NC REGIONAL LANDSCAPE
SUMMARY
Rutger's Grand Rapids
October 29, 2002

MEMBERS PRESENT: Janet Boe, Harold Cotant, Tim Engrav, Clyde Hanson, Rick Horton, Steve Mortensen, Matt Norton, Kern Ridlington, Hal Rime, Ron Rude, John Steward, Tracy Beck (rep USFS) Bill Steele and Jack Shaffer.

STAFF: Dave Miller, Chad Skally and Julie Heinz

Review Process

Dave reviewed the Committees progress to date and that their recommendations would be presented to the Council at their January, 2003 meeting. The Committee asked several points of clarification and identified additional information needed for the next meeting:

- Volume figures: the economic analysis indicates the relative impact between scenarios (scenario 1 has more impacts then scenario 2 etc) but the impact of each scenario (scenario 2 employment loss of 180) is not exact. The reason for this is that the economic analysis is based on volume estimates derived either from acreage goals developed by small groups (scenario 1&2) or 1990 FIA growth minus a percentage of mortality. The volume estimates for scenario 1 & 2 were made by assuming the proportion of acres of type that changed from existing acres was directly related to the volume change for that type. For example, if the jack pine type acres increased 10 % in scenario 1 then the volume harvested for jack pine was increased 10% from what was harvested in 1999. Multiple entries were not considered.
- Need to look at other employment mitigation possibilities, for example potential jobs created to accomplish forest restoration work.
- Important to emphasize employment diversification in the landscape.

Feedback

Each member of the Committee was asked to give their feedback on the scenarios and preference if they had one. Committee comments:

- Scenario 2 seems to be a good mix (2 comments).
- Tourism has been served well under all scenarios; preference is for scenario 2.
- Concerned about development impacts on water, wildlife and wood; are ok with whatever scenario Committee agrees to do (2 comments)
- Scenario 1 & 2 are too focused on RNV (don't' agree with RNV concept); scenario 3 would be ok; scenario 4 & 5 are unrealistic; does not like exact acreage goals, would prefer to focus on strategies (management options) that would push toward desired future forest condition.

- Scenario 1 & 2 push toward desired future forest condition which is good; lean toward 1.
- Not in a position to state the Forest Service preference; first 3 scenarios do fit nicely with Forest Plan alternatives (scenario 1 relate to FS alternatives B&F; scenario 2 to FS alternatives E&G; scenario 3 to FS alternatives A&C)
- Scenario 1 hits the min RNV which seems doable based on IMPLAN analysis; acreage goals are important as a mitigation outlined in GEIS; RNV is not just a historic reference, but is a method that takes into account natural disturbance in the ecosystem.
- Scenario 1 is closer to natural environment.
- Scenario 1 gets us closer to long term goals (2 comments).
- Two people that had not looked at the material enough to make a preference.

Next Steps:

The overall preference was for scenario 1 or 2 but the committee requested the following information before a final recommendation would be agreed on:

- Re-run economic model using new employment data (job losses since 1999: 630 Potlatch, Brainerd; 83 other; 243 Potlatch (SAPPI), Cloquet; 61 other) to see if it makes a difference. Dave Miller will work with Jim Skurla to see if this is possible.
- Analyze scenario 2 to see how it gets to min RNV using growth stages and how long it would take. Dave Miller, Chad Skally with help from NRRI.
- Develop a scenario between 1 & 2 looking at substituting maple/mixed hardwood/birch volume for aspen (similar to what GEIS recommended). Dave Miller, Chad Skally, with help from NRRI and committee members.
- Explore possible employment mitigation's to help any job losses due to changes in wood supply. Janet Boe and Matt Norton working with Jim Skurla.

The forest fragmentation due to development issue is the 3rd bullet in the desired future forest condition statement. A report has been completed summarizing 4 or 5 county comprehensive plans and other plans. The Committee will get a copy of this report for the next meeting and it can be used to develop goals and strategies on this issue.

Enclosed is the latest copy of the goals and strategies for scenarios 1 & 2. This is the copy we will work from at the next meeting.

Next meeting will be held on Tuesday-January 14, 2003 at Rutger's.