

**Blue Mountains Forest Partners  
Damon Project Committee Meeting  
July 17, 2008**

**Participants**

Dan Bishop, Tm Lillebo, Emily Platt, Karen Coulter, Elaine Korhman, Charlie O'Rourke, Mike Billman, Alden Boetsch, Diane Browning, Glen Johnston, Daniel Hubbard, Sarah Bush, Ryan Falk, Roy Walker, Asante Riverwind, George Meredith, and Brooks Smith.

**Next meeting**

The Damon project committee will have a conference call to talk about the draft PIL on Wednesday, August 6<sup>th</sup> from 3 – 4 pm.

**Timeline Update and Discussion**

County money involved in this project in effort to expedite it. Prairie District has a full-time team working on the project – fuels and vegetation almost every day for the last three months. New list of botanical species out from the regional office. Huge landscape. Lots of work. Working on identifying units so analysis is just done on necessary areas and not across entire planning zone. Trying to narrow down the 20,000 acres.

*Please see attached timeline for more detailed information.*

**Information Request**

Asante drafted a list of requested information that the group reviewed and added two items to: information on listed fish species and soils information. The Forest Service will share this information with the group as it becomes available.

*Please see attached document that details the information request.*

**Process**

We talked about the current process whereby committee members who can't make it to a meeting have to wait to give their feedback at the full group meeting where the final decision on the issue at hand is made.

***We made the following decision to resolve the issue:***

Committee members agree that every effort will be made to attend committee meetings. If attendance is not possible, the member will inform the committee co-chairs right away. Providing information to committee members prior to meetings is encouraged if a member cannot attend the meeting but wants to share information or ideas. If an agreement is made that a member does not support at a meeting that member could not attend, he or she may try to get consensus on an altered proposal or agreement. The member with the disagreement is responsible for this process, and any altered agreement would need to be

approved by committee members before the next committee meeting. If a new agreement is not reached, the area of concern will be flagged when the committee gives their recommendations to the full group for consideration.

In addition, the group supported the idea of creating a “common zones of agreement” document which would be put together by whole group as standing agreements that can be referred to on every project.

### **Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project Concerns**

Karen Coulter was invited to share the concerns her organization and supporters have with the Damon project agreements that were made at the field tour because she didn't know about the tour in advance. This communication lapse has been remedied and won't be an issue in the future.

#### ***DOGs***

Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project (BMBP) is concerned about losing mature forests and about impacts to DOGs from logging. BMBP is not opposed to a commercial component per se. Karen said she could look at this on a case by case basis and noted that she is more likely able to agree to doing something in low elevation dry pine sites. Her organization will have more of a problem with natural mixed conifer sites (as opposed to dry mixed conifer sites that were not historically mixed conifer). As the committee had already agreed, this will be looked at in the field (both dry p pine and dry mixed conifer) and a sample marking exercise with ribbons will be done.

#### ***Group agreed to change language in recommendations to date document to:***

Trees with mature and old growth characteristics will be protected.

Forest Service noted that more specific feedback would be helpful. For example, when/under what conditions would we want them to into a DOG to treat it.

#### ***Aspen***

BMBP concern is that there is no need for removal of 21” trees to restore aspen. Karen said that ICBMP scientists identified 21” trees as really lacking across the landscape. Discussed costs of restoration and cost of fencing and how larger trees could support that work.

Group agreed to drop this bullet as a written recommendation to the Forest Service.