

Lolo Restoration Committee
March 13, 2008
5:30-8:00 PM
Holiday Inn-Parkside

Members Present: Jeff Juel, Marnie Criley, Larry Anderson, Beverly Dupree, Larry Jakub, Scott Brennan, Debbie Austin, Gary Edson, Bob Lamley, Earl Reinsel, Hank Goetz, Len Broberg, Rick Deniger, Al Christophersen, Larry Westcott, Matt Arno, Julia Altemus, Brian Kahn, Chelsea Pennick

USFS: Gary Edson, Sharon Sweeney

Observers: Mary Mitsos, Joe Kerkvliet

Consensus agreements highlighted in bold

Action items highlighted in red

1. Report from Westside Working Group/Adoption of Design Elements
2. The Westside WG met with a group of landowners in the Fish Creek area for a mutual learning opportunity on the LRC, elements of the proposed project, etc.
 - a. Marnie felt that it was a good opportunity to think about how the LRC presents itself to outsiders/publics in terms of how individuals present themselves and who they represent, i.e. their interest/organization or the LRC.
 - i. Larry Jakub, as a landowner in the Fish Creek area, has met with the other landowners and reported that they have come up with a comprehensive proposal/letter that they will submit to the FS. For the most part, the proposals are very similar, which speaks well for this process.
 - ii. Cameron and Bev spent a lot of time reaching out to the landowners, which has paid off.
 - b. Forest Service Comments:
 - i. Words become very important in these documents. Words such as “no permanent roads” could be problematic, so as to not overly limit future opportunities. If there was a situation where building a short section of road could lead to eliminating much more old road, then they would informally articulate that with this group and other constituents.
 - ii. This is true of all of the elements if they decide a certain suggestion does not work, etc.
 - iii. The LRC would like to meet before the formal alternative is finalized to go through where it might divert from the LRCs suggestions. The back-and-forth, interactive process is the important element.

- iv. There was some discussion about doing a watershed-wide EIS, particularly given the existence of bull trout in the project area. Debbie said that if the short-term detriment is outweighed by long-term benefit, then they do not pursue a full EIS and they consult with USFWS. FS stated they don't have watershed dollars or capacity to complete these kinds of analysis.
 - v. Jeff brought up the fact that the principles state that budgets should not affect the prioritization of restoration projects.
 - vi. Further dialogue will occur with the working group.
 - vii. **Future agenda item: Jeff's concern about budgets limiting restoration priorities.**
- c. OHV element: Scott requested a change to the language "concern over OHV opportunities"
 - i. Marnie suggested "concern over lack of designated OHV routes on the Lolo NF"
 - ii. This above language was approved by the group.
 - iii. The LRC makes a commitment to work with the OHV community, but outside of this proposed project, since the group could not reach consensus on this component of the project.
 - d. Larry suggested that the FS provide a field trip to look at some restoration projects similar to what is being proposed.
 - i. Gary is putting this together for landowners and can share with this group as well.
 - e. Forest Health: Earl was concerned about #1 under Forest Health and the statement about areas burned in 1900 fires, particularly in regard to pure lodgepole stands.
 - i. After some discussion, NO change was made though there was general agreement that different types of stands will require different restoration actions.
 - f. A question was asked about contracting, and the language about "wildlife and watershed" as it relates to the number of points a contractor gets in evaluation of their bid.
 - i. Al clarified that the FS can work with the LRC in developing the guidelines for best-value contracting.
 - g. Document was approved to be submitted to the FS.**
- 3. Cedar Tom
 - a. There is a public meeting on March 19th on this project. Mostly informational. Sharon is willing to sit down with anyone who is interested.
 - b. The state of funding is in flux, so she is not sure how much they will be able to accomplish this year.
 - c. She suggests that the group get together in April to talk about how they would like to see the project put together.
 - 4. Debbie and Marnie presented an opportunity for the LRC and FS ID Teams to engage in a training on collaboration.

- a. One proposal is to have a three-day workshop, one day for FS, one day for the LRC and one day together.
 - b. Debbie shared that she felt the technical folks could benefit from some training on collaboration.
 - c. Clarification of roles, communication, working together, how fits in with public process.
 - d. Only a minimum of the group expressed a willingness to devote two days to a training.
 - e. Marnie will put together a proposal to the group which will outline goals and objectives more clearly.
5. Eastside Working Group:
- a. Asking Seeley RD for written descriptions for two selected areas/landscapes.
 - b. April/May site visit.
 - c. The working group has approved the project evaluation tool.
 - d. The LRC will look at the Charter and discuss next month whether they feel a need for a LRC-wide charter.
6. Memo from Marnie and Brian:
- a. Brian went over the memo and discussed how to address the ability of the group to reach consensus and meet social, economic and ecological criteria.
 - b. Jeff felt that going through the process to answer these questions about a project is worthwhile at this stage.
 - c. Scott felt that starting small meets the need of building trust and relationships and learning through starting small.
 - d. If a project does not have the potential for meeting the zone of agreement among the various interests, then it should not be pursued, unless one of those interests is willing to set their interests aside.
 - e. Marnie will take a stab at modifying the project selection criteria to include this issue.
7. Communication:
- a. Brian indicated that the MFRC process encouraged members to meet outside the formal sessions to discuss issues, provided they reported those discussions/results back to the whole group. This was agreed to by the MFRC because it encouraged communication and retained trust.
 - b. He thought the LRC had adopted this rule, but in reviewing the minutes, and Code of Conduct, it had not.
 - c. Based on his faulty recollection, he had facilitated a meeting between Cameron and Julia and wanted to get the sense of the LRC as to whether they wanted to utilize the MFRC approach.
 - d. **The Committee felt comfortable with the above scenario happening.**
8. Project Evaluation Tool:
- a. Larry Anderson and Jeff developed the tool.
 - b. Jeff amended the rating system on Larry's version so that it would be possible to rate a component as "conflicting with a principle" rather than only "low correlation".

- c. The ELWG sees it as a framework for discussions among the WG and with the FS, a way to document and remain transparent on decisions made, etc.
 - d. The negative numbers provide a red flag for issues that need to be addressed.
 - e. **The Committee approved the use of the tool.**
9. Next Steps:
- a. Contracting: Debbie, Matt and Marnie to work on.
 - b. Training or other conversation on clarifying roles of members of LRC when dealing with the public, media.
 - c. Field trip: Pattee Blue
 - d. Director of the National Off Highway Conservation Association has offered to give a presentation. Marnie will follow up with Rick.
 - e. Budgets limiting restoration priorities.
10. Next Meeting:
- a. April 8, 2008