USFS Bankhead National Forest Health and Restoration Initiative

LIAISON PANEL AND MONITORING WORK GROUPS

March 20, 2004

Meeting Summary

Farmers and Traders Bank Building - Double Springs, Alabama

Liaison Panel Members:
Randy Feltman, Logger and Local Resident
Mike Henshaw, Alabama Cooperative Extension Service
Vince Meleski, Wild Alabama/Wild South
Stuart Horn, Wild South
Rory Frzaer, AMMUniveristy
Ted Kuzma, Wild South
Sue Sparks, AMMUniveristy
Yong Wang, AMMUniveristy

USFS Bankhead National Forest Personnel:
Glen Gaines, Bankhead District Ranger
John Creed, Bankhead Ranger

Facilitators:
Mary Lou Addor, Natural Resources Leadership Institute
Steve Smutko, Natural Resources Leadership Institute

Meeting Agenda
March 20, 2004 8:00am - 3:00pm.

Field Trip:
8:00am: Bankhead National Forest Field Trip
8:15am: Forest Health/Commercial Thinning: Compartment 148
9:00am: Longleaf Pine Woodland Community Restoration - Compartment 160
10:00am: Shortleaf Pine Woodland Community Restoration - Compartment 127
10:15am: Mile Creek Prescribed Burn Area

Lunch/Meeting:
11:00am: Lunch
12:00pm: Welcome/Introductions
12:05pm: Update: Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
12:30pm: Update: Timber and Thinning Monitoring Work Group
1:30pm: Update: National Science Foundation Proposal
2:00pm: Monitoring Work Group Agenda
2:30pm Liaison Panel Agenda
3:00pm Adjourn

March 20th Handouts Provided

• January 8, 2004 Meeting Summary.
• Updated Monitoring Work Groups Contact and Description Information.
• Example of a Monitoring Effort in Montana: Collaboration for Community and Forest Well-Being in the Upper Swan Valley, Montana
• NRLI/RESOLVE Assessment and Final Report
• Liaison Panel Notebook (includes all meeting materials since January 2003)
• Timber/Thinning Monitoring Work Group Report
KEY POINTS/ACTION ITEMS/NEXT MEETING DATES AND GOALS:

1. Timber and Thinning Monitoring Work Group is underway. Working Group met for the first time on March 9 to review several sites being prepared for treatment and two additional sites being prepared for restoration.
   - Timber and Thinning Monitoring Work Group will meet at the District Forest Office on March 30 when bids are due for the initial commercial sales.
   - Pictures of monitoring activities and written summaries will be loaded on the NRLI website and updated accordingly.

2. Schedule Discussion Topics for the Liaison Panel on a 6-weeks basis. This schedule will do two things: maintain continuity and provide a reasonable time frame to work through the numerous topics proposed by various individuals and community groups.

3. The five Monitoring Work Groups will meet as needed.

4. Action Items:
   a. Develop a list of potential questions to present to the Forest Service regarding impacts of prescribed burns on soils. Stewart Horn will work other researchers to provide a list of potential questions to address.
   b. Timber and Thinning Work Group wants to schedule a conference call with the co-leadership of the other monitoring work groups: Ron Eakes and Ben Vail (Wildlife); Faron Weeks and Gene Gold (Cultural); Keith Tassin (Desired Future Conditions); Gary White and Mary Lee Ratcliff (Recreation). Proposed date is April 20th at 4:00pm CST.
   c. Rory Frazer will work with loggers and the USFS to determine how market value is determined for each group.
   d. Mary Lou will contact Liaison Panel members who have not attended the last two meetings to determine their preferences on how and if they want to remain involved with the Liaison Panel.

5. Next Meeting is Tuesday, May 4, 2004, at the Farmers and Traders Bank Building in Double Springs, Alabama: 5:30-9:00pm. Agenda is:
   1. Updates on Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
   2. Updates: Monitoring Group Reports
   3. Sequencing of Future Topics
   4. How to deal with stands missed in the current EIS:
      a. Discussion role for DFC Monitoring Group?
   5. Bankhead wide trail needs

Format Key:
Questions (Q), Responses (R) Comment (C), Liaison Panel (LP), Monitoring Group (MG), Forest Service (FS)

I. WELCOME/MEETING ORIENTATION

A. Welcome
   1. Mary Lou Addor and Steve Smutko (Natural Resources Leadership Institute), introduced themselves, welcomed the Liaison Panel and Monitoring Group members and other guests present. Those in attendance also introduced themselves.
2. Mary Lou went over the meeting objectives and agenda. She also provided a brief explanation of the handouts and Liaison Panel Notebook distributed at the meeting.

B. March 20th Meeting Objectives

1. Field Trip Objectives:
   - Review and discuss site preparation for the initial forest health and restoration thinning work.
   - View current sites for thinning, timber sales and prescribed burn areas.
   - Develop a better understanding of monitoring work group expectations and examples of how to achieve these.
   - Encourage attendance by anyone who has an interest in the Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative to join this monitoring effort.

2. Meeting Objectives:
   - Encourage attendance by anyone who has an interest in the Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative to join the field trip and meeting.
   - Updates on the Bankhead National Forest Health and Restoration Initiative.
   - Clarify Expectations of the Forest Health/Restoration Monitoring Groups.
   - Update: AAMUniversity National Science Foundation Proposal
   - Develop a broad action plan for the Liaison Panel to discuss other topics proposed about the Bankhead National Forest.

C. Review of January 8, 2004 Meeting Summary

1. Meeting Summary approved without changes and posted on the NRLI website at: www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html

II. UPDATE: STATUS OF BANKHEAD FOREST HEALTH AND RESTORATION PROJECT/Glen Gaines

A. Implementation Phase

1. The initial timber thinnings are out for bids. Bids are due by 9:30am on March 30, 2004 in the Bankhead National Forest District Office (bid is for one sale of 107 acres - was initially 150 acres but sale takes into consideration streamside management zones, bluff zones, and areas damaged by SPB that are not operable).

2. On southern pine beetle restoration, the FS is going to treat 300 acres done this year and prepare to plant next year. Site preparation is drum chopping and prescribed burn. In addition, the FS is also conducting field checks.

3. Questions posed to Glen Gaines and John Creed

   Q: Are there any other restoration projects going on in a similar scale as the Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative?
R: Currently, the 5-year plan for the desired future condition in the Bankhead National Forest is the only initiative in the Southeast of this scale. The coastal plain forests and Talladega Forests are working on restoration initiatives related to Red-Cocked Woodpecker (a driver for restoration initiatives in the South). Under the new Forest Health legislation, several other national forests in the Southeast will gear up for the restoration initiative.

The Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative is innovative. The technical and scientific communities as well as the public-in particular the Liaison Panel - engaged in a long-range examination of the various issues and opportunities of the restoration initiative. The efforts of these communities helped determined some long-range strategies. All involved are still learning and will continue to learn and adapt and modify strategies, as we know more - through the decisions we made and in working with one another. The Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative is much easier to examine when efforts of the Liaison Panel and the broader community, the citizen monitoring work groups, technical expertise, and research work together.

Q: Does the Bankhead Forest Service staff connect with other Forest Service personnel who are involved in forest health and restoration initiatives - in order to learn from their efforts and to learn about the effort underway in the Bankhead?

R: Yes. The Bankhead Forest Service is working with the Conecuh Forest Service personnel.

Q: A big concern of mine is the effect of prescribed burns on soils. If A&M University does not receive the National Science proposal, will the FS be able to fund research on this area?

R: Some of research work at the USFS Southern Research Station with Callie Schweitzer will involved research on soils. If someone wants something in particular addressed as it pertains to impacts of burns on soils - specify those concerns clearly. It is part of the citizen participation and monitoring efforts. The FS and Callie can look at the monitoring program and see if the issue is already identified in research or to be identified. However - clearly articulating what the need is, important in this determination.

Furthermore - the soils research might be something that could be funded through other grants even if AMUMiveristy does not receive the National Science Foundation Grant.

B. Bankhead National Forest – Timber Inventory Update

1. Continuous Inventory of Stand Conditions (CISC) database: a database to supply the FS with info on species; age; classes of species in a given area; and other environmental parameters. The CISC is updated every 10 years. In the 90s, the FS fell behind in updating the CISC database inventory so some of the data is 15-20 years old. The database is currently being updated.

Q: How is the Forest Inventory Assessment (FIA) different from the CISC inventory?

R: The FIA survey (conducted every 10 years is a large scale assessment based on trends at the regional level. The CISC is an inventory (or assessment on forest trends at the forest level).

C: Many things went into the restoration schedule since the FS wanted to distribute the work around the district rather than concentrate the work in a single watershed. The first sale is ready to go. During the Liaison Panel discussions, it was discussed that specific acreages designated to be cut, would be somewhat different when we finally mapped it out. For instance - with the first sale, the goal was to thin 150 acres yet what will actually be available
is 107 acres because of set aside timber in the stream management zones and in beetle
damage. To get the projected acres on an annual basis, FS may have to cut some timber in
2004 intended for thinning in 2005. Eventually, this could put the project short for the final
year. As the project moves forward – other tracts that fit the criteria and not in the
original plan - may be used. The FS will need input on these areas.

III. UPDATE: TIMBER AND THINNING MONITORING WORK GROUP - Randy Feltman,
Mike Henshaw, and Vince Meleski.

A. Timber and Monitoring Work Group Report: Team Leadership - Randy Feltman, Mike Henshaw,
 & Vince Meleski

Vince Meleski handed out a summary of the March 9\textsuperscript{th} monitoring effort (see attached, pg.10 for full
report). Vince initiated the discussion about the March 9, 2004 timber and thinning monitoring
work group effort, followed with comments and perspectives from Mike Henshaw and Randy
Feltman. The field trip started out at the FS office in Double Springs. The FS provided an
explanation on the timber marking process. Highlights from the visit were:

- Group visited a long-leaf pine stand and surprised to see how much long leaf pine in the
Bankhead National Forest.
- Determined the FS has done a great job of marking the timber and getting things on the ground
to achieve the goals established. Really did a good job protecting streambeds and other
important environmental areas (FS prefers to err on side of precaution with streamside
management zones or SMZs).
- Thus far, the FS is doing a good job of managing for those species in each of the stands visited.
- Advertising the activity so others felt invited to attend (9 people attended plus 3 FS personnel).
- Assurance from FS in their willingness to meet with individuals if some folks determined this
approach suited their interests.

B. Group Discussion including Questions and Responses on the March 9 and March 20 Field Trip

Q: Is there any advantage of protecting some of the smaller trees at the precommercial site if you
expect the mid-story trees to take over.
R: As the forest health and restoration, project moves forward, monitoring will occur of what
survives and thrives at these thinning sites. If the FS needs to amend contracts to enforce
protection that can be done on future contracts.

Q: Do you have control of where skid tracks are going to go?
R: Yes, the FS works with the contractors to ensure that equipment stays in appropriate places.

C: To do a good job at these thinning sites, a logger needs to be able to make some money. Perhaps a
lower minimum bid can be acceptable to encourage loggers to take their time and do a good job.
It makes sense to try and determine what meets the loggers interests so that all of the goals can
be established more readily and as close to specification as possible.
R: If FS does not receive bids on March 30, then the FS can make some adjustments, reappraise it
and re-bid it.

Q: Is there a problem? Is the minimum bid price too high?
R: Find out on March 30th. In the end, the highest lump-sum bidder will acquire the sale. There are two points where bid price and market price may differ: estimated market value and in the volume, the FS measures for the sale. The FS does not have a real good handle on market price because there has not been any timber for sale in a number of years. The FS has a good process for estimating volume, and recommends each potential purchaser makes his/her own estimate of volume before they bid.

C: It would be interesting to conduct research and determine if there are differences between FS volume estimates and private estimates, and what causes them to be different.

C: This initial sale is a single sale for the four sites. This is being done this way from an efficiency standpoint. It costs the FS the same to estimate a timber sale on 1000 acres as it does on 20 acres. The minimum bid here is about $28,000. Sale sizes are being done so that we can get small, local companies to bid on these sites and we will also have larger sales as well.

IV. UPDATE: NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION PROPOSAL -Rory Frazer

A. Center for Forest Ecosystem Assessment (CEFA):
   1. The AMMU University Research Proposal Team thanked the Liaison Panel for the National Science Foundation Proposal letter of support. In addition, the Regional Forest Supervisor submitted a letter of support with the NSF proposal. The Research Proposal Team will hear by mid-summer whether the proposal is awarded or not. Currently, the Research Proposal Team is working with the FS to gather baseline data now before the actual grant is awarded. There is a lot of interest from the faculty, and interest in seeking additional research grants.

   2. Research Goal of National Science Proposal: to investigate how well the forest health and restoration plan works to reach its goals through 5 subprojects. The project will focus primarily on Area 1 and impacts of the thinning and prescribed burning actions. The idea is to look at the impact of the disturbances (changes) resulting from the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative. The 5 subprojects are:
      a) Vegetative Community: How the vegetation responds to the changes (trees and mid-story vegetation);
      b) Macro-Invertebrate: Impacts on macro invertebrate (birds specifically) and invertebrate (insect) communities;
      c) Biogeochemical Nutrient Cycling: Changes to soil and water systems - biochemical and nutrient cycling;
      d) Molecular Biology: Changes in genetic makeup of biological systems; and
      e) Human Dimensions: How people are impacted by these changes and influence the forest. Specifically interested in how people are responding to and interacting with the new plan.

B. Other Research Proposals
   1. Other research teams at AMMU and other Universities are moving forward outside of the NSF proposal to submit research proposals that focus more on management issues instead of scientific
research. The Southern Research Experimental Station is researching the management treatments.

V. NEXT STEPS: MONITORING WORK GROUPS

A. Monitoring Groups Clarifications:

Although decisions have been made about to proceed with the Bankhead Forest Health and Restoration Initiative, the "work" is not completed. In fact - the larger work is about to start - the implementation phase. It is in the implementation phase that the technical, scientific, and citizen communities can monitor the decisions made to determine if the decisions are working, and if so, re-determine to stay the course and if not, what adjustments and modifications can be made.

Obviously, the strength of making good decisions is diversity of feedback and discussion - in contributing one's expertise as well as learning from one another. This needs to continue. Moreover, folks who are no longer interested in participating should be supported in this decision. The same person does not need to represent the same interest, especially if someone is not interested in doing so. Perhaps they know of someone else who would like to engage on the Liaison Panel or a monitoring group. Mary Lou will contact Liaison Panel members who have not attended a meeting since December about his or her preference for long-term engagement with the Liaison Panel.

The Monitoring Groups can act as catalyst for continued discussion and the larger Liaison Panel can help work through areas of disagreement. Some people may have thought the monitoring groups would conduct the fieldwork - however- that is the FS job. Although the Monitoring Groups may participate in some of the field activities - it would be by choice to do so. Mary Lou is currently providing support to the Monitoring Work Groups to help initiate their efforts.

The Timber and Thinning Work Group is getting a better feel for what is needed on the monitoring groups. Those who are engaged find the process reasonable. The co-leadership model for the monitoring groups is very helpful as well as guidance from the FS, the facilitators, and hopefully, the research and scientific community. It would also be helpful to engage the other monitoring teams - to see them up and running.

1. Goals of Monitoring Work Groups:
   a) Monitor progress and performance of the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative;
   b) Identify and confirm what the USFS said it would do;
   c) Develop an ongoing learning process with community members;
   d) Attend meetings/field trips;
   e) Document learnings and monitoring observations;
   f) Follow through on action items;
   g) Establish operating structure for accountability such as co-leadership;
   h) Members may come from Liaison Panel and beyond (anyone interested - come and go).

2. Co-Leadership Criteria:
   a) Can commit time to develop group agendas;
   b) Maintain meeting summaries or notes or checklists;
   c) Experience and knowledge with the Forest Health and Restoration Initiative;
   d) Interest and willingness to contribute and learn;
e) Interest and willingness to engage in contributing and learning;  
f) Group process skills;  
g) Willingness to compromise (collaborate);  
h) Organized – ability to have a vision, a plan;  
i) Resourceful;  
j) Divergent thinking;  
k) Committed to public outreach expansion and education, and not just one’s own constituency; and  
l) Ability to communicate.

B. Monitoring Groups Points of Concurrence:
   
1) Points of Concurrence on Multiparty Monitoring Work Groups Expectations and Format:  
   a) Participation: subcommittee members or anyone who chooses to – can become involved in monitoring to whatever level they are willing and able to do so. It is each person’s responsibility however- to check in about upcoming schedule of activities. Currently- folks can contact the FS or the co-leadership about upcoming activities for the Timber/Thinning Work Group, and read the announcements in the newspapers.  
   b) Progress: Keep monitoring work groups an open process –will not deter the efforts of those who participate more frequently. Those who were decide to be involved on a less frequent basis need to take the time to catch up with the efforts of those who are participating more often. It is expected that monitoring group results will be posted on the website, made available on the local library, and through local email.  
   c) Activities: Monitoring Work Groups will engage in more hands on activities to encourage learning and participant, and perhaps focus on topics for discussion.  
   d) Co-Leadership: co-leadership can initiate the agendas, plan the trips, and maintain the summaries. The FS has the database to provide meeting notices as well as the facilitators of the meetings. Work groups can be as informal while at the same time having a sense of long-term and some short-term goals.

VI. NEXT STEPS: LIAISON PANEL  
A. Liaison Panel Clarifications:  
   
Will continue to check in with other Liaison Panel members that have not attended a meeting for awhile to determine how they would like to move forward with LP efforts. The LP provides a forum for discussion and a point of connection and learning within the Bankhead community. The LP allows those who attend to share in solving a problem, to create opportunities for different ways to solve problems, or hear about concerns of one group and how other user groups might be able to assist in working through the issue. The LP also provides an opportunity to hear about FS updates or study updates and general concerns.  
   
1) Liaison Panel Points of Concurrence:  
   - Meeting Dates: Keep standing meeting dates: Tuesday or Thursday night (rotate sight where possible) about every 6 weeks.  
   - Provides interface: for larger community as well as for all five monitoring groups - especially on macro or broad-base issues in the Bankhead.  
   - Leadership Role: citizen information tool to share learning and experiences with the local community. Acts as a sounding board and as means for the community to interface with the management agency.  
   - Meeting Agenda Development: develop 5 year "squirt-gun" deadline- long-term plan - set tentative agenda for the next plans.
- Perhaps work with the USFS to hear from regional and national levels on what other districts are doing.
- Provide opportunities for educational forums.

**B. Topics for Future Discussion:** (not listed in order of importance - see criteria for determining how to schedule topics of discussion)

1. Trail needs on the Bankhead (Horseback Riding, ATV, Hiking)
2. Updates on scientific research projects and studies
3. Unmanaged Recreational Activities (illegal use)
4. Management of stands not included in the current EIS
5. Next steps toward Desired Future Conditions: Hardwood Component and other loblolly opine stands.
6. Looting of Cultural Resources
7. Wildlife Habitat Plantings
8. Road maintenance, access and decommissioning
9. Safeguarding property rights
10. Sustainable economic development
11. Anticipating Emerging Issues
12. User Conflicts
13. Invasive species
14. Oil and gas extraction; coal mining
15. Expanding Community Outreach

**C. Determination of Topic Schedule**

1. What criteria can the Liaison Panel use to determine the schedule of topics?
   a) timing: when does it make sense to discuss topic?
   b) Amount of public interest
   c) Environmental need

**VI: Next Meeting: May 4, 2004 Meeting Agenda**

1. Updates on Forest Health and Restoration Initiative
2. Updates: Monitoring Group Reports
3. Sequencing of Future Topics
4. How to deal with stands missed in the current EIS:
   a. Discussion Role of the DFC Monitoring Group for proposal to Liaison Panel?
   b. Another Process?
5. Bankhead wide trail needs

**VII: ITEMS OF INTEREST:**

1. Final Report submitted to the US Forest Service and the Bankhead Community by the Natural Resources Leadership Institute and RESOLVE is online at: [www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html](http://www.ces.ncsu.edu/nrli/bankhead.html)

2. The National Forest Service provides an online glossary of ecosystem management terms to assist in learning about agency and scientific words. A glossary can assist in facilitating communication between citizens, management, and scientists. The glossary is located at: [www.fs.fed.us/land/emterms.html](http://www.fs.fed.us/land/emterms.html)
March 9, 2004: Summary of Bankhead National Forest Timber and Thinning Monitor Team Field Trip

Present: Charlie Mackaravitz, Glen Gaines, John Creed, Mike Henshaw, Randy Feltman, Jamie Alexander, Bobby Ayers, Ron Eakes, Ted Kuzma, Stewart Horn, Lamar Marshall, and Vince Meleski

We began at 10:00am at the USFS office in Double Springs. The Forest Service explained the paperwork process including maps, prescriptions, timber marking process, and contracts for the first timber sale of the Bankhead Health and Restoration Project. This sale is currently out for bids and bids will be opened Tues March 30 at 9:00 at the USFS Double Springs office. Again, all panel members and the public are invited to attend the bid opening and similar field trips in the future. Plans are to view future timber sales and then follow-up during cutting, immediately after cutting and over time in the future to see the results of the thinning process.

We then went to two of the three locations of the first sale. The first sale is of 150 acres located in three different areas. The first site was a longleaf pine stand that will be thinned to increase the health of the stand and move towards the Desired Future Condition (DFC) of longleaf pine woodland. This stand is about 35 years old. As we walked in to the site we observed that trees were marked to be cut adjacent to the logging road. This will be required to make adequate clearance for equipment to get into the site. At the site we saw the tree marking plan of trees to be cut. The stand will be thinned to 60 sq. ft. basal area per acre with some pines and hardwoods being thinned. Trees to be cut were marked with blue paint. Mixed in with the longleaf pines were good sized hardwoods that will be left. The selection of boundaries was explained. This site had ephemeral, intermittent, and year round streams including a canyon along one side of the site. A minimum of 100 ft is maintained from bluffs, 35 ft from scoured streams and no traffic is allowed over some expected ephemeral streams at the head of streams. Originally the bluffs were considered riparian zones with a 35ft safety zone, but on realizing there were canyon bluffs, the boundary was moved back. This site is planned to have controlled burns to control undergrowth.

The second site was loblolly pine which has a DFC of hardwood forest. The original site was reduced because there was no access to part of the area. At this site only loblolly pines are marked for removal. All hardwoods will be left. There was heavy brush on the ground with many briars. After the pine removal the site will most likely become more overgrown as the canopy opens up and more sunlight comes in. Eventually as the hardwoods get to mid and upper levels, the canopy will shade out the undergrowth. No burning is planned for this site; therefore undergrowth removal will be totally natural.

Both areas were well marked with clearance around streams, canyons and ephemeral streams. We did not view the third location since it was similar to the second site with the same DFC. We will continue to monitor these sites as the restoration process continues through thinning and regeneration.
Each area had a priority list of trees to be marked and removed during thinning. For instance, in the longleaf area, loblolly pine, virginia pine and most hardwoods are given priority to be marked and harvested. Longleaf is left unless the longleaf trees are too closely spaced and there is no other species of tree to be removed. Shortleaf is intermediate in ranking. During our field trip, the ranking system seemed to be followed very well, considering the difficulty in identifying the species of trees quickly. It should be noted that hardwoods are also given some preference by species in the longleaf stands. For instance, blackjack oak was given preference over other hardwoods in the longleaf areas because it is a fire adapted species and one that is associated with a natural longleaf stand. This seemed to be an appropriate decision even though it was not mentioned in the stand prescription. Future stand prescriptions for marking and thinning stands could give more detail about such preferences.

A couple of other comments came up during discussion of the field trip:

- The tree markers may benefit from comments from contractors as to how best to select trees to be thinned. An example was made of a marked tree at the second site. The tree marked to be removed was behind another loblolly pine and some hardwoods and was not easily accessible. To get to the marked tree the contractor will have to work around the loblolly to remain, and will likely damage two hardwoods that are to remain. If the front loblolly were marked, that tree could have easily been removed without damaging the two hardwoods and one loblolly would still remain after the thinning. This site’s DFC is hardwood, so all hardwoods are to be left.
- It was suggested that if the minimum bid were lower, it would allow a contractor to do a better job. Contractors feel the USFS required management practices are more costly than similar projects on private land. In order to make a profit a contractor will try to work fast and may not do as good a job as if it were easier to make some profit.
- Another potential problem is the fact that the USFS method of evaluating and bidding a timber sale does not coincide with the actual market conditions as far as timber class specifications go. Bidders will have to make adjustments between what they expect they can obtain for the sale and the method the USFS used to calculate the minimum bid.

Members of all monitoring teams are invited and encouraged to go on future Timber and Thinning field trips so you can become familiar with the locations and begin making plans for their monitoring activities.

Prepared by Vince Meleski, Mike Henshaw, and Randy Feltman (March 22, 2004)