

**National Forest Advisory Board (NFAB) Meeting**  
January 3, 2007 – 1:00 p.m.  
Forest Service Center, 8221 South Highway 16, Rapid City, SD

**Members Present:**

Tom Blair, Chair; Jim Heinert, Vice Chair; Douglas Hofer, Everett Hoyt, Ron Johnsen, Jim Margadant, Patrick McElgunn, Bob Paulson, Jim Scherrer, Nels Smith, Linda Tokarczyk, Bob Kloss, and Aaron Everett.

**Forest Service Representatives:**

Craig Bobzien, Frank Carroll, Craig Kjar, Bob Thompson, Mike Lloyd, Pat Hudson, Alice Allen, Kerry Burns, Randy Griebel, and Twila Morris, Recorder

**Others:**

Approximately 15 Congressional representatives, media, and other members of the public were in attendance.

**Members Absent:**

Theresa Two Bulls, and Paul Valandra

**Welcome and Roll Call:**

**Chair Blair:** Quorum present. Happy New Year and it's nice to be in the new Forest Service facility.

**Comments to the Chair:**

**Bobzien:** Welcome back Bob Thompson, Mystic District Ranger. Bob has been on detail to the Forest Service Regional Office in Denver. Bob will give a tour of the building at break for anyone who is interested. Today's agenda is full of important topics, some of which are going to take some time and thought. For information, there has been no legislative movement on the Secure Rural Schools issue.

**Approve Minutes:**

**Chair Blair:** Are there any changes to the October minutes? No changes, the October minutes stand as reported.

Are there any changes to the November minutes? No changes, the November minutes stand as reported. Frank Carroll will locate the Noxious Weed Guides that were dropped off at the November meeting, and distribute them.

**Approve Agenda:**

**Chair Blair:** Are there any changes to the agenda?

**Tokarczyk:** Would like to give an update on the invasive weed meeting. Topic will be added after the open space discussion.

**Chair Blair:** With the addition of the one requested addition, the agenda will stand as presented.

Motion made to approve agenda, motion seconded.

**Chair Blair:** If there are no other comments, the agenda will stand.

**Housekeeping:**

**Thompson:** Explained layout of the building. Bob will give tours during the first break.

**Meeting Protocols - Issues:**

No additional comments.

**Hot Topics:**

**Blair:** There is an article in the newspaper that deals with certification of logging processes. Tom asked Aaron to clarify the certification process.

**Everett:** Forest industry companies can choose to participate in one of three independent programs to certify their forest management and business practices. These three programs are: The Sustainable Forestry Initiative (SFI), the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC), and the ISO 14000. Companies seek formal certification in these programs through a third-party auditing process before earning the right to market their products as "sustainable." The article discusses a

challenge being brought by environmental groups against two SFI enrolled companies' certification status. The SFI is governed by a Sustainable Forestry Board, and it is before this body that the complaint is heard. The challenge seems likely part of a broader effort in the Pacific Northwest to further curtail timber harvest, as the Seattle Audubon Society and others sued the State of Washington and Weyerhaeuser in the fall of 2005 over their spotted owl protection measures.

**Blair:** Tom reported that Governor Rounds has moved forward with the recommendation made by the NFAB, regarding an Off Highway Vehicle Task Force. The first meeting is scheduled for Monday, January 8, 2007 in Pierre. Tom read the names of the members of the Task Force.

**Hofer:** The agenda for the meeting is to go over background information, and share the preliminary draft legislation with the new group.

**Bobzien:** The recommendations that the NFAB provided are really incredible. The thoughtfulness that went into the recommendations has really helped set the table to get the task force going. We had a very good turn out by County Commissioners at the Forest Service public meetings. We will continue to keep the Commissioners engaged. Our goal is to involve people early on and often.

**Blair:** We are on our two year anniversary of having the first meeting regarding OHV. The process still may take a couple of years.

## REGULAR AGENDA

### Spring Creek Fishery/Sheridan Lake ~ Frank Carroll & Koth:

**Carroll:** There is currently discussion relative to whether or not it is possible to increase the diversity of our water use (flat water recreation, and a great fishery) by letting water out of Sheridan Lake. Frank introduced Ron Koth from the Game Fish & Parks who shared information regarding the possibilities of this project. A public meeting was held at Johnson Siding where 84 people turned out.

**Koth:** Thank you Frank, and members of the board. There are large reservoirs here in the Black Hills, one of which is Sheridan Lake, which is essentially a recreation watershed. In most recent history the fishery has become rather dry. What the question is, is can we use some of the water out of the Lake to supplement the fishery.

#### ➤ Sheridan Lake/Spring Creek Tailwater Recreation and Fisheries

- Why are we here?
  - USFS and GFP are public service agencies.
  - Mission of both agencies includes recreation and fisheries.
  - Potential for improved future conditions.
  - We would not be doing our jobs if we failed to bring the idea forward.
- What are the future possibilities?
  - More regular tailwater fisher (3.5) miles) in Spring Creek below Sheridan Lake.
  - Better access/boating facilities on Sheridan Lake.
- What is the concept?
  - Use some water from Sheridan Lake to supplement Spring Creek.
  - Make this use of water transparent to Sheridan Lake users.
- What are the considerations and logistics?
  - New valve installed making releases possible.
  - Two foot drawdown would not occur every year.
  - Coldwater release shown to be successful in moderating temperatures.
  - New Hill City wastewater plant to discharge 1.5 cfs/day equaling 2.8 feet of water.
  - Is storage of an additional one foot of water possible?
  - No impact to lake fisheries.
- Considerations – Must do items:

- Operating plan to guide releases and identify criteria for shut down based on annual precipitation trends.
  - Lake Infrastructure improvements: boat launches, docks, marina, shoreline fishing access, beaches.
  - USFS decision making process (Estimate 18 months).
- Summary:
    - There is not a plan at this time, only a concept.
    - Solutions for infrastructure improvements need to be determined.
    - Modeling to help determine the best way to use available water has not yet been fully completed.
    - Nothing will change for some time.

**Paulson:** What was the original purpose of the valve?

**Koth:** For an emergency evacuation method for Sheridan Lake.

**Paulson:** Can the valve be set to do automatic releases?

**Koth:** Yes, that is a possibility.

**Blair:** Where does the water below the Lake eventually end up?

**Koth:** It flows past the Strata Bowl, and down past Reptile Gardens. The water disappears into sinkholes before it gets to Reptile Gardens.

**Hoyt:** Everett asked Ron to explain the downstream water rights agreement the users had with the Forest Service?

**Koth:** The agreement was that there would be up to a one foot temporary storage on top of the lake, when that was reached, the water would be let out all at once to try to recharge the stream. Use of the water right was recently deemed abandoned because of non use of the water right.

**Smith:** Nels questioned who built the reservoir and who administers it.

**Koth:** The Forest Service has the water storage rights and jurisdiction over the whole reservoir. Ron stated that it was either built by the CCC's or WPA and the Forest Service is responsible for the maintenance.

**Smith:** Nels clarified that Spring Creek is the sole outlet for the water from the lake.

**Koth:** The water rights for down stream users are consumptive water rights, for water as available, users can use it when available.

**Hofer:** Nels also clarified that there would never be water released from the lake if there were water flowing over the sinkholes.

**Scherrer:** One of our constituents called and asked about Spring Creek flow, and they were concerned because their wells are drying out. Jim asked if this project was in any way large enough to help with this. Jim also asked if the people downstream were aware of this proposal.

**Thompson:** The types of flow being considered with this project would not make a difference for downstream wells. No one has come to the Forest Service to request the water use for some time.

**Carroll:** The District did follow up with all of the people in the downstream region and gave them copies of the original water right.

**Scherrer:** Jim questioned the logic for the proposal when we are currently in a six year drought. Does it make sense to release two feet of water and invest that in the fishery while setting up a system that would have to be stopped when the drought persists.

**Koth:** The GF&P will link the whole hydraulic record (10 years) in their study. The record shows that six out of the 10 years we could have done some good. There are times when there would not be enough water to release. We can have a beneficial impact on the fishery without impacting the lake. The probability analysis will help us to determine if the process will be viable. The mechanism for payment is not clearly determined, but the money the GF&P receives from fisheries may be used.

**Hoyt:** The real key to the whole plan was the replacement of the valve. Now that that expenditure has been made, we should see if there are ways to expand on the use.

**Carroll:** Watch for this topic to be back on the Board's agenda often.

### **Norbeck Wildlife Preserve – Current and Desired Conditions ~ Lloyd, Hudson, Allen, Burns, and Griebel:**

**Bobzien:** Craig introduced Shelly Deisch, Wildlife Biologist with the State of South Dakota; Kerry Burns, Randy Griebel, Alice Allen, and Pat Hudson all with the Forest Service.

**Hudson:** The main purpose for today's presentation is to inform the Board about where the Forest Service currently is in regards to the Norbeck issue, how they got to this point and where they would like to go.

Highlights from the PowerPoint presentation follow:

- The Norbeck Wildlife Preserve is a special place due to its unique geology, ecology, human created features, and strong human connections.
  - The Norbeck Wildlife Preserve was established in 1920 as a result of the Norbeck Organic Act.
- The mandate of the 1920 Norbeck Organic Act was the protection of "game animals and birds and their breeding places therefore".
  - When the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve was created, most game species had been heavily hunted and trapped.
  - The Norbeck area had habitat available, but wildlife populations were at low levels.
- The accumulation of a century's worth of changing land-use designations and legislation has resulted in administrative complexity. Seven land use areas have evolved, each with different sets of laws and regulations.
- The Black Hills National Forest encompasses 1.2 million acres, 27,494 acres of which are within the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
  - The Norbeck Wildlife Preserve "is managed to provide habitat for game animals and birds. Some human activities are allowed, consistent with wildlife needs"
- The Black Elk Wilderness was designated by Congress on December 22, 1980 and constitutes the geographic core of the Norbeck. The Wilderness comprises 13,542 acres.
  - The area is to be managed to protect and perpetuate natural processes while providing opportunities for solitude and self-reliance.
- The Upper Pine Creek Research Natural Area (RNA) consists of 1,190 acres entirely within the Black Elk Wilderness. This RNA was designated by the Secretary of Agriculture on July 3, 1932.
  - This RNA is a member of a national network of ecological areas designated in perpetuity for non-manipulative research, education and biodiversity conservation.
- The Peter Norbeck National Scenic Byway was established in 2001.
  - This 70 mile corridor was created to emphasize the scenic quality of the heart of the Black Hills granitic core.
- There are 2,130 acres of private property located within the boundaries of the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
  - There is Forest Plan direction to attempt to acquire private property.
- Legal and Administrative Timeline:
  - 1920 – Custer State park Game Sanctuary established.
  - 1920 – Norbeck Organic Act.
  - 1932 – Upper Pine Creek Research Natural Area designated.
  - 1933 – Mt. Rushmore National Memorial was moved to the Department of the Interior.
  - 1949 – Custer State Park Game Sanctuary renamed to Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
  - 1980 – Black Elk Wilderness established.
  - 1989 – Final EIS and Record of Decision for the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
  - 1994 – EAs for the Needles and Grizzly projects were issued.

- 2002 – “The Daschle Legislation”
  - 2004 – MOU signed between SD GF&P and the BHNF concerning Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
  - 2005 – Phase II Amendment provides current management direction for the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
  - 2006 – Norbeck Landscape Assessment.
- In June 2006, an assessment of the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve was conducted. This condensed study provided the Black Hills National Forest with the “Norbeck Wildlife Preserve Landscape Assessment”.
  - Wildlife:
    - A wide range of species are present in the Norbeck, including species associated with old forest, but populations of game animals and birds are lower than their potential.
  - Habitat Types of Norbeck
    - 92% Ponderosa Pine
    - 3% Aspen
    - 1% White Spruce
  - Fire Hazard Rating
    - The majority of the area is in a high fire rating.
  - Desired Future Condition:
    - Actively manage the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve to create habitat for game animals and birds.
    - Open Canopy, dense under story thinned out, grass and shrubs coming in.
    - Some of the biggest trees in the Forest are found in the Norbeck area.
    - Promote Aspen stands. Enlarge the Aspen areas, and build on the other hardwood species as well.
    - Maintain Spruce component. Spruce is important for many bird species and cover for whitetail deer.
    - Maintain meadows, and open up meadows that were historically there.
    - Expand Riparian area hardwoods.
  - The assessment team did a “social assessment”, in which they interviewed everyone they could contact, the findings were as follows:
    - Most people interviewed felt that active management is needed.
    - Management actions should benefit wildlife species.
    - Little conflict exists between user groups.
    - Norbeck Wildlife Preserve is a special place
  - Recommendations:
    - Under the provisions of the MOU, determine the list of species to manage for within the Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.
    - Use the final list of game animals and birds to design projects to provide habitat for those species.
    - Use timber management as a tool in the periphery (outside the Wilderness).
    - Use fire as a management tool throughout the Norbeck.
    - Engage stakeholders to reach consensus and/or gain acceptance on methods to maintain the habitats necessary.
    - Evaluate/compare the contribution of management projects to habitat conditions across the entire Norbeck Wildlife Preserve.

**Tokarczyk:** What process was used to determine that the wildlife populations are down?

**Griebel:** Professional observations, and much research.

**Kloss:** Are there animals that are non game animals?

**Griebel:** Yes there are, such as the Pine Martin.

**Deisch:** We have to take into consideration the 1920 era, which was a time when they actually shot robins, but robins are not a game animal today. In the settlement of the two sales, it was determined that the Forest Service can not manage Norbeck for overall species diversity, but the intent has to be for game animals and birds.

**Blair:** The original intent of the law, talked about game animals and birds, then it talked about the habitat - is the habitat section in the original law?

**Deisch:** No. The time frame of the law and the historic overview has to be considered to determine what they meant when the law was written.

**Hofer:** Does federal legislation allow timber management within the Black Elk Wilderness portion of the Norbeck?

**Bobzien:** Fire is a tool for us to be considering in the Black Elk, but timber harvesting is off limits in the wilderness.

**Paulsen:** The cabins at Camp Remington impact the interface on the wilderness, and they are not mentioned at all in your presentation.

**Hudson:** The Forest Service is aware of the fact that there are many overlapping uses, and we did not try to cover everything. We mainly want to show where we are in the process.

**Hofer:** One of the concerns that the State of South Dakota has is for the Sylvan Lake and Needles Highway area in Custer State Park. Since in the Black Elk Wilderness area, timber management is not allowed, and it is one of the hot spots for beetles, it poses a threat to the Park for fire and beetles. The South Dakota Department of Agriculture and the Department of Game Fish & Parks are introducing a piece of legislation for a bill that would fund a project in Custer State Park to create a buffer strip on the North end of the Park. The buffer strip would be a treated piece of forest, to aide in slowing the spread of beetles, and to improve the health of the forest. Most of the timber in Custer State Park has not been managed because of the difficult terrain, non marketable timber, etc. The bill will ask for an appropriation of \$150,000.00 to assist with the project.

**Scherrer:** Is \$150,000.00 all they are asking for?

**Hofer:** That dollar amount seems minimal, but in conjunction with the current dollars being spent along with revenue generated from some of the marketable timber, it will help.

**Hoyt:** What is a timeline for the Norbeck project?

**Hudson:** May of 2008 is the target date. The NEPA process has not been initiated yet. The species list will be finalized first, and then we will look at potential habitat. Following those steps are the EIS, Notice of Intent, scoping, etc.

**Scherrer:** Jim commented that it is unfortunate that the Forest Service is forced, because of process, to let so much time lapse before progress can begin in the area. Right now, there is nothing to prevent a catastrophic fire event in the area being considered.

**Deisch:** For information - the MOU with Department of Game Fish and Parks and Forest Service left it open for the entire Department, not just one section or the other.

### **Open Space - Forest Service National Strategy ~ Paulson & Kjar:**

**Paulson:** The comment time frame was extended to December 31, 2006, which is past, but Bob believes that it is not too late to send a letter to the Chief. Bob attended a listening session in Golden Colorado in December. The document "Cooperating Across Boundaries" was distributed and discussed. Agenda topics at the listening session included Land Exchanges, Private Lands, and Urban or Virtual Forests. The main question before the Board today is, do we want to provide input to the Chief?

**Kjar:** The Forest Service would like recommendations from the Board. There is a lot of development occurring and it will really take a lot of partnership cooperation to make significant differences occur. Twenty percent of the land inside the National Forest is private land.

**Paulson:** The comments Bob received previously were in regards to process, not content.

**Kloss:** What is it that the Forest Service would like us to recommend at this time, and what kind of input and support do they need?

**Bobzien:** This is one of the more unique things that the Chief has brought forward in the Four Threats, because so much of the solution is across the boundaries working with partners. So much of the process rests on what our relationship is with our Counties.

Some of the questions the Board can answer are:

- Is this an important issue nationally and to the Black Hills?
- Is the means in the initial strategy sound or would we want to offer some other strategy?
- What other work can we do within the Forest Service to go outside the norm? The Counties are a very important part, and it is hugely important to the Tribes.
- What are some short term actions that the BBNF might do to further enhance the issue?

**Kloss:** Motion made to do a letter stating that it is an important national issue and there are specific concerns for the Black Hills National Forest as well.

**Bobzien:** Should we put the Boards comments in a letter? Comments should be done by the end of January.

**Smith:** You would be hard pressed to find another Forest that has the land in holdings such as the Black Hills has. We need to take some non traditional approaches for disposition of some of the forest lands. Nels proposal is to set up non simultaneous land exchanges, to help move the process forward.

**McElgunn:** There are a lot of areas where we can do some things, and maybe an incentive plan would be appropriate, when private lands are being developed.

**Blair:** The County is probably the tool that needs to be used. If private landowners are not willing to do certain things, such as the fire wise program, the result should be at the owner's expense.

**McElgunn:** If a property is in a vulnerable area, and the landowner is willing to do what they have to, a property tax break may be the right incentive.

**Bobzien:** Does the board want to prepare a response to the committee?

**Blair:** Tom stated that the Black Hills has been described as the most fragmented forest in the most rural state, and if that is the truth, then we really need to take a position on this.

**Tokarczyk:** In the Federal Register entry, they are asking for specific information, not just a general buy in of the issue.

**Blair:** There are certain meetings and comment periods that are asked for because the law says to ask for them.

**Johnsen:** Ron does not believe that the Board is ready to take a position on any of the three questions presented in the Federal Register.

**Smith:** Nels asked what the three questions were.

**Tokarczyk:** Linda read from the Federal Register, the three questions:

- How can the Forest Service protect land from conversion to other uses?
- How can the Forest Service assist private landowners and communities in maintaining and managing their land as sustainable forests and grasslands?
- How can the Forest Service mitigate the impacts of existing and new developments?

**Hofer:** The opportunity isn't so much what we can do to influence the Forest Service at a national level, but what we can do to support the Black Hills NF at a local level. This initiative is interesting because the Forest Service is asking how they can be more affective by cooperating with partners and across boundaries. From a Board stand point, we should be looking at supporting what the Black Hills is doing. It would be a mistake for the Forest Service to look only at the Federal land and not the private in holdings.

**Smith:** There is and needs to be a multi lateral relationship with the Forest Service.

**Everett:** If we are to write a letter before the end of the month, all it would say is that we agree that open space is an important issue. We may be much better served to look at the issues that are important to the Black Hills itself. The details will be a source of great conflict, so Aaron's suggestion is to retreat into the sub committee, and structure ourselves around step one, which is to understand what is happening on the Black Hills, and step two is proposing something better, and set a goal for ourselves.

**Blair:** Where do we go from here before the end of January?

**Everett:** What is there that we can actually “advise” the Chief on?

**Margadant:** Is it necessary to engage in the process or just send in a letter to “reserve a place” for the Black Hills.

**Bobzien:** It is not necessary to send a letter as a place holder.

**Blair:** I agree that it is not necessary to send something in to reserve a “spot” for the Black Hills.

**Smith:** The Federal Register is pretty specific in the disclaimer of what the Forest Service does not want to get in to. There is no doubt that the three questions are ones we could get a lot of controversy over.

**Scherrer:** At the meeting in November, we talked about the importance of weighing in on this, but in order to provide useful information, we would need much more time. We are all very interested in what is going on in the Black Hills, and we are worried about the issue of fragmentation. Who are the members of the subcommittee? (Pat McElgunn, Craig Kjar, Aaron Everett, Doug Hofer, and Bob Paulson). This is a big issue, why wouldn't we want to take this opportunity to have the subcommittee work on it and make an intelligent statement to the Chief?

**Bobzien:** Craig appreciates the interest of the Board to focus on the Black Hills; we do however, have a voice by the stature of the Board, to offer advice. There might be some recommendations that would work nationally as well as on the Black Hills.

**Heinert:** The threat to open space does not seem to be an issue in Northern Meade County, but in Southern Meade County, there are threats occurring. I see the need for better planning in order to provide education services, fire services, etc.

**McElgunn:** Are the questions being asked in the Federal Register legitimate? Is there any harm in us acknowledging to the Chief that we are engaged in, and want to be a part of the process?

**Blair:** Agree that it would not hurt to let them know we are paying attention.

**Kloss:** Is it the charge of the subcommittee to recommend to the Board what it is that we might do. Would the subcommittee for open space be telling the board what the legitimate questions are etc?

**Blair:** The Board will not meet again till the middle of February. Tom sees no problem with allowing the subcommittee to write a letter to the Chief acknowledging the questions.

**Scherrer:** If we send a letter, we will have to have follow up. We would then need to advance the ideas into the Black Hills. But to send a letter with no follow up would serve no purpose.

**McElgunn:** The letter should state that the questions are legitimate, and that we agree with the importance of the issue.

**Hofer:** The questions almost infer that they are looking for a national answer to local questions. We should be engaged as a Board with the Forest Service trying to solve the problems on the Black Hills. We should start thinking about ways to start getting engaged with what we can do on the Black Hills, and not worry about what they are doing nationally. This forest is fragmented to a greater degree than most; therefore the need to work across boundaries is as great as anywhere.

**Lloyd:** We already have the tools available to us to go a long way towards stopping fragmentation; we just need to be fully funded in the land exchange program so that we can move forward more quickly with the exchanges.

**Blair:** Believe we need to move on, deal with the issues relative to the Black Hills and continue to keep the subcommittee active.

**Hofer:** Could the subcommittee develop a set of questions in order to keep the issue alive, and get a better handle on what is really happening on the Black Hills.

**Blair:** Tom asked that Mike Lloyd spend some time with the subcommittee to help facilitate the land exchange questions. As a reminder, this Board will exist as is for about 120 days or so, and then we will be having new people come on board. Tom would like to have some of the current issues tied up before the new board comes in. Also, Tom would like to have subcommittee updates at each NFAB meeting.

**Hoyt:** Are we making this too complex? Everett made a motion to simply weigh in on the state of the Black Hills by sending a letter to the Chief.

**Blair:** The issue is back to the subcommittee to be reviewed next month.

**Scherrer:** Are we going to weigh in or not?

**Hoyt:** Motion to go ahead and weigh in with a general letter to the Chief explaining the Boards view point that the time frame for comments was too short to address the three questions asked in the Federal Register with substantive, complete answers. The NFAB has a task force working on this issue to develop collaborative processes with local governments that will facilitate solution of the open space issue.

**Tokarczyk:** Second the motion. Linda would like the following added to the letter: this is an important issue to the Black Hills, and we are going to pursue comments at a local level.

**Smith:** Nels would like to add to the letter: Responsible development rather than controlled.

**Scherrer:** Allow the subcommittee work up the language.

**Bobzien:** Recommend that the response is done in January.

**Blair:** Motion approved.

#### **Invasive Weed Management ~ Linda Tokarczyk:**

**Tokarczyk:** Copies of the Black Hills Invasive Weed management Coalition Formation Meeting minutes were distributed and discussed. There is another meeting scheduled for 2007.

**Johnsen:** Ron attended the meeting and stated that it was well attended, and there is enthusiasm amongst the group about moving forward.

#### **Public Comments:**

**Chair Blair:** If anyone from the public wishes to address the Board, please do so.

**Elaine Everett:** Elaine asked if the Governor appointed the people to the Governors OHV Task Force, and wondered if there was representation from any of the Environmental Groups.

**Blair:** Tom stated that he did not know if there is an environmentalist on the task force, and said that he would be a representative for the environmentalist groups.

#### **Adjournment:**

**Chair Blair:** Governor's conference on tourism scheduled for January 17 & 18, 2007.

**Chair Blair:** If there is no other business to come before the Board, I will ask for a motion to adjourn.

Motion made and seconded. Meeting adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

#### **Next Meeting:**

**The next NFAB meeting is scheduled for Wednesday, February 21, 2007, at the Forest Service Center in Rapid City, beginning at 1:00 p.m.**