**Key Points from 9/15/2016 SBEADMR Working Group Meeting**

I. Report from Clay Speas on Current Status of SBEADMR and What to Expect Next

* Final Record of Decision (ROD) for SBEADMR project was signed in July, 2016
* 5/17/2016: FS conducted its annual stakeholder meeting to present the out-year (2017 and 2018) program of work for priority treatment areas in the east, west and north timber zones
* FS has moved into implementation mode for the SBEADMR project – completing field surveys, layout and planning of specific treatment plans
* 8/18/2016: FS conducted a public field trip of 2 treatment areas in the Gunnison area (east zone); positive feedback from stakeholders who participated; comments are posted on FS website – SBEADMR implementation link
* Notice of 30 day public comment period to comment on updated treatment list and maps was published mid-summer. 3 comments were received; FS is developing a spreadsheet that will list comments received and how they will be addressed by the FS; this will be posted on FS website – SBEADMR implementation link
* Wild Earth Guardians (WEG) filed a Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) request for any and all information related to the SBEADMR project. The GMUG has submitted all information to the Regional Office which is in process of reviewing prior to submitting to WEG. WEG also submitted similar request to Fish and Wildlife. At this point FS does not know what that request means in terms of potential future litigation
* Science Team has had field crews out this summer; completed the regeneration study initiated last year; information will be presented at next stakeholder meeting
* FS has committed additional funds to keep the science team engaged for at least one and probably two more years
* Suggestion to change annual stakeholder meeting to a fall date rather than in the spring. Science Team has requested this to allow additional time to make modifications to treatment design based on input/comments over the winter months. Next meeting is proposed for mid-November, 2016. More detailed information on treatment areas and plans than was available in May will be available to share with stakeholders.

II. Transition from SBEADMR Working Group (SWG) to a Collaborative Adaptive Management Group

 (AMG)

The SBEADMR Working Group (SWG) discussed at some length the recommendations of the “collaborative subcommittee” for a more formally organized collaborative group to provide consistent participation from a diverse group of stakeholders during multi-year implementation of the projects. The discussion focused primarily on the purpose of the proposed Adaptive Management Group (AMG), the recommended “seats” at the table, how individuals representing the diverse interests would be selected and possible time commitments.

**Purpose**: For purposes of recruiting stakeholder interest in serving on the AMG, a general statement of purpose for the AMG would be to assist the Forest Service in applying the adaptive management framework to the implementation and monitoring of SBEADMR projects. A more definitive statement of purpose or mission in accord with the final ROD would be agreed to by members of the AMG once organized.

**People:** The subcommittee recommended the AMG consist of nine “seats” representing the following interests: local elected officials, environmental/conservation groups, forestry processors, forestry loggers, geographically important stakeholders/community members at large; water providers, recreation interests and wildlife. After considerable discussion, the SBEADMR Working Group recommended a larger group with the following diverse representation and an alternate for each seat:

* Local elected officials or designee: 6 or 7 seats depending on interest. 1 seat for each County in which projects are occurring, i.e. Delta, Hinsdale, Gunnison, Mesa, Montrose, Ouray and San Miguel
* Environmental/conservation group: 2 seats
* Forestry Processor: 1 seat
* Forestry Logger: 1 seat
* Geographically important stakeholder/community member: 3 seats. 1 seat for a citizen-at-large from each of the three timber zones
* Water providers: 1 seat. Given the number of water providers in the large geographic area, there was consensus that the seat should represent a broader watershed based perspective of water resources/hydrology than a water provider, (water provider was described as a “subset” of a local official seat, i.e. municipal/county water provider or water company
* Recreation Interests: 1 seat. Group preferred to use term “recreation user group” rather than trying to distinguish between motorized and non-motorized recreation
* Education – 1 seat. Western State College or Mesa State
* Wildlife – 1 seat. Group recommended using the term “wildlife and fish” (not to confuse with Fish and Wildlife!) to represent both wildlife and fishery interests.

 Total number of seats: 17 and possibly 18 if Mesa County elects to participate

In regard to concerns about the number of “seats at the table” for effectiveness and efficiency, it was suggested that smaller subgroups might form within the AMG based on timber zones/ where activity is occurring. This larger group would represent the broader SBEADMR project. Each individual seat would designate an alternate with “proxy voting rights”.

In terms of soliciting interest to serve on the AMG, it was agreed that PLP should prepare a news release announcing the formation of the AMG and send a personal letter or email to each of the interest groups/counties named soliciting recommendations for individuals to serve. It was further recommended that PLP convene an organizational meeting for the AMG group in January to invite all individuals who have expressed in interest in serving on the AMG. If there are more persons interested then seats available for a given interest group, then that group would caucus amongst itself/themselves to select the designated number of seat(s) and alternates for that interest group. Names of persons and alternates designated to represent each interest should be submitted to PLP no later than February 1, 2017.

**Process:** Some process type issues that were discussed include:

* AMG would meet quarterly as needed in Montrose
* All AMG meeting would be open to the public
* AMG meeting agenda would provide for a “public comment” time at the end of the meeting
* AMG would provide recommendations to GMUG based on a consensus decision making process (“consensus is defined as decisions that parties can support, or ***at a minimum, agree to live with***.”)
* Compensation for AMG members. Mixed feelings about need for compensation for mileage. Concerns expressed for public perception if AMG members accept funds provided by FS for implementation of SBEADMR

III. Future Role of SBEADMR Working Group (SWG)

It was the consensus of those present that this meeting represented the last official meeting of the SWG which is now transitioning into a smaller, more formally organized Adaptive Management Group. Given relationships that have developed over the past two years, hope was expressed that several from SWG would continue on the AMG.

Notes compiled by: Susan Hansen, Facilitator