

Clearwater Basin Collaborative Working Group Meeting

February 22, 2012

Clearwater Regional Offices
Idaho Fish and Game

NOTES

Attendees: Alex Irby, Bill Higgins, Brad Brooks, Dale Harris, Leo Crane, Barb Opdahl, Don Ebert, Greg Danly, Holly Endersby, Jonathan Oppenheimer, Joyce Dearstyne, Larry Jakub, Orville Daniels, Ron Aldrich, Scott Stouder, Skip Brandt, Stan Leach, Dave Cadwallader

Liaisons: Rick Brazell (US Forest Service), Elayne Murphy (US Forest Service), Tony Snodderly (US Senator Mike Crapo's Office), Joe Hudson (US Forest Service), Mike Ward (US Forest Service), Mike Hanna (US Senator Risch's Office), Scott Carlton (US Congressman Raul Labrador's Office), Will Whelan (The Nature Conservancy), Tera King (Clearwater RC&D)

Visitors: Barry Ruklik (USFS), Scott Russell (USFS), Bill Warren (University of Idaho), Ryan Haugo (The Nature Conservancy), Patty Johnston (USFS), Don Curnutt (USFS), Sandra Pinel (University of Idaho), Jessica Daniel, Kathy Rodriguez (USFS)

Review of Action Items and Decisions

Previous Meeting Notes of November 16, 2011: accepted with minor changes

Vicki Christiansen is our Acting Regional Forester and would like to meet with us.

SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS

Forest Health and Function

The Subcommittee met on January 6th with the purpose of finalizing the Formal Request to Collaborate to the Forest Supervisor. It was hand delivered to the Forest Supervisor during their meeting regarding Slate Creek. We are expecting a response in the near term.

The MOU has been in place for over a year, with a lot of work completed. The Forest Service came forward with projects for us to consider and since then there were several meetings and calls to determine priorities to determine projects we wished to collaborate on. In simple terms, we have a draft document with minimum expectations regarding project identification, meetings, and response to Scoping Comment letters. Then we will provide a formal level of support statement at the decision point. One of our projects has a draft decision out and another on the list that we should provide a level of support statement for.

A majority of the subcommittee was in Boise over the end of January/February for the IFRP.

Landscape Assessment Proposal

During the January meeting there was a proposal brought forward for the Landscape Assessment. Partnering with The Nature Conservancy would provide support needed for several aspects. There is a need for funding for a GIS Specialist for spatial analysis. This is in the works and being developed. There is hope to have products within the next month.

Forest Plan Pilot Project

The Nez Perce Clearwater has been selected as a pilot project for a new Forest Plan. This will be a priority for the Subcommittee. Our next meeting will be early March.

Clear Creek Scoping Comment Letter under the MOU

Scoping Comments are due March 1 for Clear Creek Project. Some concepts have been submitted and if there are further suggestions they should be submitted as soon as possible. Anything and everything should be considered – even if it's not part of a specific need for the project. It may be rejected by the FS, but it's worth asking. There may be concern around old growth issues and definition of old growth. We could use this opportunity to bring such items forward.

Scoping is very early in the process and a good time to bring all hypothetical situations forward. It's not something that will commit CBC to anything concrete or require formal voting or committing to a formal level of support – it's an open public process and if anyone has a desire to submit comments you can do so.

This letter was to be discussed during the January meeting, however that meeting was cancelled and we did not have the opportunity to discuss. It was moved forward to the Forest Supervisor.

Comments:

- There is a lot on the FS plate at the moment and its imperative they know what we want to collaborate on – early on.
- There was angst in the Subcommittee over which projects to collaborate on and which not to. We did not want to miss an opportunity to collaborate, so we opted to select more than less. We realize this will confront capacity issues for both sides, however, we chose to aim high. We selected projects from each zone.
- The opportunity I saw in getting into reviewing projects is that we finally taking a piece of ground and discussing our interests. We would like to take a project, in early stages, to begin having discussions at a larger level. It may be overwhelming, but it really is the opportunity to roll up our sleeves and talk about issues and see where we can come to agreement.
- Clear Creek is an ambitious project, in the Scoping Stages, where we could recommend what should be included in the analysis.

At the Subcommittee level, our two biggest projects are the MOU (top down approach) and the Landscape Assessment (bottom up approach) and the two should complement the process of the Forest Plan Revision and our contributions.

There is now a lot of cross-over from the Forest Health into Rural Economies as they have some common objectives: harvest levels, management levels and more.

One thing for future discussion would be a discussion of the NEPA Process so that everyone has a good, common understanding of the process. If individuals or groups want to have their name or signature included on the Scoping Letter, it is appropriate. If we only sign on our Co-Chairs then we have no real teeth in the future letters and they would be the only two who could respond.

Comments:

- Thanks for bringing the letters. We have a MOU Coordinator for the CBC and they could come to educate the group on NEPA.
- Thank you for that, it was an important part of the letter. We see that the CBC and FS have equal responsibility in administering the MOU. Having an Agency person is important.
- I agree that it would be great to have a NEPA 101. It can get very complex, but we need to be careful with the level of detail we enter as it can be very complex.

- NEPA sounds fascinating, however, if you need training on NEPA we could have a separate training session on this level. It could be at the Subcommittee level. What's important is that if you have interest in the project, you get yourself involved early. I suggest we not do it at the Working Group level.
- To the issue of "standing", wouldn't it be important to submit our comments on "behalf of all CBC members?"
 - It would be a question for attorneys. You have to have a lead respondent with a name, address and contact information clearly displayed. We would have to ensure that everyone around the table would be in support.
- Science is good, but not of all importance for this group. We appreciate the support for the Landscape Assessment. The Assessment should be relevant to the needs of this group and enable us to come to consensus on agreements of the group. We need to commit to be sure it's understandable. Thanks to the groups making this happen financially.
- A Scoping Letter is looking for issues, when a draft letter comes out you can submit your comments with the Co-Chairs names on it and when the draft comes out you can voice your concern and still be able to have standing. NEPA is very difficult to handle in one hour and if you pique interest and don't answer the questions you will lose that interest.
- If we don't establish a baseline understanding of NEPA, we will spend more than one hour going through these discussions getting bogged down because we don't understand the various stages of NEPA. We don't have to spend an inordinate amount of time, but it will be very easy to get confused and make people angry when they get confused later.
- We have had a NEPA 101 at the Subcommittee level and we've learned about Scoping and the decision making time, but I do agree people need to be educated.
- It's good that you understand that the power of this group is in NFMA, not NEPA. You collaborate on the NFMA side and come to common interest. Once you get to NEPA the FS hands begin to get tied. It's a gray area where it's difficult to collaborate. Please understand this difference. Don't get hung up on NEPA.
- That's a very good point. There is collaboration with the FS in the room and then there is CBC collaboration where we come to a position.

Decision: In response to a request by the Landscape Health Subcommittee, Rick has agreed to appoint the Forest NEPA Coordinator, Marty Gardner, as liaison to the Subcommittee to work with MOU issues.

Action Item: The working group was asked to consider including a “NEPA Process” segment in an upcoming meeting (or hosting a separate session for interested members). An understanding of NEPA would help individuals working on projects via the MOU process.

Status of Selway Middle Fork Clearwater CFLRA Project

In general, CFLRP was funded at the maximum level of \$40M. Our share this year was \$3.1M, and we were one of 4 at that level and no one was funded above that level. We think the reason we were funded at that level has a lot to do with this group. The last couple of years we’ve been successful in getting the money on the ground in projects. We are now in the process of putting our budget together. The good news is we got the money, but we have to match it with appropriated and partner dollars. We’re currently in that process. We have a Strategy Group that some have participated in and will continue, but as we put a proposed Plan of Work (POW) together that group will meet more often. We have a NEPA team working diligently and we have a slate of restoration projects ready for award. In Clear Creek we’d like to get ahead of the restoration work and when we come to the aquatic and vegetative restoration work, we’d like to talk.

This will be a continuation of what we’ve done over the last few years. Interface fuels project (between Lowell and Syringa) is in full swing. We will be selling the Lodge point project this summer, which is a biomass focused sale with some saw timber.

With regards to Clear Creek, we pretty much covered that. We’ve had conference calls and discussed Scoping.

Comments:

- *In the Federal Register on Monday there was another Clear Creek notice – what was that? It was a Notice of Intent to Prepare an EIS.*
- *Are there any photographs of those logs being flown? This is significant and newsworthy and we should publicize it.*
- *We will be talking about the Coordinator later today, and we would like to talk about how the money is being spent. There was \$1M the first year - a lot of money. Is there another request in for NEPA money? Yes, we’ll be making that call today. I’ve heard we were the most competitive in the area. The \$/acre, we were #1 in the region.*
- One thing not mentioned earlier, they brought 13 new projects and the \$40M will now be split among 23 projects instead of 10. There will not be any further new projects but the pie is now smaller and we will be competing for dollars.

- It's in the preliminary stages, but we've had discussion on expanding the landscape size within the CFLRP project area. There are pros and cons to this, with pros being increasing flexibility for the FS to put the money towards the highest priority projects without constraint by landscape.
- When in WDC we talked to Vegetative Management and moving the boundaries needs to be in a certain manner, but it's not difficult and is by notification.

Action Item: The co-chairs requested that the Forest Service provide an accounting of how CFLRP monies have been spent to date (displayed in a manner similar to the report prepared by Susan Graves regarding ARRA work).

Action Item: The co-chairs and the Landscape Health Subcommittee will have additional discussions regarding the proposal revise boundaries for the CFLRP area (to make it larger).

Rural Economies

We have met a couple of times since our November meeting, with a January 12 meeting in Orofino and another one on Feb 17th. This built around the Community Forest Trust Proposal with addressing the needs of the counties. Prior to that, there is an Action Request for consideration.

Clearwater Soil and Water Conservation District

Presented to us on Friday, February 17th was a request for a letter of support for their woody biomass utilization grant for a plant next to the prison. This is part of the Feasibility analysis initially completed by the County. The next logical step is to perform Engineering Design and Financing Options for construction of that facility. You have the letter of request in front of you. There was unanimous agreement from the Rural Economies Subcommittee. We could draft a letter and circulate for the entire committee approval.

Comments:

- *Wouldn't it be appropriate to vote on having the Co-Chairs write the letter?* Yes
- *So, Clearwater County had a feasibility study, did not that pencil out part of the heat?* Yes, it identified that the power production was a wash and the heat portion could produce a profit. The machinery and technology to produce heat is less costly than the machinery to produce power. They can also use that to heat/cool the building. It would be closer to \$1.5M plant and in the future supply other buildings.
- *Did they estimate a payback period?* Yes, I think it was 12 years. The combined heat/power would have 20 years payback with a thinner payback.

- *Where are we in the process and is this just a step in the process?* It's about step 4, and there is money available through the woody biomass utilization program with a match of 20% and we'll submit a GEM grant to fund a portion of the match with the remainder in-kind. It appears, preliminarily, it would be feasible.
- This process does not have to refine the chips; it can take lower grade chips. Heat requirements, consistency wise, are lower than a power requirement. The potential complex that these could heat in the future makes logical sense. If we can pull this off, we may eventually get electricity in the future.
- *What are you heating with now?* Steam, powered by electricity. Switching to heat only would save the prison \$168,000 per year. With State struggles to fund, this would help.
- We did study the Feasibility Study and there is broad deference to the County and there is potential material out there. Previous impediments have been cost of transport and that has been addressed in the Feasibility Study. This is a "next Step" – it's not a formal construction stage, it's an engineering study.
- *The reference to the CFLRP, is it generic? Or is there a specific project in mind that made them reference the act?* It's not going to rely solely on CFLRP, but it will help.
- This is a viable way to go to utilize materials that come off the land. Power is a difficult comparison because we have very cheap power here – 7.3 cents.
- My only hang up is that the Commissioners had worked with the FS, but they do support this project – and as long as they do so I am on board. I do want to compliment the Soil and Water Conservation District.
- *What value does it provide CBC to endorse this project?* It shows a broad census of support for utilization of support of use of materials. If we can establish this one, if it's viable, it could create more markets in the future.
- From what we've been standing for, this is what we support as a concept – not just economics but for air quality, ecosystem support. There is a finite amount of space for smoke and this would eliminate smoke from neighboring states.
- I'm all for this, and I think the collaborative endorsement adds a lot to their momentum. A word of caution – the Council School District entered into a Performance Guarantee Contract. The technology for heating from woody biomass, when you get into co-gen it's more difficult, but this has already been done. They ran into General Contractors not having the expertise, and when the Southwest RAC funded the project they personally shepherded the project, especially through construction. They had to go through bonding in the end because of problems in the

end. It didn't have to do with technology but with construction. The worst thing that can happen is that we endorse this and they move forward and suddenly they have spent millions and it takes 5 years instead of 2 to build. Be mindful that people will be watching. They are a valuable resource for lessons learned. They are asking for support for the Engineering Design Phase, which is basically still in the planning stages.

- The guy we've been dealing with has been doing these in Finland and Scandinavian Countries for years. We have hundreds of truck loads per day of hog fuel. A concept of scale: this plant would take one truckload of chips per week – that's small. We will certainly be in discussion with as many people as possible.
- I think this is important from the standpoint that CBC perception is currently out there demanding things from the Forest Service. This type of support demonstrates that this group has the potential to help others and alleviate that perception.

Decision: The working group agreed to have Jonathan draft a letter of support for the Clearwater Soil and Water Conservation District who is leading the effort to secure funding for an engineering design for a heat-only biomass project for the Idaho Correctional Institution in Orofino.

Other Subjects

From the Co-Chairs discussion, we have a Task Team to work on Secure Rural Schools in the short-term. There are proposals in the Senate from our Senators and if people want to be involved in the Task Team, please let us know.

SRS, in the long term, we've identified a Team to work on that. We're going to discuss one proposal in just a moment.

Search and Rescue

We identified a Task Team to work with the Sheriff and there may be opportunities there.

Stewardship Contracting Renewal

Task Team developed.

Youth Challenge Program

Discussions are ongoing with Governor and Legislature and a potential in looking at it in a new light. Perhaps some State support will come forward. Timing will be critical in a couple of weeks, but right now we're just staying on top of it. There is effort being led by Sen. Bert Brackett, and we're doing outreach to see how CBC can be supportive. It's important to get support letters to this senator for his efforts. Last year, the Governor said NO MONEY, and this year they are attempting to start this as an Alternative

School and the legal mechanisms to do so. The National Guard, serving at the Governors pleasure, did not pursue the effort further. This year, with the Governor changing his thoughts, we can now move forward. We are still in search of startup funding and this perhaps may come from the Veterans Administration. So far, we have a friend on the JFAC Committee and it hinges on that Committee. Rep. Ken Roberts is supportive and is helping us to move through the political process.

County Proposal

This is a draft for discussion. This emanates from discussion in November where there were issues with the Community Forest Trust Proposal. This should be viewed as an “Early Concept Proposal” and we wanted to be sure this had a full level of discussion. We didn’t want to just bring something forward for a vote, but identify specific components that could contribute to an overall Administrative/Legislative package. These concepts are brought forward from the Counties.

County Proposal for CBC

The purpose of this proposal is for Idaho and Clearwater Counties to suggest options and concepts that rely on its human and natural resources for a sustainable tax base rather than relying on funding from the federal government. The end result of supplying more products to our mills will be a stronger, more stable economy for the entire region along with a more reliable source of product for the manufacturers.

As is evident with the state of our federal budget situation, it is uncertain whether Secure Rural Schools will be reauthorized. If it is reauthorized, it is likely to be the last time this will happen. In preparation for the ongoing need for a stable consistent tax base, Idaho and Clearwater County have introduced the following concepts to the Rural Economies Subcommittee for consideration in either the legislative and/or administrative packages to be brought forward by the CBC.

- *Establish specific million board feet target of timber extracted from the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest. This target will be established in conjunction with the landscape assessment and the Landscape Health and Function Subcommittee.*
- *All timber sales whether Stewardship or Traditional sales will have a \$25 per thousand board feet of saw timber or 25% of revenue from total timber sale receipts returned to the county, whichever is greater.*
- *\$6 per acre per year Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) for Wilderness, paid to County in which the Wilderness is located, or a value based on a formula to determine an acceptable market-based approach to compensate counties for Wilderness.*
- *Local priority will be given to contractors hired for contracts on the forest.*
- *It is essential that the permanency of the economic package have a similar permanency as the Wilderness package.*

We want to stress that these are “priorities to the Counties” and these are items that will need to be addressed in one form or another to ensure their needs are met. It will also ensure that we all go forward hand-in-hand across the finish line.

It has been pointed out, in previous meetings, that we have not brought forward a formal proposal. It’s literally crunch time for school districts that are now in need of doubling levies that they barely passed before, our Road and Bridge departments are facing 50% cuts. It will be devastating and there are few Bills being introduced in Congress, especially because they have no offsets.

Comments:

- I think this is a huge step forward. It’s come along since November and gives us room to maneuver. Watching the Tester Bill, it started on the edge and the Agency has come a long ways towards refining the language to be acceptable to all parties. I think it’s great you’re engaged.
- I have the same reaction – a smile on my face. I don’t want to undersell the underlying challenge, but it gives us a start.
- I agree that it’s a step forward. Going back to previous discussions about biomass and supporting energy plan – I think we should do away with MBF and get to something else. Maybe some other unit besides BF. If they are selling pulp, it’s not by BF. We should look at the future of selling biomass. On the wilderness proposal, I think it’s a great idea; I would try to tie it to Search and Rescue, Transportation corridors, or something that you have to provide. Those two categories are variables and need support.
- Thank you for bringing this forward. I would like to see a County Commissioner on the Landscape Forest Health Subcommittee. That’s where the rubber meets the road. If someone from the counties could participate it would be beneficial. We have 20 projects that will take approx 3 days to discuss, visit and analyze – that’s money in the county pocket. We need you there, and it’s in your best interest. I agree, MBF is old fashioned and the way we’re going at it is the future – not MBF. With more people around the table, we can get you what you want. If we’re working on landscape management I think there’s a better way forward. We heard Tidwell say that Collaboration is it, so let’s use Collaboration to move the counties forward.
- I think there’s confusion that tying it to MBF – there is revenue back to counties to replace the 25% back to counties and then there is work all over the landscape. Nothing but saw timber will produce revenues. If you tie it all to work, and there is no saw log timber, it’s not going to produce anything.
- In the Colville Collaborative they had established a target and it’s surprising that this group has not done so yet.

- I think we can do better than focusing on MBF.
- Forest leadership changes are eventual and we need something ensure that it survives leadership changes.
- The FS doesn't sell saw timber by the MBF, it's now by the ton. Through my years, if you go to the store you buy a BF of timber. In the long run, it is per MBF. The gross value in these counties is saw timber. We can change language if you want; but, the infrastructure, job potential; income capacity is saw timber in this country. It isn't fiber - if we get it that's great, but if you look at taxpaying income potential, it is saw timber.
- The forest industry and counties have a common objective. Forest industry has been trying to get there through landscape health and that's a target for saw logs. The question is, are you going to do it through administrative or legislative? I have been advocating for administrative. But, I am only one member. Through many months and years of work, these two Subcommittees have common objective of establishing a timber target that can be enshrined in the Forest Plan Revision. Saw timber has the value to make the contribution to the counties, either by percentage or floor price. Things like pulp wood and biomass may have a negative value in the woods, but it's not appropriate to put this payment on top of wood that doesn't have value in the woods. I would make the argument for saw timber – however you measure it. We actually think that a track through legislation would be less productive.
- For local contractors, is that just timber harvest or everything else? Everything. We've had outfitters bid on contracts and have been outbid by those in New York. Use best value, get around it.
- I come here today as a humble servant. We were challenged to come up with ideas. We still have a lot of work to do. There will still be a debate. We were apprehensive on bringing this forward. This will be a tough discussion. We will need help with these ideas. I don't think it's an option for this group to just say no, we need options and assistance. It's going to take a lot of time and effort. Everyone says not to ask Congress for money and we don't need to – we have money standing on the stump right now.
- We are all in agreement that we need to do something. With MBF, I can practically write the opposition letter right now. But, we need to get something major that's acceptable, whether it's lands restored, risk reduced per acre, but as long as it's a description of forest health and restoration that's what's important. How we sell this and how we couch it is as important as ever. Just think of the next letter.
- I agree. Think about how these points will move forward. You can do collaboration in different ways to meet each other's needs. Trade off forestry for health. I find the target of interest; we

can express that in a way that creates predictability in fire resilience, education, forest health. That is something people want and makes the package more compelling.

- I agree with that. I'm glad you brought this forward. This isn't whether I support it, it's how can we get this done? It would be great if we could get \$6/acre for wilderness, and I'm really glad you didn't charge for Wild and Scenic Rivers! I could sell this to my organization! I don't really have a problem with any of it. Obviously, we have to work through how we do it.
- On the harvest level, we've been working through this on the Landscape Assessment process. I understand establishing projected treatment acres, but in the end we do want it to be measurable and predictable. The industry and those who look after the economy need to know that. Whether it's acres or MBF, we need to be able to track it.
- This is a huge step forward. We cannot just say now, it applies to everyone. What would help me, and the group, is to understand where this comes from and what it will pay for. If you didn't have wilderness, what would you be paying for? Having those numbers laid out would be helpful.
- I think this is a good start. The Colville struggled with permanence as well. We tried to accomplish that. It was called a Sustained Yield Unit, and it's been done before in other forests. We thought we had social license to do so, and we found out they didn't buy into it. The Chief will talk about that failure. You have to have enough money to do so – you would have to take from one forest to another. The other side is NEPA, you can't guarantee that output. If you don't produce it, you have people depending on it, you'll get push back. No one is disagreeing with the need for permanency, but get ready for that push back.

One other thought on Search and Rescue, this is a national issue. What if there was a fund set up for this just like the Fire Fund?

- I'm hearing the same thing – you have to paint this picture a certain way. We can tie this to Ecosystem Services, Transportation, Search and Rescue – whatever. I don't know how to paint this. I'm at a loss – here's where we are and we need help moving forward.
- It's important to note here that this is being brought forward for consideration either legislatively or administratively. Whatever this is, it would have the buy in of the Collaborative and that's different. And, we do need the Counties participating in the Landscape Subcommittee, but they are pressed for time and it's just as pressed for Rural Economies. It helped when Landscape Subcommittee came to Rural Economies and contributed. Every CBC member is a defacto member of other subcommittees.

- The reason I was excited about #1, is that it was in conjunction with the Landscape Assessment. That tells me it will be a science based, landscape target which is an evolving target. You can't put a number on an evolving organic component. I think that's a selling point, not a detractor.
- I can speak to the first two bullets – it's what we've asked for. It's a great step forward. We should embrace it as such, not a carved in stone thing. ASQ is not a target, never has been and never will be. He has a target, it's a Forest Harvest Schedule, and if he makes a commitment and the Regional Forester signs off on it you have a real strong document. It's a statement to the public of the Agency Commitment to do so. Legally, you're going to put into law that the FS buys back the timber product that cannot be sold? In the past we had to outlay millions to buy back timber because the market went south.
- Conceptually, it seems like we're talking about maximums. Am I mistaken that this is fairly ambitious? How about we establish a baseline to minimum BF? What if it's a decent number that doesn't excite people too much.

SRS will be sunseting, and there is no re-authorizing put in for yet and next year that will be followed by PILT and further program reductions. We all need to put our heads together, participate in more Subcommittee meetings.

Decision: The working group agreed the Rural Economies Subcommittee provided an excellent framework in the "County Proposal for CBC" paper and should continue to refine the concepts for further discussion.

Recreation Subcommittee

Thanks to the Forest Service for their support in the grant request to the IDPR Grant Request. FOC put their own grant together. Everything came together and they need a round of thanks. We do have grants in the works and will report to the Subcommittee on their progress. We saw the Forest Service move at an extremely fast pace and we are absolutely thankful.

Forest Service Recreation Program and FY12 Budget, Patty Johnston

2012 Recreation Wilderness and Wild & Scenic Rivers Budget: \$ 1.297 Million

- 25% - General Forest Area - Dispersed Sites
- 6% - Interpretation and Education

- 5% - Scenery and W&S River Management
- 16 % - Special Uses Administration
- 27 % - Developed Sites
- 21% - Wilderness

12 % of this Allocation funds the Heritage Program (off the top)

Recreation, Wilderness, and Wild & Scenic Rivers: Historical Budget Comparison
NFRW Allocation in thousands (\$)

	2006	2008	2011	2012
R-1 Allocation	\$13,790	\$12,742	\$12,495	\$11,800
% NP/CLW \$ of R-1 Allocation	16.90%	15.30%	11.60%	11%

Budget Amount												
Year	2006 (Final)			2008 (Final)			2011 (Final)			2012 (Initial)		
Forest	CLW	NP	Joint	CLW	NP	Joint	CLW	NP	Joint	CLW	NP	Joint
Total Forest Allocations	\$1,328	\$999	\$2,328	\$10,060	888	\$1,948	\$735	\$716	\$1,452	\$672	\$625	\$1,297

From 2006 to 2012 we had a 40% decrease in combined forest budgets

Trails: Historical Budget Comparison - CMTL Allocation in thousands (\$)

TRAILS	2008 (Final)			2011 * (Final) w/out Contingency			2012 (Initial)		
	CLW	NP	Joint	CLW	NP	Joint	CLW	NP	Joint
Total Allocation	\$576	\$792	\$1,368	\$681	\$988	\$1,669	\$658	\$866	\$1,524
O&M	\$328	\$451	\$779	\$400	\$617	\$1,017	\$424	\$583	\$1,007
Project CIP	\$248	\$341	\$589	\$230	\$320	\$550	\$214	\$294	\$508

* 2011 Blowdown Contingency: + \$59,800 for 280 TL-MAINT-STD

➤ 2008 Represents an average budget year as it is after the Lewis and Clark Bicentennial funding (2003-2006) and prior to the ARRA funding on the CLW NF

➤ **Allocation Changes**

➤ **2008 to 2011: + 22%**

➤ **2011 to 2012: - 8.7%**

Nez Perce-Clearwater NF's Staffing Overview: 2010-2012

(dark red: % of staff & substaff time; red: lost positions; green added positions)

- 2010 – 2011 RWTR Program Staffing
- Forest Level
 - Technical Services Staff (GS-13)
 - RWTR Staff (GS-12)
 - Trails Program Leader (GS-11)
 - Resource Assistant (GS-7) 100%
 - North Zone
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11)
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-9)
 - RWTR Specialist: Palouse (GS-7)
 - Trails Trails Specialist: North Fork (GS-7)
 - Central Zone
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11)
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-10)
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-9)—2 positions
 - Trails Specialist: Lochsa (GS-7)
 - Trails Specialist: Moose Creek (GS-6)
 - Packer: Lochsa long string (WG- 7)
 - Packer Moose Creek long string (WG-7)
 - River Ranger (WG-7)
 - Developed Recreation Specialist (GS-7)
 - Lolo Pass Visitor Center Manager (GS-6)
 - South Zone
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11 SR)
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11 RR)
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-9 RR)
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-7- SR)
 - Trail Specialist (GS-7, SR)
 - River Ranger (GS-7)
 - Developed Recreation Specialist (GS-7)

- Target RWTR Staffing
- Forest Level (+approx \$15,000 staff salary)
 - Technical Services Staff (GS-13) **Reduction in %**
 - RWTR Staff (GS-12)
 - **Trails Program Leader (GS-11)**
 - **Resource Assistant (GS-7) Reduce % to 50%**
 - North Zone
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11) **Reduction in %**
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-9)
 - Trails Specialist: Palouse (GS-7)
 - Trails Specialist: North Fork (GS-7)
 - Central Zone)
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11))
 - **RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-10)**
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-9)—2 positions
 - **Trails Specialist: Lochsa (GS-7)**
 - **Trails Specialist: Moose Creek(GS-7)**
 - Trails Specialist: Moose Creek (GS-6)
 - **Packer: Lochsa long string (WG- 7)**
 - Packer: Moose Creek long string (WG-7)
 - River Ranger (GS-7) Vacant
 - **Developed Recreation Specialists (GS-7)**
 - **Developed Recreation Specialists (GS-7)**
 - South Zone
 - RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11 SR)
 - **RWTR Zone Staff (GS-11 RR)**
 - RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-9 RR)
 - **RWTR Zone Substaff (GS-7 SR)**
 - Trail Specialist (GS-7, SR)
 - **Trail Specialist (GS-7, RR)**

The only point of this slide is the visual representation of loss in FY12 as seen by all the red staffing lines----there could be some discussion regarding the integration of the packers with the wilderness program, but they primarily supported trails for 80% of their time with the exception of the long string packer to MC whose position is continued. Reduction in the amount of time in NFRW at Forest level. Reduction in the north zone is time we have for seasonal and number.

Implications

- Figures are not related to the combination of the Nez Perce and Clearwater National Forests
- Decline reflects the implementation of the Regional Formula and Declining National Trends
- Funding Permanent Recreation and Trails Permanent Staff Reduces \$ available for field crews
- Reduction in Length of Season and Number of Field Crews to accomplish developed recreation, trails, wilderness and River Work
- Tough decision ahead regarding services we will be able to continue to maintain at current service levels

Recreation Facilities Analysis -7 Step Process

- Step 1 – Prepare Inventory and Financial Data -
- Step 2 – Develop Forest Recreation Program Niche
 - Niche has been update combining both forests
- Step 3 – Identify Operational Efficiencies
- Step 4 – Rank Recreation Sites
- Currently we have completed Steps 1 – 4
- We are currently completing the internal work on the proposed program of work so that we can present to the public for review.

Steps to Complete the RFA Process

- Step 5 – Propose 5 year Program of Work to the Public
- Review the 5 year Program of Work generated in model with Forest visitors, Partners and Organizations
- Step 6 – Finalize 5 year Proposed Program of Work.
- Step 7 – Implementation with Site Specific Public Participation

Options Being Considered

- Concession Campgrounds - Evaluating the option for the Campgrounds within the Selway Corridor and Lochsa River Corridors
- Consideration of Concession at Lolo Pass Visitor Center
- Temporary Campgrounds and Rental Cabin and Lookout Closures
- Less Cleaning of Toilet Facilities at Trailheads and Dispersed Sites
- Shortening garbage collection season and reducing sites
- Reduce River Patrols on the Salmon River from weekly to every other week and extend coverage in the fall and spring use fishing season

- Proposed closure of LHRs: would result in loss of a “Working Station” where public can view working pack stock and packers and learn about traditional packing skills and western and wilderness history
- Loss of Forest Service pack strings in local community parades: Limited parades were done by FS pack strings: Orofino, Kooskia, Kamiah, Grangeville, Stites, Clearwater: traditionally FS pack strings have been in these parades almost annually.

Alternative Funding Sources

- CFLRA
 - Funding source is a current strength, but is primarily helpful only to the Central Zone
- CMLG (Legacy Funding)
 - Integrated into NFRR in FY12 where emphasis is on Road Decommissioning and treatments only in the 4 identified priority watersheds
 - Trail support funding will probably go down to about \$30,000 annually from \$100,000-\$200,000 annually in FY10 and FY11
- RAC
 - Funding Source proposed to end in 2012; trails program support was critical to partners providing trail maintenance and reconstruction work in burned over areas; in FY10 and FY11 funded about \$50,000-\$80,000 annually in trail maintenance contracts
- IDPR Grants
 - Funding source is a current strength for deferred maintenance and reconstruction in motorized areas; current 3 way partnership with outfitters is a valuable asset in working on current blow down that occurred in FY11
- RTP
 - Program where Forest targets motorized use has a questionable future
- ARRA (2010-2014):
 - 3.1 Million to Clearwater NF Trail partnerships & contracts
- Much work to address deferred maintenance and weed treatment
- IDPR grant funding for Developed Campgrounds and Waterways

- RAC funding for Restoration of Dispersed Sites

The Future of Collaborative Efforts and Partnerships Some Challenges

- A tremendous Volunteer program has been built, and is expected to continue; however finding even enough funds to pay per diem and mileage for volunteers is becoming increasingly difficult
- Workload increase resulting from reductions of field-going trail personnel results in less time for logistical planning and project specific oversight of partner projects

Volunteer Hours for Recreation, Wilderness, Trails, and Rivers

Nez Perce	District	Accomplishment Hours
	Salmon River	616
	Clearwater RD	1208
	Red River	1626
	Moose Creek	12424
		15874
<hr/>		
Clearwater		
	Palouse	4208
	N. Fork	3208
	Lochsa	7931
	Powell	4897
		20244

Our Outstanding Partners

- Local ATV & Motorcycle Groups
 - PLAY, Lewis & Clark ATV, Valley Cats, PANTRA, Dust Devils, High Mountain Trail Assoc., Clearwater Road and Trail, Pathfinders and others
- Bureau of Land Management
- Montana Fish Wildlife and Parks
- Discover Your Northwest
- Idaho Fish and Game
- Nez Perce Tribe

- PCEI: Palouse-Clearwater Environmental Institute
- SBF: Selway-Bitterroot Foundation & Bitterroot RC&D
- GBSG: Great Burn Study Group
- MCC: Montana Conservation Corps (Idaho Unit)
- SCA: Student Conservation Assoc
- IDOC: Idaho Dept of Corrections (work program)
- IDPR: State Trail Ranger and Grant Programs
- Idaho & Latah Counties: Snowmobile Trail Grooming Program
- BCH: North Central Idaho and Twin Rivers Backcountry Horsemen
- Framing Our Community (Elk City)
- University of Idaho
- Many others.....and of course CBC
 - Total Volunteer hours from 2011 report: xxxx

Comments:

- What will we do with our Trails Contractors? We are still going to try and continue with Opening Contracts. What's the percentage? Unknown, perhaps 70%.

....Lunch....

Welcome to Dr. Richard Margerum, speaking at the University of Idaho on February 24th from 12:00 to 1:00.

Washington DC Briefing and Co-Chair Meeting in Boise

The Chief of Staff for Senator Crapo gave us extensive time and gave a thoughtful discussion. They requested that perhaps we try to meet in Boise occasionally.

We also met with several State Directors of Idaho for various departments: Lands, Fish and Game, and Parks and Recreation.

Idaho Forest Restoration Partnership

It was a good conference and will be set again for next year. Day one was regarding ecological basis for mixed regime forests. The second day was for products coming off the forest. Next year they would like to address actual problem solving for projects.

CBC was represented on collaborative forests on a mixed regime environment. They spoke for less than 10 minutes. We opened our comments with “how” we are going to address this, not “if”.

Senator Crapo and chief Tidwell were in Boise on Monday and gave repeated consideration to the CBC.

When are we going back to DC again? We are working on a calendar of events.

Comments:

- I think our Washington DC trips are very important as we are a known name and that’s important.
- We want to be cautious and continue what we’re doing.

State of the Forest – Nez Perce / Clearwater national Forests, Supervisor Brazell

I went to DC with all of you, and everywhere I went people knew about CBC. We have a good reputation.

Upper Lochsa Land Exchange

We did a supplement EIS analyzing an alternative brought forward by Idaho County. That generated more input than the previous – 425 comments. We are in the process of analyzing. It’s an acre-for-acre trade, so it will be difficult to recommend for us. But, it will go forward. Law Enforcement has been necessary at some meetings.

Travel Planning

On January 12th we released the Travel Management Plan, which was accepted by some and not by others. We have 8 appeals so far and are anticipating more. We’re not sure where it will end up, we usually try to settle but that may just aggravate the situation. We have both ends of the spectrum at work (close more trails vs. open more trails).

The Nez Perce TMP will be released soon and we anticipate it will meet the same reception.

What is the timeframe for appeals? The team working on appeals convenes the 28th. We're at the tail end of the period.

We had two appeals we dismissed where they commented during Scoping, but not during another and that did not give them standing.

Administrative Combining of Forests

This started somewhat before I got here but is now moving towards completion. This will save a lot of money. We have almost 1 of everything where we used to have 2. There will be close to \$2M savings in salaries. We have the package almost ready and may be submitted in the next month.

When I got here we had 350 employees and our target is 285. A lot of those are vacant positions, so it's not like a lot of people are losing their jobs. We also are performing buy outs and transferring people to different positions.

Future Supervisor Office

This isn't my decision; a team of experts came in to perform a Value Analysis. They look at buildings, lease rates, amenities in communities and Kamiah was the most desirable location. That will save \$10-14 million dollars. This will most certainly affect communities. Where we have offices, we will continue to have offices. District people will stay where they are through their leases.

We pay over \$1M in leases every year. More of that money needs to get to the ground rather than being spent on rent.

The formal combination needs to be approved by the Chief's office. It's an Administrative combination. There has only been one case where the combined two forests and later split them up, it doesn't usually happen.

Forest Plan Revision – Early Adopter

We will be moving on this right away. We were to get \$1.2M the first year. We will be having Counties develop the process. We have to be careful about the relationship with CBC; this is not a FACA approved group. Legally, under this new planning rule, it has to be open to everyone – larger than this group. My hope is that the heart of that group contains CBC members because you know what it means to collaborate.

FACA rules apply when the FS is hosting the meetings. When they are invited to someone else's meetings, such as CBC or County Commissioners, they are not subject to FACA. There is a Washington

FACA Committee and we have sent a letter to recommend a new member. But, they will not be an oversight group to tell us right from wrong, but they will be working alongside us in aide.

What are some of the interim products that may come out of this, even if the Forest Supervisor doesn't sign a final plan in 3-4 years? One thing could be "what would be a sustained output?" There were also some great aquatic products that came out of our last revision.

To the best of your ability, can you lay out an outline and timeline of what's going to happen? The first year will be the analysis – looking at everything we've done. We will have to contract a lot of this because it will go beyond our capacity. That's something this group will have to address as well. There is an expectation that this will be done in three years.

How are you working with the Regional Office? Part of the problem in the past is that it was internal battling about how to perform things. Historically, the Regional Office was the final decider. We will work towards controlling the process and truly make it a collaborative process and get the RO involved. There will be no extended review process by the RO because they will be involved all along. This has never been done before and it's a huge effort.

Perhaps we should think, as a collaborative, as to what the key issues are to work with the Forest Service on this plan. I suggest we don't wait to see what the Forest Service puts out, we should be proactive.

There are certain things that will *not* be on the table, such as the Idaho Roadless Rule – because trying to open those up is not going to work as it's already gone through a public process and been decided.

If we come as CBC, are we one voice or 22? You have to determine that. I would suggest you be 22 voices.

What about synchronizing with BLM planning? Short answer is no. They may be discussing this at the Washington level, but not here. It makes people go through two very long processes side by side. It's hard for people to separate them.

Steering Committee

CFLRP Coordinator RFP

We produced a RFP, based on our Cost Share Agreement. We received the applications and reviewed the 4 applications. NW Management submitted the best proposal. The Selection Committee recommended to the Steering Committee to negotiate a Professional Services Contract. We will be encouraging those not selected to reapply in the future for other aspects of the contract.

Action Item: *Kelli will send the Attorney General opinion regarding conflict of interest to the working group.*

Letters of Support

The Co-Chairs have finalized Letters of Support to:

- Clearwater Soil and Water Conservation District in support of their Woody Biomass Utilization Grant
- Lewiston Orchards Irrigation District (LOID) in continued support of their project
- North/South Route Proposal to Parks and Recreation Grant

Calendar of Events

We've had lots of requests for people to come visit. Our new Acting Regional Forester would like to come and visit.

Public Comment

Round Robin

Meeting Concluded

Table of Contents

Review of Action Items and Decisions	1
Forest Health and Function.....	2
Landscape Assessment Proposal	2
Forest Plan Pilot Project.....	2
Clear Creek Scoping Comment Letter under the MOU.....	2
Status of Selway Middle Fork Clearwater CFLRA Project.....	5
Rural Economies	6
Other Subjects.....	8
Search and Rescue	8
Stewardship Contracting Renewal.....	8
County Proposal.....	9
Recreation Subcommittee	13
Forest Service Recreation Program and FY12 Budget, Patty Johnston	13
2012 Recreation Wilderness and Wild & Scenic Rivers Budget: \$ 1.297 Million.....	13
Recreation, Wilderness, and Wild & Scenic Rivers: Historical Budget Comparison NFRW Allocation in thousands (\$)	14
Trails: Historical Budget Comparison - CMTL Allocation in thousands (\$).....	15
Nez Perce-Clearwater NF’s Staffing Overview: 2010-2012.....	15
Implications.....	16
Recreation Facilities Analysis -7 Step Process.....	17
Steps to Complete the RFA Process	17
Options Being Considered.....	17
Alternative Funding Sources	18
The Future of Collaborative Efforts and Partnerships Some Challenges	19
Volunteer Hours for Recreation, Wilderness, Trails, and Rivers.....	19
Our Outstanding Partners	19
Washington DC Briefing and Co-Chair Meeting in Boise	20
Idaho Forest Restoration Partnership.....	21
State of the Forest – Nez Perce / Clearwater national Forests, Supervisor Brazell.....	21

Upper Lochsa Land Exchange..... 21

Travel Planning..... 21

Administrative Combining of Forests..... 22

Future Supervisor Office 22

Forest Plan Revision – Early Adopter 22

Steering Committee 23

 CFLRP Coordinator RFP 23

 Letters of Support 24

Public Comment..... 24

Round Robin..... 24

Decisions and Action Items

DECISIONS

- In response to a request by the Landscape Health Subcommittee, Rick has agreed to appoint the Forest NEPA Coordinator, vice Marty Gardner, as liaison to the Subcommittee to work with MOU issues.
- The working group agreed to have Jonathan draft a letter of support for the Clearwater Soil and Water Conservation District who is leading the effort to secure funding for an engineering design for a heat-only biomass project for the Idaho Correctional Institution in Orofino.
- The working group agreed the Rural Economies Subcommittee provided an excellent framework in the “County Proposal for CBC” paper and should continue to refine the concepts for further discussion.

ACTIONS

- The working group was asked to consider including a “NEPA Process” segment in an upcoming meeting (or hosting a separate session for interested members). An understanding of NEPA would help individuals working on projects via the MOU process.
- The co-chairs requested that the Forest Service provide an accounting of how CFLRP monies have been spent to date (displayed in a manner similar to the report prepared by Susan Graves regarding ARRA work).
- The co-chairs and the Landscape Health Subcommittee will have additional discussions regarding the proposal revise boundaries for the CFLRP area (to make it larger).
- Elayne will send the Recreation, Wilderness, Trails and Wild & Scenic Rivers PowerPoint to Kelli so it can be posted on the CBC website.
- Kelli will send the Attorney General opinion regarding conflict of interest to the working group.