

Southern Crown Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Meeting

Lolo National Forest Conference Room 9am - 3pm January 19, 2009

DRAFT MEETING ACTION ITEMS AND NOTES

Next Meetings: 9am-3pm February 9th, March 9th, April 13th

Action Items:

- **Bo** will update FS ownership of former TNC lands on the Seeley and Lincoln districts on the landscape map while ensuring all ownership shape files are current.
- **Bo** will run the numbers to determine if including BLM lands would reduce the % of FS ownership in the landscape below 50%.
- **Tim and Amber** will talk to BLM representatives to see if they want to be more involved in this process.
- **Megan** will send a copy of the glossary of terms document to Keith and Jon.
- **Travis** will continue to work on language describing the restoration treatment possibilities in this landscape.
- **Jon** will provide more language describing both restoration and fuels reduction practices and the differences between the two.
- The **individual watershed groups** will determine which landowners to include and how best to include them on an ongoing basis.
- **Scott** will follow up with the IT staff and re-organize the FTP site.
- **The Filtering Team and the Fire/Economics Working Group** will continue to work on developing a matrix of prescriptions and products.
- **Megan** will make sure that everyone on the outreach list who has been contacted is now on the “informed” email list.
- **Bo, Scott, and Megan** will begin building a list of potentially useful figures, maps, and other images for the proposal.
- **Megan and Scott** will review the entire document to get rid of redundancies.
- **Travis, Keith, and Jim B.** will develop a monitoring draft (a couple of paragraphs to fold into our existing document) by February 2nd.
- **John and Brad** will provide a sentence or two about how we’ve let fire play its natural role in the wilderness area.
- **Bo** will add a fire history map figure for the landscape.
- **Jim, Keith, and Jon H.** will make sure that we’re consistent in our discussion of “low elevation” versus “mid-elevation” since most of what we call low elevation forest is actually mid-elevation with a mixed-severity fire regime.
- **Travis** will track ongoing climate change analyses and ensure that we’re up to date and incorporating everything we need to in our climate change discussion.
- **Megan** will use these notes to draft consensus definitions of what it means to “maximize retention of large trees” and to “fully maintain, or contribute to, the restoration of pre-suppression old growth conditions”
- **John I.** will send his working definition of these terms to Scott and Megan.
- **Amber** will send out a revised template of the spreadsheet ASAP.
- **Tim, Amber, and Brad** will provide their respective districts’ FLRA-compatible, non-vegetative restoration project lists for 2010 and 2011 by February 9th.

- **Tim, Amber, and Brad** will work with their staff members to compile their respective districts' FLRA-compatible, non-vegetative restoration project lists for 2012-2019 and keep the group apprised of their progress.
- **Joe and Keith** will work on listing restoration treatment possibilities and coming up with costs and revenues associated with them for 2010 and 2011 before February 9th.
- **Keith** will look at Brad, John, Joe, and Travis' documents to get an understanding of what we still need in order to make cost estimates and will make progress in finalizing cost estimates for different silvicultural treatments in years 2010 and 2011.
- **Brad, Keith, and Joe** will talk between now and the next meeting to make sure all appropriate costs are taken into account.
- **Tim** will provide biomass feasibility studies to Joe.
- **All working group participants** will come up with 3 ways that communities can be involved by February 9th.
- **All working group participants** will consider the pros and cons of a firm diameter cap being included for each species/forest type.

Present:

Bo Wilmer (TWS), Jeff Barber (TNC), Jim Lowery (UM), Scott Brennan (TWS), Tim Love (USFS), Anne Dahl (SEC), Amber Kamps (USFS), Al Christopherson (RMEF), Megan Birzell (CRC), Travis Belote (TWS), Mo Hartmann (NWC), Keith Stockmann (USFS), Brad Gillespie (USFS), Mike Okecheo (USFS), John Ingebretson (USFS), Jon Haufler (CRC), Kevin Riordan (USFS), Joe Kerkvliet (TWS)

Personal Goals for the Meeting:

- Better coordination among sub-groups to aid in prioritization
- Ensure that the unique features of each watershed in the landscape are properly represented.
- Continue to build the momentum for the proposal
- Figure out what the long-term support roles are for the various collaborating organizations
- Focus the proposal and reduce redundancies
- Incorporate monitoring into the proposal
- Learn how best to garner local input from the three watersheds in the landscape.
- Get a clear view of what cost estimates and outputs we'll use for the proposal
- Ensure that we're meeting all the requirements of the proposal
- Get a better idea of how we will incorporate biomass into the proposal

Updates/new information:

- Bruce Fox will have a large say in where things will go in this region with respect to this proposal. We should check in with him and share details.
- Multiple biomass feasibility reports are floating around and may be of use for our proposal.

Report on action items/deliverables from last meeting:

- Scott has added a category of RACs to the outreach list. Contact has still not been made.
- John and Brad prepared a narrative about fire that can be meshed with the existing proposal. *We still need to figure out how to get LANDFIRE data in so they can run the models. We need to determine acreages, types of treatments, outputs, costs, etc. to make our proposal more quantitative.*

- Scott has added Craig Rawlings and Jim Lowery to the email list.
- Scott has inserted some notes and language in the proposal explaining that the landscape is not pristine and is in need of restoration. *We need to beef this language up with some key statistics that help paint this picture.*
- Bo and Scott have amended the project area to drop land east of Hwy 141 and south of Hwy 200 but still include Lubrecht.
- Bo prepared a new project area map and a new locator map. This draft map was just meant to highlight the new landscape boundaries and was not 100% accurate with respect to ownerships. The final map will reflect the most up-to-date ownerships. **Bo will update FS ownership of former TNC lands on the Seeley and Lincoln districts.**
 - There was some discussion about the pros and cons of separating out roadless lands on the map versus just showing them as FS ownership. These lands will be included when looking for restoration opportunities across the landscape.
 - There was discussion about why the landscape boundary includes Lubrecht Experimental Forest but does not include the Garnet Mountains. The landscape boundary was changed so that we would fit the criteria of having at least 50% FS lands across it. We kept Lubrecht in the boundary due to our desire to maintain a connection to UM. **Bo will run the numbers to determine if including those BLM lands would reduce the % of FS ownership in the landscape below 50%. Tim and Amber will talk to BLM representatives to see if they want to be more involved in this process.**
- Jim Lowery prepared a glossary of terms that we will use to ensure consistency throughout the proposal. **Megan will send a copy of this document to Keith and Jon.**
- Megan is still working to clarify how many of the 223,000 acres listed in the draft are actually going to the FS.
- Joe and Craig provided more discussion of how this funding will help local economies (i.e. through biomass utilization).
- Travis determined that we need more discussion to narrow down restoration treatment possibilities in this landscape (i.e. how many acres, what kind of volume, what are the costs, etc.) so that he can then provide language listing examples of types of restoration. **Travis will continue to work on this deliverable.**
- Jon Haufler provided language distinguishing between fuels reduction and restoration projects for the filtering section of the proposal. **Jon will provide more language describing both restoration and fuels reduction practices and the differences between the two.**
- Megan has revised the document such that wood is referred to as a “good” or “commodity,” not as an ecosystem service.
- Scott sent an update on outreach activities, including new people to reach out to, after the last working group meeting. Scott also set up a listserv to keep everyone up to date on our activities. **Scott will send out finalized talking points and the FYI email to this working group.**
- Gary, Anne, and Jon H. provided looked through lists of landowners in their watersheds to identify which landowners should be involved in our efforts. **The individual watershed groups will determine who to include and how best to include them.**
- Bo and the rest of the filtering team have taken the FS Integrated Restoration Protection Strategy into account in the filtering process. There is some disagreement with respect to how it helps us prioritize projects. They are currently looking for places where the IRPS strategy prioritization coincides with the filtering team’s prioritization. Where there is disagreement, and where the

filtering committee does not endorse the IRPS prioritization, the group will justify its recommended course of action.

- Scott put Jon’s presentation on the FTP site, but there have been some problems with the site. *Scott will follow up with the IT staff and re-organize the FTP site.*
- The filtering team provided a strong narrative about how we got to where we are in terms of our filters and identifying appropriate project sites.
- The Filtering Team and the Fire/Economics Working Group have not come up with a matrix of prescriptions and products. *They will continue to work on this before the February 9th meeting.*

Outreach Update

- *Megan will make sure that everyone on the outreach list who has been contacted is now on the “informed” email list.*

Person	Affiliation	Contact	Progress 1/19/10
Jim Satterfield	FWP	Cathy	contact made, no mtgs
Mack Long	FWP	Debbie	contact made, no mtgs
TBD	Relevant RACs	Megan	Newly added
Pat O'Herren	Msla RI	Debbie	contact made, no mtgs
Pat McKelvey Missoula County Commission	Lewis & Clark County	Amber	contact made, no mtgs
Rem Mannix	Powell	Debbie	contact made, no mtgs
Sue Shannon	Lake County	Tim	contact made, no mtgs
Dan Roberson	Swan DNRC	Anne	contact made, no mtgs
Rob Ethridge	MAIRS; DNRC	Anne	contact made, at 11/16
Joyce Schwartzendruber	NRCS	Tim, Amber,	mtg
Mike Volesky	MT Land Board	Gary	will contact
Bill Frings	Plum Creek	Rob	will contact
Gordy Sanders	Pyramid	Debbie	will contact
Rick Frankie	Smurfit	Gary	contact made, no mtgs
Ellen Simpson	MWPA	Megan	contact made, no mtgs
John Fitzpatrick	Northwestern Energy	Marnie	will contact
Rosalie Cates	MCDC	Debbie	contacted
Dave Atkins	FS	Rosalie	will contact
Mick Harrington	FS Research	Scott	contact made, at 11/16
Marnie Criley	MFRC	Keith	contact made, at 11/16
Nancy Anderson	BLM	Tim	contact made, no mtgs
BFPA		Tim	contact made, at 11/16
Salish Kootenai		Scott	mtg
Seeley Lake Community Council		Gary	contact made, no mtgs
Condon Community Council		Tim, Megan	contact made
		Tim	contact made
		Megan	contacted
		Anne, Mo	informal contact made,

			will continue
Lincoln Community Council		Amber Scott, Gary,	contact made with chairman, meeting scheduled at end of month
Lincoln Restoration Cmte		Amber	contact made
Conservation Organizations		Scott, Marnie	contact made
Bruce Farling	Montana TU	Scott	contact made
Juanita Vero	BBCTU	Gary	contact made
Sierra Club		Scott	contact made, no mtgs
Wild West Institute		Scott	contact made, no mtgs
Montana Logging Association		Scott, Marnie	contact made via email
Al Christopherson	RMEF	Scott, Marnie	contact made
Greg Neudecker	FWS	Gary	contact made
FWS upper level		Debbie	will contact
Andrew Larson	UM Ecology Prof	Travis	contact made
Cara Nelson	UM Restoration Prof	Travis	contact made
Leslie Weldon	USFS	Debbie	contacted
Seeley Community		CRC	will contact
Blackfoot communities		Challenge	will contact
Tony Liane	DNRC	Debbie	contacted
Bruce Friede	MDOT	Gary	will contact
Condon Community		SEC & NWC	will contact

Reviewing Proposal Draft and Embedded Questions:

- The group went through the draft proposal. All comments will be incorporated in a revised draft for the next meeting. Following is a list of action items and general themes that emerged from this discussion:
 - **Bo, Scott, and Megan** will begin building a list of potentially useful figures for the proposal.
 - **Megan and Scott** will review the entire document to get rid of unnecessary redundancies.
 - There was discussion about monitoring language. It is currently lacking in the proposal document. FLRA speaks specifically about monitoring guidelines (page 24 of the Act), as does the CFLRP field guide. It also appears that some of the CFLR fund money can go toward monitoring. One of the difficulties with describing monitoring is deciding on the most appropriate scale of monitoring to frame the discussion. In the proposal, the group agreed that we need to approach monitoring component to the same level of detail as vegetative treatments, including estimated costs. Keith has created a spreadsheet that begins to address this issue. **Travis, Keith, and Jim B.** will develop a monitoring draft (a couple of paragraphs to fold into our existing document) by February 2nd.
 - In order to illustrate the need for restoration in the SW Crown landscape, we need to quantify the change to native ecosystems. It was suggested that we could use FRCC with LANDFIRE data to get an idea of the changes that have occurred. Other ideas included: 1) showing how many fires have been suppressed in the last X number of years, 2) X

- number of acres exposed to commercial harvest in the last X number of years, 3) use T&T species as an indicator of changes to the landscape. We could also use anecdotal evidence to tell a story of why restoration is needed.
- We need to insert fire suppression statistics to back up the assertion that fire has been effectively suppressed in the landscape. Suggestions included provided data about the number of fire starts held to 10 acres or less. Fire regime condition class is included in John and Brad's fire language, and we could maybe pull from that for this paragraph. **John and Brad** will provide a sentence or two about how we've let fire play its natural role in the wilderness area. **Bo** will add a fire history map figure for the landscape. **Jim, Keith, and Jon H.** will make sure that we're consistent in our discussion of "low elevation" versus "mid-elevation" since most of what we call low elevation forest is actually mid-elevation with a mixed-severity fire regime.
 - There are several ongoing analyses of climate change. Steve Running is conducting a fine-scale analysis whose results should be available to us by April 1. There is another similar analysis moving forward through the FS whose results may be available around the same time. These analyses should be incorporated into a specific discussion about climate change in our landscape strategy. **Travis** will track these analyses and ensure that we're up to date and incorporating everything we need to in our climate change discussion.

Discussion Questions:

- What does it mean to "maximize retention of large trees?"
 - Leave small trees available for growth; focus treatment on small-diameter trees.
 - Incorporate species composition into the accounting of which trees to leave and which to take
 - Retain trees above a certain DBH threshold determined by habitat type
 - Work with the resilient characteristics of an existing stand to determine which trees to take and which to leave
 - Recognize that large trees may not exist in a given stand right now, and the actions required may be to just encourage the growth of some trees in the stand so that they become large trees in time.
 - Always be able to justify the taking of any large tree.
 - Retain, to a pre-suppression level, trees in a variable size range that existed in pre-suppression conditions.
 - It is important to remember that large trees are not necessarily synonymous with old growth.
- What does it mean to "fully maintain, or contribute to, the restoration of pre-suppression old growth conditions?"
 - Allowing stand-replacing fire to occur where ecologically appropriate, particularly the west side of the Swan Valley
 - Follow Green et al.'s definition of old growth by habitat type.
 - Restore historical stand structure and landscape diversity with a focus on understory diversity.
- Would it make sense to develop a working definition for these terms?

- The group agreed that this is a good goal. However, the definition will depend on the scale. It is easy to develop a working definition at the stand scale but very difficult at the landscape scale.
- **Megan** will use these notes to draft consensus definitions that will go into the introduction of the proposal.
- **John I.** will send his working definition of these terms to Scott and Megan.

Prioritizing non-vegetative restoration activities:

- The staffs of the Seeley, Bigfork, and Lincoln ranger districts met last week to be briefed on CFLRP. The discussion focused on how to implement this program if we get funded. They discussed the specific restoration activities each district felt they needed to provide for the proposal. They also discussed how CFLRP would fit in with the rest of each district's program of work. Ultimately, the district's decided that the CFLRP in and of itself will not be a comprehensive plan of work for each district but will be one program within each district's plan of work.
- Amber, Tim, and Brad are currently working on a spreadsheet of all non-vegetative restoration work that each district could possibly do in the next 10 years. It includes things like road density/trail restoration, weeds, vegetative composition and structure (native plant vegetation, planting trees, riparian management), monitoring, range improvements, grassland restoration, etc. (The districts also have a corresponding spreadsheet for vegetative management restoration.)
 - Each district will populate the non-vegetative restoration spreadsheet, incorporating comments that Scott has provided. These 3 lists will be melded into one, which will require prioritizing them across districts. **Tim, Amber, and Brad** will provide their respective districts' lists by February 9th. **Amber** will send out a revised template of the spreadsheet ASAP.
- Once this list is populated and prioritized, it will bring us MUCH closer to a focused proposal with regard to the non-vegetative restoration component.
- Suggestions for the spreadsheet:
 - Re-structure it to match the requirements of FLRA as much as possible.
 - Add a monitoring field to each project instead of listing monitoring as a separate class of projects.
- The Lincoln District doesn't currently have a program of work, and so the CFLRP will likely drive their program of work moving forward. The Bigfork District will be very conservative in their projects when we start looking more than 5 years out because they are at capacity right now with respect to project and people available to manage them.

Review Strategy Straw Man:

- Scott prepared a straw man outline in an attempt to boil down the landscape strategy into something understandable.
- In discussion about the strategy, some were concerned that the outline format would create an arbitrary prioritization. Others said that we need to flesh out our prioritization more before we can bring together an outline like this.
- There was also concern that the Fs will not be able to provide concrete details about out-year projects because right now they exist only in concept form.

- The group agreed that we should populate the non-vegetative restoration spreadsheet with everything we know about the NEPA-ready projects for 2010 and 2011. We will wait to address 2012 – 2020 for now.
- **Joe and Keith** will work on listing restoration treatment possibilities and coming up with costs and revenues associated with them for 2010 and 2011 before February 9th.
- **Tim, Amber, and Brad** will populate the spreadsheet using info for 2010 and 2011 projects that they believe are FLRA-compatible by February 9th.
- **Keith** will look at Brad, John, Joe, and Travis' documents to get an understanding of what we still need in order to make cost estimates and will make progress in finalizing cost estimates for different silvicultural treatments in years 2010 and 2011.
- **Brad, Keith, and Joe** will talk between now and the next meeting to make sure all appropriate costs are taken into account.

What, if anything, are we missing?

- We need to discuss how communities will be involved in implementation and monitoring over the next ten years.
 - **Every working group participant** will come up with 3 ways that communities can be involved by February 9th.
- We need to develop a collective strategy of where we want to go with biomass utilization in this proposal. Do we want to make biomass start-ups part of this proposal? Or do we just want to let that happen externally and take advantage of it if it does take off?
 - There has also been some discussion of putting boilers at the three districts to use biomass to heat the facilities.
 - **Tim** will provide feasibility studies to Joe.

Next meetings: Feb. 9, Mar. 9, April 13