

Blue Mountain Forest Partners
Full Group Meeting
Thursday, October 16, 2008

Our Mission: Enhance forest ecosystem health, economic opportunities and public safety in Grant County through collaboration.

Present: Mike Billman, Elaine Kohrman, Irene Jerome, Alden Boetsch, Teresa Raft, Dianne Browning, Doug Gouchner, Charlie O'Rorke, Roy Walker, Dan Bishop, King Williams, Glen Johnston, Mark Webb, Jeff Fields, Tim Lillebo, George Meredith, Curt Qual, Dave Hannibal, Bob Crisler.

The next Full Group (Group) meeting will be **Thursday, November 20th from 4:00 to 6:00 pm**. The location will be at the school in Seneca. A public meeting on the Damon Project will follow the full group meeting from 6:00 – 8:00 pm.

I. Previous Meeting Notes

Minutes from the September meeting approved unanimously.

II. Damon Subcommittee Update

Alden briefed the Group on the Damon Subcommittee meeting:

- 1) There was a discussion on goshawks and how the group felt about treating goshawk habitat (Old Forest Multi Strata).
- 2) The Group was asked if they had concerns about doing Forest Plan amendments. They are OK with the idea.
- 3) The Forest Service will use a decision tree to help determine the appropriate treatment for aspen stands located in Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs). There has been no commercial treatment in riparian areas for at least 10 years.
- 4) There will be a Damon Public Meeting November 20th in Seneca. The collaborative group will be represented at the public meeting.
- 5) The next Damon Subcommittee meeting will be November 20th and from 12:00 – 3:00 in the Federal building.
- 6) Temporary roads will be needed to implement commercial treatments on Damon. The roads will be discussed as part of the proposed action at the next Damon Subcommittee meeting.

III. Dads Creek Objection Update

NOTE: A few days after the Full Group Meeting all of the objections to the Dad's Creek project were withdrawn.

Doug Gouchner explained his rationale for the decision during the Dads Creek objection process:

- 1) Objections were received on Dads Creek after changes were made to the proposed action (3 units and a temporary road were dropped). Five objections were received.
- 2) Modified proposed action was selected.
- 3) He doesn't want to jeopardize the collaborative process over 10% of the volume. By selecting the modified proposed action 100% of the precommercial thinning and burning as well as 90% of the commercial volume can be achieved.
- 4) If more volume or additional units are added to the Dads Proposed Action additional analysis will be required; would delay the project while additional analysis is completed.
- 5) The next step is for the objectors to relay their concerns to the Deputy Regional Forester at the objection resolution meeting which is open to the public.
- 6) Didn't want to risk breaking up the collaborative group for a minor amount of volume or having the environmental community litigate the project.

Comments/concerns from group members included:

- Economic viability of the project without the three units included
- Balance of power among interests involved in group
- Working to prevent what happened on Dads from occurring on future projects by anticipating and addressing tough issues early is a good idea . What occurred is also partially a process issue and updating the operations manual should clarify what to do should the group be unable to reach consensus again. Having the group do a self evaluation would be a good way to gauge issues we still need to work on.
- Developing some implementation monitoring protocol could be helpful.

IV. Operations Group Update

- 1) The Operations Group would like to meet with the Forest Supervisor to formally introduce themselves and talk about working together in the future.
- 2) The Group recommends developing measures of success for projects (acres treated and the scale of the project could be included).