	Director, Ecosystem Workforce Program, Institute for a Sustainable Environment, University of Oregon	Oregon	Science	Social Science
James Johnston, PhD	Assistant Professor (Senior Research), College of Forestry, Oregon State University	Oregon	Science	Vegetation Management
Jerry Franklin, PhD	Professor Emeritus, School of Environmental and Forest Science, University of Washington	Oregon	Science	Forest Ecology
Jose Linares*	District Manager (Retired), Bureau of Land Management, Northwest Oregon	Oregon	Organization	Underserved Communities Outreach Organizations

	District and Board Member, Straub Outdoors			
Karen Hans	Good Neighbor Authority Program, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife	Oregon	Government	State Governments
Laura Osiadacz*	Kittitas County Commissioner	Washington	Government	County Governments
Lindsay Warness	Western Regional Manager, Forest Resource Association	Oregon	Organization	Forest Products Industry
Meg Krawchuk, PhD	Associate Professor of Landscape Fire, Ecology, and Conservation Science, College of Forestry, Oregon State University	Oregon	Science	Fire Ecology
Mike Anderson, JD	Senior Policy Analyst, The Wilderness Society	Washington	Organization	Wildlife Organizations
Nicholas Goulette	Executive Director, Watershed Research and Training Center	California	Organization	Watershed Organizations
<i>Robert "Bobby" Brunoe</i>	Secretary Treasurer/CEO, Confederate Tribes of Warm Springs	Oregon	Science	Indigenous Traditional Ecological Knowledge
Ryan Haugo, PhD	Director of Conservation Science, The Nature Conservancy	Oregon	Science	Climate Change
Ryan Miller*	Director of Treaty Rights and Government Affairs, Tulalip Tribes	Washington	Government	American Indian Tribes
Ryan Reed	Co-founder and Executive Director, Fire Generation Collaborative and Wildland Firefighter	California	Public	Member of the Affected Public at Large
Susan Jane Brown, JD	Principal, Silvix Resources	Oregon	Organization	Forest Collaborative Groups
Travis Joseph	President/CEO, American Forest Resource Council	Oregon	Organization	Forest Products Industry

Key: *Not in attendance* | *Virtual attendance


Planning Team Attendees

Name	Title/Affiliation
Candice Magbag Plendl	Facilitation Team, True Wind Collaborative
Cory Archer	Facilitator, True Wind Collaborative
Delaney Caslow	Resource Assistant PPSG, U.S. Forest Service
Don Yasuda	U.S. Forest Service
Jacque Buchanan	Northwest Regional Forester Region 6, U.S. Forest Service
Jennifer McRae	Assistant Director for Planning and Public Engagement, U.S. Forest Service
Katie Heard	U.S. Forest Service
Kimm Fox-Middleton	U.S. Forest Service
Laura Schweitzer	U.S. Forest Service
Meryl Harrell	Deputy Under Secretary, U.S. Department of Agriculture
Priya Shahani	U.S. Forest Service
Shannon Browne	Facilitation Team, True Wind Collaborative
Talia Neiman	Facilitation Team, True Wind Collaborative

Public Comment

Name	Affiliation
Collin Emmerson	Sierra Pacific Institute
Kyle Wiebold	PNW Four Wheel Drive Association
Ric Bailey	Public
Hayden Wyatt	Law Student
James Aven	Public
Matt Comisky	AFRC Washington
Timothy Ingalsbee	Firefighters United for Safety, Ethics, and Ecology
Cindy Mitchel	Public

Co-Chair Verification

 7.30.24

Susan Jane Brown

 8-04-24

Travis Joseph