

**HERGER-FEINSTEIN QUINCY LIBRARY FOREST RESTORATION ACT**  
**Pilot Project Collaborative Meeting**  
 Marysville, CA – January 8, 2009

**Meeting Notes**

**Participants:**

- **Quincy Library Group:** Linda Blum, Mike De Lasaux, Tom Downing, Jay Francis, Michael Jackson, Ed Murphy, Harry Reeves, John Sheehan, Frank Stewart, George Terhune, Bill Wickman
- **Plaintiffs:** David Edelson, Todd Schulke, Craig Thomas
- **US Forest Service:** Alice Carlton, Kathleen Morse, Beth Pendleton, Tom Quinn, Dave Wood
- **State Attorney General's Office:** Sally Magnani, Janill Richards
- **Facilitator:** Robert Fisher
- **Recorder:** Larry Fisher

The group agreed that discussions at the meeting would be confidential. \_\_\_\_\_, a property owner and an interested member of the public, was at the meeting briefly, and left after being informed the meeting was for invited participants and not open to the public.

**Action Items:**

1. Mike De Lasaux offered to identify a recorder from County Cooperative Extension to serve as recorder for the next meeting.
2. Robert Fisher will distribute a revised draft of the Operating Parameters.
3. Robert will send out an electronic scheduler to all participants to determine specific dates for the next few meetings.
4. Robert will follow up with the three plaintiff organizations (Sierra Club, Natural Resources Defense Council, and The Wilderness Society) that did not attend this meeting about participation in the process.
5. The group set up a small group (Linda Blum, David Edelson, Janill Richards, Dave Wood) to work with Robert in developing the agenda for the next meeting.

**Important characteristics of a successful Pilot Project**

(Brainstorm list, does not represent group agreement)

- Forward-looking, creative, not necessarily risk-averse
- Measurable results, providing a learning laboratory to improve successive projects
- A strong, collaborative, open process
- Protects and restores old-forest characteristics throughout the project area
- Promotes viable populations of wildlife
- Better protects homes and communities from the risk of high-severity wildfires
- Protects the forest from the risk of high-severity wildfires
- Changes at the landscape level – small experimental units are insufficient
- Openness to new information, flexible and adaptive to address change along the way
- Provides information about resource impacts and what is or isn't a sustainable financing mechanism for forest management

---

• Bulleted notes are from the flip charts written during the meeting, edited for clarity and readability.

- Address both what we are doing, and how we are doing it – how identified, implemented, and planned
- We learn enough to know when and where the lessons can be applied
- Is forward looking, about climate change (e.g., how forests may need to look to be resilient in the future)
- Addresses the forest’s ability to store water in the dwindling snow pack
- Needs to identify, develop, or sustain appropriate infrastructure to conduct treatments
- Based on broad stakeholder agreements
- Projects designed so that implementation results in financial benefits to the local community
- Projects are ecologically driven, recognizing there will likely be socio-economic benefits
- Implements learning - leads to outcomes that are more sustainable in terms of management, so that they can be implemented on scales that are much greater than the Pilot Project

**Potential Focus of the Collaborative** (Brainstorm list, does not represent group agreement)

- Climate change consequences: ecosystems, wildlife, and human impacts
- The sustainability of forest management capabilities - both public and private – infrastructure and funding
- The obstruction of valid forest management for political reasons
- Group selection, DFPZs, area thinning, and the land base
- The relationship between scale and intensity
- Funding sources/mechanisms to implement appropriate projects on the ground
- What are the benefits and/or adverse effects of the Pilot Project?
- Creating the future, rather than correcting the past – build a more robust strategy (e.g. taking a fresh look at ecosystem restoration)
- Focus on the research component and adaptation, and how to use this to affect future projects and management
- Senator Feinstein’s request: appropriate and necessary modifications to the Pilot Project for the duration of the Act
- Projects with final decisions
- Projects in the pipeline for the remainder of the Pilot Project
- What happens beyond 2012 (if agreement on projects)

**Process Considerations**

The group agreed to the following. All meetings will be considered “closed” unless determined to be open in advance. *Closed* includes representatives of the public as well as the media. The group will not invite other participants (beyond those specifically identified in the Omnibus Act) to join the process at this time. Appropriate communication mechanisms will be established with other interested parties, as the group pursues these initial collaborative and more substantive discussions. The group will revisit this decision during each of the meetings ahead and reassess the need for confidentiality and restricted participation. The group also noted that there will be opportunities for the public to comment on and influence any outcomes or agreements (e.g., through the NEPA process).

**Meeting Topics**

Agenda topics for the next meeting include:

1. “Elephants” in the room, including:

- Perception that groups like the Quincy Library Group imply an emphasis on local control (i.e., “yokel control” – that monitoring is being carried out by the same people who wanted it to happen)
  - Questions about whether there are in fact benefits to the Pilot Project
  - Whether it is appropriate to have any commercial logging on federal forests
2. Historical perspectives that have shaped each of the groups’ views on forest management (with presentations from the QL G and plaintiffs),
  3. Objectives

Future agenda topics include:

- Pilot project components - aspects of scale and explore intensity
- How the understanding applies to projects (in the pipeline, and possibly in litigation)
- Values that drive perspectives on forest management (without ranking or judging people’s values).
- Agreement on specific projects (in the pipeline, in litigation) and how they can be modified to get them implemented
- Address individual Pilot Project components (group selection, DFPZs, area thinning, land base, scale and intensity), and how that understanding would be applied to projects in the pipeline
- Develop recommendations for future areas to address, or specific recommendations on those areas