

## **Payette Forest Coalition**

Thursday, May 16, 2024 – 10:00 am to 1:00 pm

Hybrid meeting: Payette National Forest Supervisor's Office, 500 N. Mission Street, McCall, ID  
and [Join Zoom Meeting](#): Meeting ID: 815 3909 0811 Passcode: 703461  
One tap mobile: +13462487799, 81539090811# US (Houston)

### Desired Outcomes

- (1) Learn about characteristics of successful collaboratives and collaboration
- (2) Discuss the upcoming 2024 NFF collaborative funding cycle
- (3) Continue evaluation of PFC's zone of agreement

### Agenda

10:00 AM Introductions, review agenda and desired outcomes

10:10 AM Characteristics of successful collaboratives and 2024 Idaho Collaborative Capacity funding, Maise Powell, Northern Rockies Program Coordinator, National Forest Foundation (NFF), and Jaimie Baxter, Collaborative Capacity Program Manager, NFF

11:00 AM PFC Zone of Agreement review continued

12:00 PM News and Updates

- Summer field trip topics
  - Johnson-Goodrich, Mike Reggear
  - Specific options for PFC to choose from for Granite Slope, MFWR, NCT projects, Forest Service
- Availability of draft Specialist Reports on future projects, Facilitator and Forest Service
- Granite Goose final EA status, Dana Harris

### *References for Meeting*

Clicking the link in the meeting email announcement will take you to the meeting packet which includes references below.

[April 18, 2024 meeting notes](#)

[PFC Zone of Agreement \(Using Granite Goose as example\)](#)

## **Payette Forest Coalition**

Thursday, May 16, 2024 – 10:00 am to 1:00 pm

Hybrid meeting: Payette National Forest Supervisor's Office, 500 N. Mission Street, McCall, ID  
and [Join Zoom Meeting](#): Meeting ID: 815 3909 0811 Passcode: 703461  
One tap mobile: +13462487799, 81539090811# US (Houston)

### **Topic Information Sheet**

#### **Characteristics of successful collaboratives and 2024 Idaho Collaborative Capacity funding**

During the February's review of the Granite Goose EA comment letter, interest was expressed to learn about how collaboratives remain successful over time and move through challenges. Maisie Powell from the National Forest Foundation's Conservation Connect program, which works with collaboratives to identify challenges and suggest workable solutions, will speak about collaborative foundations, conditions that allow for collaborative success, and offer suggestions to help groups address challenging issues. Jaimie Baxter, Collaborative Capacity Program Manager for NFF, will describe NFF's 2024 collaborative funding program and application requirements. PFC applied for and was granted funding from NFF last year.

#### **PFC Zone of Agreement**

The PFC adopted its zone of agreement (ZOA) by consensus in 2012. The ZOA defines PFC's purpose, its role, the five restoration goals which represent members' interests, and metrics that define progress towards reaching those goals. The document is the common ground upon which members build consensus for recommendations and gauge whether project documents and restoration outcomes are consistent with those recommendations. Both PFC membership and federal policies driving funding (and treatment) priorities have changed since then.

At April's meeting, Forest Service outlined how federal policy (i.e., the Wildfire Crisis Strategy) is focusing the PNF's work on fuels reduction, noting that even so it [the Forest] still desires projects which incorporate all PFC restoration goals.

The PFC began examination of its zone of agreement with the following questions in mind: Is the zone of agreement still consistent with members' interests, and to what extent are PFC and Forest aligned in light of changes and new expectations brought by new federal funding priorities?

PFC will continue evaluating PFC's zone of agreement in light of these questions focusing on the following objectives:

- Discuss whether these changes have created inconsistencies between the zone of agreement and the current situation,
- If so, consider what amendments to the zone of agreement are needed, and
- Identify how to go about making those changes.

**Payette Forest Coalition  
Meeting Notes  
April 18, 2024**

**Desired Outcomes**

- (1) Learn about smoke management in regard to natural events and Rx fire
- (2) Begin evaluation of PFC's zone of agreement

**Smoke Management, Mark Boyle, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)**

Mark's presentation and a thread for further questions and discussion can be found [here](#).

Highlights include:

- Rx fire is allowed in Idaho by statute. An adequate smoke control plan for each fire is required. DEQ determines adequacy through interagency agreement (USFS, IDL) but has no power over federal entities.
- Prior to COVID, there weren't any MOU's in place for a State Management Fire Plan. A draft MOU was created in October 2023 and Mark engaged various entities in discussions that will continue through the end of June. The group's name is the Forest Practice Advisory Committee (FPAC).
- Air quality is not necessarily addressed in Rx fire plans. DEQ is working with Forests on this.
- Entities submit burn plans a day before ignition and DEQ responds with a yes/no based on air quality, wind direction, number of Rx fires in area planned for same day, and other factors. While DEQ cannot prevent an ignition on federal lands, historically Forests and DEQ have been able to work things out if smoke issues are projected. Mark noted that DEQ, the MT/ID Airshed Group and the Payette consistently work very well together. The Forest also has a track record of self-policing (i.e., stopping ignition or downsizing the size of an approved fire if smoke gets too bad).
- Described role of MT/ID Airshed Group, wildfire smoke response and outreach programs. The latter includes Air Quality Awareness and Smoke Ready Week (early to mid-June) and a daily smoke outlook July – October. Forest Service, State of Idaho, Health Districts, EPA and IDL all receive this information simultaneously.

**KEY MESSAGES**

- Generally, wildfire smoke has a higher CO<sub>2</sub> content and contains more particulate matter and secondary pollutants.
- Smoke from Rx fires will likely impact communities in ways that it hasn't in the past because of the scale of Rx fire use. Mike Reggear noted that in some places (Region 1 mentioned) that private entities are struggling to remediate slash because they "compete" for burn windows with Forests in the fall which is the major time for Rx fire.
- Much discussion about how the lack of air quality monitoring equipment makes it hard for DEQ and others to understand what local conditions are actually like and react accordingly. Only McCall has air quality monitoring equipment and DEQ does not have the resources to purchase more monitors.

- There are less expensive monitors available (Purple Air mentioned) whose data can be uploaded to websites like Airnow.gov. Larry Laxson noted there are volunteer groups and perhaps county commissions who might be interested in buying monitors. If DEQ could suggest what equipment they could buy and how to link it to a system like Airnow, it would help expand the monitoring network at local levels (and it would all be the same equipment).
- Real-time air quality information: [Airnow.gov](#), [MT/ID Airshed Group](#), [PurpleAir](#)
- **Action:** Facilitator will create a Forum thread for further questions and discussion.

## **PFC zone of agreement**

### **MAIN POINTS**

- PFC was formed to build support for forest restoration centered around five restoration goals: wildfire, wildlife, watershed health, forest access and recreation, restoration economics.
- Zone of agreement was adopted by consensus in 2012 so the PFC didn't keep re-inventing the wheel for each project. It defines PFC's purpose, role, focus (restoration goals), and metrics for the Coalition's work at all stages of projects.
- Restoration goals represent members' interests. Mutual support of those interests is key to finding consensus (i.e., members support each other by supporting all goals).
- Metrics define progress toward reaching restoration goals (i.e., desired conditions).
- Linda Jackson, Tim Leishman and John Riling discussed how the federal policy (Wildfire Crisis Strategy) drives work on the ground. Fuels reduction is the primary focus. This affects the agency and PFC. Cold July and RR Saddle were given as examples. Subsequent discussion about how that focus was difficult for PFC given all restoration goals were not addressed in those projects and that the emphasis on Rx fire and non-commercial thinning is troubling for some.
- Linda Jackson noted that CLFRP projects are coming back in a year or so and its objectives will need to be merged with WCS's. She noted the PNF desires projects that incorporate all PFC restoration goals citing Granite Goose as an example.

### **KEY MESSAGES**

- A Coalition member commented that PFC has become too NEPA-focused. Does it only want to be a NEPA review group? Led to subsequent discussion about how this focus makes attracting new members difficult. Are there other things PFC could do that would meet its purpose and attract new members? There is a need to return to the basics of building support for forest management.
- Tim Leishman talked about how collaboratives he has worked with have shifted their focus as the policy landscape has changed. One example given was working on utilization of non-commercial wood products.
- Discussed need to look at a broad set of tools to address current forest conditions. Cost will be an important criterion. While Rx fire is often the most economical treatment method, it is not always the best choice.
- Discussion of grazing as one of those tools and the challenges associated with including it as part of the action alternative because of probable litigation and that it was done

under separate NEPA. Further discussion about how its absence in action alternatives and little discussion about what will be done if allotments are closed because of Rx fire makes it difficult for grazing interests to support projects. Kara Kirkpatrick-Kreitingner noted that the concern was addressed in the Forest-wide Prescribed Fire EA within the Implementation Plan which states that the Forest is required to work with permittees beforehand to plan for and provide the needed rest and that permittees are required to be notified if the burn area may affect their allotment or pasture.

- Began review of the zone of agreement document (1<sup>st</sup> column). Members agreed to change the wording of the second-to-last bullet to read: “The conditions compromise the resiliency of the forest to recover from disturbance and adapt to shifting conditions.

**Action:** Continue review of the zone of agreement next month.

## **News and Updates**

### *Granite Goose final EA status*

Sent to OGC and Region for review. Forest will then review it here and incorporate comments. Dana Harris estimates it will be at least a month before the final EA/draft Decision Notice is released. **Action:** Follow up in May.

### *The PFC Steering Team*

Down to three members: Wendy Green (who would like to step down), Larry Laxson and Sandra Mitchell. There is a need for it to reflect the range of interests represented on the PFC (missing wildlife and vegetation). Procedure is for the Steering Team to call for volunteers who serve until November elections. Travis Barden, Forester for Idaho Forest Group, agreed to serve. **Action:** Facilitator will connect with him regarding signing the Basic Conditions of Collaboration, Forum and email registration, Steering Team duties, and answer questions.

### *Vegetation Committee*

A chairperson and subject matter expertise is needed. Travis Barden has subject matter knowledge as does Clark Lucas (currently listed as an advisory member on the committee) who might be a resource if asked. **Action:** Revisit at future meeting.

### *Summer field trips*

Good recruiting tool, way to gauge treatment impacts (monitoring), and discuss restoration opportunities on new landscapes. Ideas:

- Granite Slope (slated to begin in 2025)
- Johnson-Goodrich (in early NFMA and next project in pipeline). **Action:** Mike Reggear offered to work with Forest Service to put this trip together.
- MFWR (early implementation—timber harvest, roads treatments, Rx fire, before and after comparison for CT and NCT at Quaking Pine sale).
- NCT projects in various places across the Forest.

**Actions:** Forest will present some specific options on the above at the May meeting and PFC will discuss who will work with Forest Service to plan the trip.

### *Collaborative funding options*

Tim Leishman reported there are enough funds available through the end of the fiscal year assuming PFC does not meet every month. Garret Visser stated that the NFF is going to be renewing the Collaborative Capacity grant this May or June with an estimated budget of \$15-20,000 per collaborative for the next year. Facilitator mentioned that PFC could use its old grant application if it applies (i.e., no need to start from scratch). Question asked whether IFRP could help shed light on funding options.

### *Follow up on some of February's action items:*

#### *PFC public outreach on future projects*

- Wendy Green spoke to Durena Farr at Valley Soil and Water Conservation District which started a watershed group a few years ago. They are using Facebook, emails, social media, and flyers/posters in Valley County. Flyers likely won't be effective outside of the McCall area—digital outreach will be key. Larry Laxson observed that high school students are adept at using social media and recently cooperated with the County's recreation group to get a project done. What if PFC reached out to see if they'd do the same with a Coalition project?
- PFC has a Facebook page that anyone with a Facebook account can post on. Dennis Murphy has also offered to post content for members.
- Outreach could be done through local agencies (Valley County Citizens Recreational Advisory Board mentioned) but volunteers are more important because they offer networks. Take home message: Tap into a network of volunteers.
- Lin Davis is the only member of the communication committee. Wendy Green offered to help with the content. Brian Harris mentioned he and Lin have worked together in the past and there were discussions about adding a less technical, front facing webpage to PFC's website that would tell, among other things, who PFC members are. *Note:* The PFC website does have a member biography page.
- Suggestion to invite Mara from Valley County (Larry Laxson) and Durena (Wendy Green) from Valley Soil to our next meeting. Further suggestion made for members to think of one person they could invite to this summer's field trips as a recruiting tool.

*Availability of draft Specialist Reports on future projects and define unaddressed issues from Granite Goose likely to surface on future projects—deferred to May meeting.*

Linda Jackson will retire from Forest Service at the end of April. Kevin Knesek, Deputy Forest Supervisor, will serve as interim Supervisor until her replacement is found. Thank you, Linda.

**Adjourned at 1:34 pm.**

**Next meeting May 16, 2024**

**Payette Forest Coalition  
Meeting Notes  
April 18, 2024**

**Desired Outcomes**

- (1) Learn about smoke management in regard to natural events and Rx fire
- (2) Begin evaluation of PFC's zone of agreement

**Smoke Management, Mark Boyle, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ)**

Mark's presentation and a thread for further questions and discussion can be found [here](#).

Highlights include:

- Rx fire is allowed in Idaho by statute. An adequate smoke control plan for each fire is required. DEQ determines adequacy through interagency agreement (USFS, IDL) but has no power over federal entities.
- Prior to COVID, there weren't any MOU's in place for a State Management Fire Plan. A draft MOU was created in October 2023 and Mark engaged various entities in discussions that will continue through the end of June. The group's name is the Forest Practice Advisory Committee (FPAC).
- Air quality is not necessarily addressed in Rx fire plans. DEQ is working with Forests on this.
- Entities submit burn plans a day before ignition and DEQ responds with a yes/no based on air quality, wind direction, number of Rx fires in area planned for same day, and other factors. While DEQ cannot prevent an ignition on federal lands, historically Forests and DEQ have been able to work things out if smoke issues are projected. Mark noted that DEQ, the MT/ID Airshed Group and the Payette consistently work very well together. The Forest also has a track record of self-policing (i.e., stopping ignition or downsizing the size of an approved fire if smoke gets too bad).
- Described role of MT/ID Airshed Group, wildfire smoke response and outreach programs. The latter includes Air Quality Awareness and Smoke Ready Week (early to mid-June) and a daily smoke outlook July – October. Forest Service, State of Idaho, Health Districts, EPA and IDL all receive this information simultaneously.

**KEY MESSAGES**

- Generally, wildfire smoke has a higher CO<sub>2</sub> content and contains more particulate matter and secondary pollutants.
- Smoke from Rx fires will likely impact communities in ways that it hasn't in the past because of the scale of Rx fire use. Mike Reggear noted that in some places (Region 1 mentioned) that private entities are struggling to remediate slash because they "compete" for burn windows with Forests in the fall which is the major time for Rx fire.
- Much discussion about how the lack of air quality monitoring equipment makes it hard for DEQ and others to understand what local conditions are actually like and react accordingly. Only McCall has air quality monitoring equipment and DEQ does not have the resources to purchase more monitors.



# MEETING SIGN-IN SHEET

Project:	Payette Forest Coalition	Meeting Date:	April 18, 2024	Meeting Time:	10 am-2 pm
Facilitator:	Paul Litow	Place/Room:	McCall Supervisor's Office		

First Name	Last Name	Organization	E-Mail	Round Trip Miles	Round Trip Hours
Mark	Boyle	Idaho DFG	mark.boyle@dep.idaho.gov		
Archie	Vandenburg	Woodgrain	r.vandenburg@woodgrain.com	300	4
LARRY	LARSEN	VLC	LARSEN@CO.VBURY.ID.US	100	2
Travis	Barden	Idaho Forest Group	travis.barden@ifg.com	~ 300	6
Mike	Beggs	Idaho Forest Group	mreggeor@ifg.com	~ 310	7
Wendy	Green	Adams Soil & Water Dist.	ivallid@gmail.com	110	2
Jenni	Blake	USFS-PayetteLFS	jennib@idaho.usda.gov	—	—
Frank	Schwartz	WRCA	FrankM1@gmail.com	130	3
Dennis	Benson	USDA - FS	dennis.benson@usda.gov	—	—
Randy	Fox	Idaho Conservation League	rfox@idahoconservation.org	—	—
Patrick	Schon	USFS - PAF	Patrick.Schon@usda.gov SchonPatrick	—	—
Tim	Leidman	USFS - SJL	—	—	—
NOE	Reyes	USFS - PAF	noe.reyes@usda.gov	—	—







PFC Meeting Sign-In (Remote) April 2024

4/18/2024 9:59:55	Rachelle Leishman	Brundage Mountain Resirt			
4/18/2024 10:06:01	Brandon Flack	Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game			
4/18/2024 10:06:02	Kara Kirkpatrick-Kreitinge	USFS		0	0
4/18/2024 10:06:04	Darren Parker	Senator Risch		0	0
4/18/2024 10:06:10	Alex Ernst, Land Access C	IDPR, Recreation Bureau			
4/18/2024 10:06:19	Kevin Knesek	USFS Payette			
4/18/2024 10:06:23	Michael Gibson	Trout Unlimited		0	0
4/18/2024 10:07:06	Bill Moore	Southwest Idaho RC&D			
4/18/2024 10:07:52	Gloria Pippin	Heartland Back Country Horsemen			
4/18/2024 10:08:59	Brian Harris	Payette National Forest	brian.d.harris@usda.gov	0	
4/18/2024 10:13:32	Sandra Mitchell	Idaho Recreation Council	smitchel@alscott.com	0	0

# GRANITE GOOSE PROJECT

WHY RESTORE A LANDSCAPE?	ROLE OF THE PFC	PROJECT GOALS	WHERE ARE WE GOING?
<p><b>Current forest conditions depart from those desired.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The current conditions depart from the historical range of landscape structure and function</li> <li>The conditions may be an outcome of past management: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Timber production goals &amp; harvest methods</li> <li>Fire suppression</li> <li>Road network design</li> </ul> </li> <li>The desired conditions are defined based on data and analysis, and referenced in the current forest plan and pending amendments, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation conditions &amp; Wildlife Conservation Strategy (Appendix A)</li> <li>Aquatic conservation strategy (Appendix B)</li> <li>Watershed Condition Framework</li> </ul> </li> <li>The conditions compromise the resiliency of the forest to recover from disturbance and adapt to climate change.</li> <li>Restoration actions will help restore ecosystem function by altering forest structures, composition and their distribution (pattern) on the landscape.</li> </ul>	<p><b>We provide recommendations to the line officer on all phases of restoration.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Project Design</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend treatment strategies, priorities &amp; sideboards/guidelines.</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Review</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participate in scoping meetings</li> <li>Review scoping comments</li> <li>Comment on draft environmental impact statement (DEIS)</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Implementation</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review contract type and specifications</li> <li>Recommend priorities for retained receipts of Stewardship Contracts</li> </ul> </li> <li><b>Multi-party Monitoring</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Participate in the design &amp; implementation of project monitoring.</li> <li>Conduct site review of completed contract services, and document the review.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Our recommendations will reflect the members' diverse interests.</b></p> <p><b>Wildlife</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve habitat for terrestrial and aquatic species, as appropriate by need.</li> </ul> <p><b>Wildfire</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve forest resiliency to wildfire by restoring Potential Vegetation Groups (PVG) toward their respective historical range of structure</li> <li>Return fire to the landscape as an ecosystem process.</li> <li>Improve the ability to manage wildfire and protect surrounding communities.</li> </ul> <p><b>Watershed Health</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve water quality and watershed health</li> </ul> <p><b>Forest Access &amp; Recreation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhance the road and trail network to support access for resource management, outdoor recreation, and public safety.</li> </ul> <p><b>Restoration Economics</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Recommend actions which are financially responsible and contribute to the economic vitality of adjacent communities.</li> </ul>	<p><b>We will provide timely recommendations by a consensus process.</b></p> <p><b>Payette Coalition Mission</b> Build diverse community support for forest restoration projects.</p> <p><b>Project Design</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The PFC will submit project recommendations to the line officer by.</li> </ul> <p><b>NEPA Review</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scoping begins</li> <li>Review comments:</li> <li>DEIS</li> <li>Record of Decision</li> </ul> <p><b>Implementation</b></p> <p><b>Multi-party Monitoring</b></p>

# GRANITE GOOSE PROJECT

## KEY MEASURES (Indicators) FOR PFC GOALS

### Wildlife Habitat & Wildfire

- Acres moved towards desired condition
- PVG acres by tree size class & acres by canopy closure class of the large tree size class, with emphasis on PVGs 2, 5, & 6.
- Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) acres treated
- Acres by fire condition class (before and after treatment)
- Change in elk security habitat
- Habitat restoration requirements of endangered species recovery plans, including salmon, steelhead, and Northern Idaho ground squirrel (NIDGS) habitat quantity/distribution
- Incorporate noxious weed data and weed free areas from the Early Detection Rapid Response Program
- Native plants: distribution of native plant communities

### Watershed Health

- Watershed Condition Class
  - Apply/review watershed condition indicators (12 indicator model) for each 6<sup>th</sup> order watershed
  - Identify condition class for each watershed prior to project
  - Estimate condition class for each watershed post-treatment

### Forest Access

- Net change in open system roads
- Miles of non-system, closed roads decommissioned
- Change in miles of maintained trails – motorized, non-motorized
- Forest access metrics will be supported by Transportation Analysis Planning (TAP), and not substitute for TAP.

### Economics/Finance

- **Scale** of restoration (how much should be treated), i.e.:
  - Cost/benefit of road restoration (miles)
  - Cost/benefit of stand harvest (acres)
  - Cost, by watershed, to change watershed condition class
  - Revenue as % of project cost
- **Allocation** of restoration dollars – i.e., priority of treatment types
- **Income Contribution**
  - Job years resulting from project expenditures
  - Income contribution (dollars)
- Note: PFC supports economic activities on the forest that contribute to the vitality of local communities, including activities such as commercial wood products, ecological restoration, livestock grazing, recreation, mining, etc. Project analysis metrics should include both positive (gains in income) and negative (decreases in income, if any) resulting from proposed restoration actions.