

**Meeting Notes**  
Lolo Restoration Committee  
January 13, 2009—6:00 -8:30 pm  
MonTEC Building, 1121 E. Broadway

**Introductions**

Marnie Criley, Mark Vander Meer, Jake Kreilick, Denley Loge, Sharon Sweeney, Bob Lamley, Earl Reinsel, Scott Brennan, Chris Partyka, Len Broberg, Bev Dupree, John Manz, Chad Benson, Julia Riber, Eric Norris, Brian Kahn, & Melissa Hayes.

**Announcements or agenda additions**

- Travel management process opportunity. Would the OHV working group be interested? (for further discussion see the Westside Group report, below).

**Facilitated discussion**

**--Report from Westside Group--**

Bev received an e-mail from Garry Edson – initiating a project called Frenchtown Frontage. This project regards future travel management – resource and social problems they have been having in this area regarding OHV use.

There will be a **public meeting: Wed - Jan 21 – 7pm– in Frenchtown.** (location unknown, but it was suggested it would most likely be at the fire hall).

The plan is to take this project through a proposed action and NEPA. Purpose and need for this project – typical urban interface access management issues. It is a high recreational use area for the residents – and they have been seeing a lot of issues – environmental disturbance being one. So, the goal is to look at opportunities to manage – formalize uses, etc.

Does the Westside or LRC want to take up this project or the OHV working group?

**Bev – forward e-mail to:** Eric Norris, Mark Vander Meer, Bob Lamley, Jake Kreilick, and Len Broberg

**--South Fork--**

The specialist reports are in and the EA is being written with a mid-Feb. publishing date.

**--Cedar Thom--**

Notes from the last meeting were circulated and Denley and Jake plan to attend the next meeting. A lot of work is being done on that project. At the next meeting the group will have a final look at proposed action with specific units identified. If the project gets a thumbs-up, it will go forward.

Before being published to the public, there was a suggestion to run it through the 13 principles scorecard document and then discuss it with this group. Is there a possibility to give a presentation on the project at the Feb. or March meeting?

Westside group just met with FS folks regarding a from-scratch project in the Missoula district. It is a small-large diameter larch restoration project with a variety of different treatments. FS will set up GIS maps to show range of possibilities and the group will meet again to look at geographic spots.

**--Report from Eastside Group--**

The group met with Tim and the Auggie EA will be out next month, with a 30 day comment period. Is there a way to get LRC comments in during that time?

The group has also started to think beyond Center Ridge for the next Seeley project. At the meeting Tom Deluca presented an updated version of the GIS maps from TWS. It was a first look for changes, opinions, and is tool to become more educated and focused in on options.

This meeting the group requests consensus from the whole group on Center Ridge.

Going through the Center Ridge Principle Scorecard:

**Suggestion:** include the principle itself in the text.

Big Picture concern – The EWG & W/WG tend to rate things differently or in different ways, and that should be taken into account. W/WG did not have a FS self-evaluate where EWG did. Also, when the W/WG did not have enough info, they gave it a 0. In the Center Ridge document, the group can go off of what they see in the FS self-evaluation. In terms of consistency for the documents and how each group rates, it might be worth an agenda item in the future. It is good to examine the differences between the 2 groups – but develop consistency because in the end the evaluations are coming from the entire LRC.

How can we get consistency in scoring? The comments are the most important, but you can't help but look at the numbers. Maybe it would be beneficial to go back and re-evaluate the criteria – is the number system still good? Does it apply to what we want to say?

Also consider how this information gets through to the different rangers – how do they take the information and read it? The tough part is saying that the FS is not following through on an aspect of a project – you want to be honest, but keep the collaborative ideals.

Suggestion to maybe look at an alpha-numeric system.

Like a layering system.

So a 1 – 3 and then A-C – with the letters being the frequency of something occurring.

When there is not enough information – is felt better to read the “?” than the low number. But, if you don't have enough information, it can be hard to rate anything, which is where the importance of the self-evaluation comes in to see how the FS is thinking about the project and principles.

Another concern of the Center Ridge evaluation was not having a monitoring plan – which is a big deal and maybe it should have gotten a negative number. Every project should have a monitoring plan. But, monitoring should also be thought about with caution because of the ability to be overwhelmed with information.

Is it beneficial to use the numbers in doing the evaluation, but not send them along - just leave the comments?

The process that the EWG has gone through for these projects is to: look at data and ID places to go for a project. Get feedback from the FS. Pick a place. Tim gives a presentation about the place and how it aligns with the Principles. The group goes on a field trip. Conversation about comments & concerns. Tim sends draft self-evaluation. EWG prepares their own evaluation. This is all happening pre-NEPA. The evaluations are brought before this group to approve the comments. The process works well when there is a lot of back and forth with a little formal transmittal of documents.

So, the EWG is seeking committee approval tonight.

**Vote: Thumbs-Up.**

Scott B. had proxy votes from Bev D.: thumb sideways & Hank G.: thumbs-up

**--Report from Steering Committee--**

The SC submitted a letter for economic stimulus that went to congressional delegation discussing \$100 million of shovel-ready/NEPA ready projects. The SC did not see if FRCs or full MFRC wanted to sign on because of time constraints in submitting the letter. Some members of the SC didn't even sign the letter. But, it did receive media

attention, which can't always be controlled. Some of the media wrongly attributed the letter to the MFRC. So, once again, we have to be careful what we put out there. And, how does this impact communication issues and timing? The objections were not necessarily to the content, but rather the process of getting or not getting information out about things like this.

The MFRC got more money from Region 1. One of the uses for the money that has been discussed is to have a ½ time coordinator position. Julia putting in over 20% of her time on the MFRC effort alone, which is more than she should be. The group needs a person to coordinate the efforts – especially as we grow.

A sub-committee of the SC is creating a job description for this position. It would be under contract with DNRC who is the fiscal agent. The FRC's should see the position description before it is circulated. Marnie is potentially interested in applying, so she has recused herself from the process, but the position will also be publicly announced.

#### **--Report from Executive Committee – Discussion (approval) of Lolo RC Charter & New Members process--**

\*Because the group looked at Brian's comments and then made further suggestions, the notes contain a copy of Brian's original comments with the group discussion/comments in red.

January 10, 2009

TO: Lolo Restoration Committee

From: Brian Kahn

RE: Comments on Lolo Restoration Committee Charter Draft of 12/4/08

I cannot find the original in my computer, so will have to refer to issues by page location. My suggested additions are in CAPS:

1) **Membership:** Near bottom of 1st page.

This language suggests membership is open to anyone who is interested and attends two meetings. An application is mentioned, but no process for evaluating applications.

Do you want an evaluation/nomination process? Is this an executive committee function?

**This process needs more control than just an open invitation. It could be a process where anyone can nominate a member, and if the group agreed that person would submit a bio on why they want to be a part of the group and must be at least thumbs sideways on the principles.**

**Or the process could be similar to the MFRC process to nominate people where each person was talked about in-depth. The reason you are here is that you were picked for a number of criteria -personality, group representation, diversity, etc. Should we maintain that type of screening?**

**Suggestion that the group follows the MFRC process. The Executive committee would be the filter, but the larger body would weigh in, and the overall process as an organization is consensus.**

**It was agreed that the executive committee would act as a filter.**

2) **Chairperson.** Reference is made to one Chair. Do you want to consider co-chairs?

**Suggestion for future structure of the LRC.**

**It has a lot to do with Cedar Thom and our ability to be involved. The idea is to have 3 working groups – with a chair of each. Perhaps each would be given a little more autonomy to approve things. The WGs would meet monthly, and the full group maybe meeting quarterly? Marnie is not able to give the time to do this anymore at this capacity. Additionally, the Lolo is a big forest with a lot of interests. There is a possibility that the coordinator position could help with some of the things that Marnie did and relieve some of the pressures.**

**Suggestion: Why not have each chair of the WG's makeup the executive committee and be co-chairs of the whole LRC. Is that feasible? Would work ok for Scott, but he is being paid.**

**Would the coordinator be part of it as well? This is why the job description should be circulated.**

**Suggestion: The forest is organized through NEPA zones – East and West. We might want to divide up the same way. So, maybe just changing the structure of the groups as they are now would also work. Or could group into 5 ranger districts. That's the organization of the Forest Service.**

**What about membership in the western Westside group?**

**\*Decision: Charter should say chair or co-chairs.**

**3) Chair duties:**

a) 1st para, page 2, 3<sup>rd</sup> line "... with the MFRC to supply AND RECEIVE necessary information.":

**\*This change accepted.**

b) "... And ensure that all relevant duties are accomplished." THIS SEEMS TO ME TO BE A CHARGE THAT IS BEYOND WHAT IS REASONABLE.

**\*modest wordsmithing – seek to - Don't say try.**

4) **Exec Committee**—2<sup>nd</sup> para, page 2, add at end of para, "AND OTHER DUTIES AS APPROVED BY THE LRC.

**\*Accepted as a good change.**

5) **"other roles"** -- 3<sup>rd</sup> para, page 2: "These roles may be as MEMBERS OR chairs of subcommittees..."

**\*Accepted as a good change.**

6) **Operations:** Meetings—Requires at least 50% of LRC members to adopt a recommendation. Is this adequate? What if key interests are not present?

**There should be a good faith effort made to get the vote of people not present. Proxy is allowed. Somehow the group would need to know before the meeting that there is going to be a vote.**

**\*Decision: When the draft goes out options should include: 2/3, half + 1, and one more option.**

7) **Recommendations**—page 2: "Recommendations of the Working Groups will be submitted to the full LRC FOR DISCUSSION/CONSIDERATION AND will be reviewed by all members of the Working Groups prior to ..."

**\*Accepted as a good edit.**

8) **Dissolution:** Bottom of page 2: What % of membership vote does it take to dissolve the LRC? 50%? Should there be a requirement of informing/consulting with the MFRC Steering Committee before such a decision is voted on?

**Should there be advanced notice? Multiple votes? Higher %?**

**Is there anything in the charter about the number of members a min/max number?  
Should there be a min. number and what is that?**

**What about appointment of WG's or subcommittees and how they are set up?**

**\*Suggestion: Agenda of LRC is different in substance than working groups -- discusses broader issues and our experience is we take the full time. Based on this, if LRC wants to try meeting less frequently, Brian suggested they initially try every two months. Marnie will make the changes to the charter and send it back out to the group for approval at the next meeting.**

## --Strategic Planning discussion – Review Year 1 of our effort & planning for Year 2--

We did start talking about this at other meetings and we had a good conversation about the rating system already.

### **Collaboration with the FS/LRC interface?**

The view is that relationships are building and trust and comfort levels are up.

**Questions heard from the FS end** – how do we work with this group? What is collaboration? Does collaboration up front mean less at the end? Most of these comments are from people within the FS who have not had the opportunity to collaborate or work within this effort yet. So then how do you share the experience with those not involved? Possibly at the annual RTA workshop - where this group can discuss the principles.

There is still a lot of interest in the MFRC and the work of the LRC – and there would be no interest without the work of the FRCs. Many people are still impressed that the group is still meeting, working together and that this many projects are going through.

Cedar Thom is still a struggle. It would be nice to have more people at each meeting to talk about the principles. Yes, it is working, but more participation would be better. The FS participants are disappointed to not see more people out there – but the staff is having a great time with the idea of collaboration and listening to new ideas.

There is a reward in knowing that there are multiple people on board supporting each project and providing some consistency.

From an environmental perspective – there has been a lot of change and relationships have grown. When you get down to this level that you can do great things. But on the policy level, there is a difference in how collaboration works.

Important to recognize the principles will change and mature over time. It will be valuable to take a look at the principles after a few projects and evaluate how they are working or how they should be changed.

There is also a distinction between the principles vs. collaboration.

It was good to have the principles before diving into collaboration because it gave something to stand on.

Collaboration is empty without something to help implement them – and will show once we see the results of some of the projects as they are implemented.

May be beneficial to have a short collaboration training – to talk about collaboration and what it meant to all of us, how we can all work together. Is there interest in bringing this up again?

Mike Wood – leadership training. Could they be exposed to this effort?

### **Weakest things that we have done in the last year – what could we do better?**

- **Training** would be a good thing. Strategic retreat? Helpful to get the group thinking in terms of a few years and how the community will be impacted.
- **Committee list** – we have lost members and some that have stopped attending.
- **Recruitment** - Julia represented logging and she is gone. Forest industry is not represented, etc.
- **Generational Variety** - How many people are under 30? Many of us are in generations that think differently so we should have young professionals that have a say. Focus on the younger generation – possibly University or young urban professionals. Or young people who are from Montana and are staying.

**All LRC members will give thought to potential additions to the LRC.**

### **Next Meeting:**

Tues. Feb. 10, 2009  
MAEDC, Missoula  
6-8:30p