**Notes from SBEADMR Working Group Meeting**October 30, 2014

The second meeting of the SBEADMR Working Group was held on Thursday, October 30, 2014 in the Pioneer Room at the Montrose County Fairgrounds. Following are notes from flipcharts, facilitator’s summary notes and suggestions for follow-up steps.

**I. Establish Clear Expectation and Ground Rules:**

Attendees were asked to share their expectations of the working group:

* Submit a recommendation to the Forest Service
* 100% consensus – need to give serious thought to majority/minority opinion approach as usually does not result in durable outcome
* Need to identify membership – who is willing to commit time and energy to process
* Expect to cooperate – to come up with alternative
* Give Forest Service help as the proposed action represents a unique way of addressing the issue
* Opportunity to learn – hear about Forest Service proposal
* Enhance understanding of the proposed action
* Identify membership – establish protocol
* Opportunity to elaborate on positions
* To reach consensus on several ideas would be helpful

In sum, expectations ranged from an opportunity to learn and enhance understanding to wanting to come up with an alternative or submit suggestions/recommendations to the Forest Service. At the end of the expectation exercise, the group gave a “thumbs up” to hope (not necessarily expect) to work together cooperatively to reach “zones of agreement” on one or more issues and to provide suggestions/recommendations to the Forest Service in addition to sharing information and enhancing understanding of the proposed action.

Follow up:

* Establish protocol for making suggestions/recommendations to Forest Service
* Identify the core group, i.e. membership that has a “say” on making suggestions/recommendations
* Identify opportunities that are “ripe” for working toward agreement so as not to get bogged down on issues that we can’t reach agreement on, i.e. agree to disagree

**II. Clarify the Meaning of Stated Goals**

A. Public Safety

* Concern was expressed for the discrepancy in definitions or meaning of goal from one document to another, i.e. NOI, 7/29/13 scoping letter, and Q&A document
* Clarify what the definition of WUI is – define/identify acres to be treated in WUI

In sum, there was understanding of the meaning of the Public Safety goal – issue was not with the meaning/intent but with the discrepancies noted above.

Follow up:

* Define what the Forest Service means by “WUI” and make connection for the use of “WUI” between the Q&A and the NOI
* Revise Q&A to match other documents/definitions and clarify on websites that such clarifications have been made; date each new version of Q&A

B. Recovery

* **Q**: Why are the Western Bark Beetle (WBB) guidelines to important to this effort? **A**: To acknowledge work/research that has been done rather than reinventing the wheel for this effort.
* How is the WBB guiding this action?
* What species are addressed in the WBB? Is the species in this proposed action different?
* Is there new science that could address recovery issues since the WBB guidelines were published?
* How can/will information be updated with new information in this process?
* Is there an opportunity to incorporate recovery objectives into the goal of public safety rather than creating a separate goal?
* What do you do with the product that is recovered? – that question crosses all the goals

Discussion/comments turned to the proposed to the landscape-scale adaptive NEPA approach as opposed to a “project-by-project” approach.

* Suggestion that project be viewed from a watershed perspective. Watershed provides umbrella for project area, i.e Hayman Fire example
* Look at it from a landscape perspective, i.e. Uncompahgre Project
* What is – if there is – relationship between the Forest Plan and SBEADMR in terms of suitable timber acres? (consider showing PP presentation that was used for Forest Plan Revision)
* Provide a GIS map overlaying suitable timber acres identified in Forest Plan and opportunities for recovery in suitable timber acres for SBEADMR
* Look for general areas of possibilities where project specific treatment might occur
* Beef up design criteria in DEIS
* Could this landscape-scale approach lay out how “project” specific treatments will be addressed down the road?
* Could there be a stronger definition of where and what treatment in the DEIS?

In sum, the discussion around the Recovery goal was not concluded due to the interest in discussing some of the issues/concerns with the landscape-scale adaptive management approach versus “project” specific approach to the issue. However there was general agreement that a first step in moving the discussion forward would be to present a GIS map showing the areas identified as suitable timber and then use that tool to help define “WUI” and to look for opportunities within those areas for the proposed SBEADMR treatments

Follow up:

* Have the Forest Service prepare and present the above referenced GIS map for the next meeting
* Explain the relationship between the Forest Plan and SBEADMR in terms of suitable timber acres?
* Consider whether or not showing the PP presentation on suitable timber acres that was used for Forest Plan Revision would be helpful
* Address the question of whether it’s possible/feasible to incorporate the objectives of recovery goal into the public safety goal?
* Consider at what point a more detailed discussion on adaptive management and/or design features would be an appropriate agenda topic to help address some of the questions/concerns raised in the latter discussion

C. Resiliency – Given the time constraints this goal was not addressed.

**III. Refine Project Objectives** – discussion tabled

**IV. Review Issues/Opportunities Topics and Provide Status on Additional Research**

Forest Service Planner Samantha (Sam) Staley provided an update on the socio-economic analysis being conducted by an Enterprise Team for this project and on a proposal from the Rocky Mountain Research Institute and CSU regarding regeneration, among other topics. It was agreed to wait until the socio-economic analysis and the proposal on literature search of current research on regeneration were completed before scheduling them for working group agenda topics.

Other topics suggested for future agenda:

* GIS Map of Suitable Timber Acres
* Silviculture Prescriptions
* Aspen
* Design Feature Criteria
* NEPA – new Farm Bill (PP presentation from WO??)
* Outreach Strategy for Project
* Adaptive Management – how to build trust/confidence in the approach

Follow up:

* Begin to map out a schedule of when various issues/topic items might be placed on agenda so that attendees begin to get a better picture of where the efforts of the working group may be focused over the next few months.

**V. List of Items/Requests for Future Meetings**

* GIS map
* Name placards for attendees
* Glossary of terms
* Post meeting agenda one week before meeting
* Post meeting notes 10 days in advance of next meeting

**VI. Schedule Next Meeting**

When: Wednesday, November 12, 2014

Where: Pioneer Room, Montrose County Fairgrounds

Time: 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM (note request to extend length of meeting time)

Susan Hansen

Facilitator