

USDA Forest Service

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Advisory Committee Meeting

Virtual Meeting

June 22-25, 2020

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

CONTENTS

Meeting Summary Day 1 (June 22, 2020)	1
Meeting Opening	1
Agenda, Meeting Norms & Process Overview.....	1
Opening Remarks	2
Proposal Sifting and Clarification Questions.....	2
Proposal Review.....	3
Public Comment	4
Closing Remarks.....	5
Meeting Summary Day 2 (June 23, 2020)	6
Opening Remarks	6
Review of Remaining Proposals (continued).....	6
Closing Remarks.....	7
Meeting Summary Day 3 (June 24, 2020)	8
Opening Remarks	8
Review of Remaining Proposals (continued).....	8
Closing Remarks.....	9
Meeting Summary Day 4 (June 25, 2020)	10
Opening Remarks	10
Consensus Building on Recommendations.....	10
Funding Recommendations.....	12
Closing Remarks.....	13
Attachments	14
Attachment A: CFLRP Meeting Agenda, June 22-25, 2020	15
Attachment B: Committee Members and Forest Service Staff.....	19

MEETING SUMMARY DAY 1 (JUNE 22, 2020)

MEETING OPENING

The Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) Advisory Committee is chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and is tasked with reviewing, evaluating, and providing recommendations on each nominated Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) project to the Secretary of Agriculture for final selections. It is solely advisory in nature. The advisory committee is required to meet annually and may meet as often as is necessary to review and evaluate CFLRP proposals and make recommendations.

On June 22, 2020, Jessica Robertson, the CFLR Advisory Committee Designated Federal Official (DFO), convened a meeting of the CFLR Advisory Committee at 11:00am ET via the Forest Service's Adobe Connect web conferencing platform. The meeting was held virtually due to agency travel restrictions during the COVID19 pandemic. Ms. Robertson introduced the USDA Forest Service staff and then asked the Committee members to self-introduce. All nine Committee members were present on day one of the meeting. (See Attachment B for a list of attendees.)

Ms. Robertson thanked the Committee for their participation and summarized the goals and objectives of the meeting. She reminded the Committee that their primary objective was to jointly evaluate and judge the merits of the 22 CFLRP proposal using the selection criteria as a guide. Ms. Robertson stated that, at the end of the four days, the Committee was expected to:

- Recommend which new projects and project extensions to recommend to the USDA Secretary for funding
 - Determine a recommendation for which project(s) to fund in FY2020 with the \$2.7M in CFLRP funding available after funding the 13 active CFLRP projects.
 - Provide a ranking of selected projects to recommend which to fund as FY21 funding becomes available (up to ten and no more than 2 new projects per region, per the legislation, plus any extensions)

Following Ms. Robertson's remarks, the Committee Chair, Karen Hardigg made remarks and welcomed the committee.

AGENDA, MEETING NORMS & PROCESS OVERVIEW

As part of the Opening Remarks, facilitator Kim Douglass (CI International, Inc.) gave an overview of the process for the four-day meeting, during which the Committee would discuss the strengths and weaknesses of up to twenty-two proposals and seek consensus on which of them to recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture for funding. Ms. Douglass reminded Committee Members that they had agreed to define "consensus" as a recommendation that all participating members can "live with." She reviewed additional meeting ground rules, and explained the process of using the Adobe Connect features to facilitate discussion and participation throughout the meeting.

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

Ms. Douglass also noted that FACA Committees must provide opportunity for public comment at their meetings and explained how that would work for this meeting. On the first day of the meeting, a time for public comment was included at the end of the day. Members of the public could each have three minutes to speak on a particular proposal. If more than one person wished to speak about the same proposal, then those individuals could divide six minutes among themselves.

NOTE ON RECUSALS:

Committee members must recuse themselves by not scoring the relevant proposal(s), not actively participating in the detailed discussion of that proposal(s), and will notify the Designated Federal Official in the following situations:

- The committee member, or any member of their immediate family or organization employing them, would directly or indirectly financially benefit from a CFLRP proposal being evaluated
- The committee member had an identified role in planning, implementation and/or monitoring of the project
- The committee member, due to some other involvement or relationship, feels they would be incapable of being objective in evaluating the proposal.

The following Committee Member(s) recused themselves from the discussion of specific proposals:

Karen Hardigg

Region 6 – Northern Blues Forest Restoration

OPENING REMARKS

At 11:15, the Committee was also joined by The Honorable Jim Hubbard, Undersecretary for Natural Resources & Environment, USDA. In his remarks to the Committee, he commented on the significant accomplishments of CFLRP and the lessons learned. He noted the need to focus on how to manage the land and that shared stewardship does not work without collaboration. He also highlighted that CFLRP was created in large part to aid in reduction of wildfire and to improve forest conditions to assist in the betterment of communities.

PROPOSAL SIFTING AND CLARIFICATION QUESTIONS

Before the meeting, each Committee member scored a subset of the proposals individually using the selection criteria outlined in the Committee charter. The individual scores were compiled to make available to the Committee members by the USDA Forest Service staff.

At the meeting, there were a number of decisions that needed to be addressed at the outset to finalize the list of proposals the Committee would review for final consideration during this meeting. Ms. Robertson opened this discussion by setting some context for the Committee regarding some geographic considerations that they might consider in their deliberations. The Committee then discussed and decided on the following outstanding questions:

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

- Does the Committee want to consider a CFLRP Proposal (Oak Ecosystem Restoration, Illinois), noting that it is not a majority or plurality of forested National Forest System (NFS) Lands?
 - The Committee unanimously voted YES
- Are there any proposals that should be sifted out in the very beginning? Do we want to take a look at anything that we could potentially take off the list for further deliberation after looking at initial scores?
 - The Committee unanimously voted YES to do an initial sifting exercise

Committee Members then engaged in an initial “sifting” discussion to determine whether any proposals should be eliminated from further consideration for Committee recommendation at the outset because they did not meet the CFLRP criteria or were consistently ranked as low across individual Committee members. Lindsay Buchanan, the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Coordinator, then shared a spreadsheet of the initial scores that had been submitted by Committee Members based on their initial review of proposals. The pre-meeting scores would be used as one form of input to this discussion, but not necessarily the deciding factor; no proposal would be eliminated unless the Committee chose to do so by consensus.

Committee Members spent a few minutes asking for clarification on the organization of the spreadsheet that was projected on screen. The spreadsheet listed each project, and sorted the projects into high, medium, and low rankings based on how each reviewer ranked the proposal across the proposals they reviewed. The Committee discussed the merits of whether geographical diversity should be considered in their decision-making up front and should they filter by Region initially to include a proposal from each region. They decided to consider all proposals based on merit not geography.

Ms. Douglass then asked the Committee Members if there were any proposals that should be removed from further consideration. The Committee decided to discuss the lowest ranked proposals based on individual reviewers’ scores to determine if they should be removed from further consideration at this time. It was also decided that these could be revisited at any point in the process over the next four days if the Committee felt there were other factors that changed their initial thinking. Ultimately, the Committee reached consensus to remove three proposals from further consideration:

- Utah Shared Stewardship Landscape Restoration
- Somerset Integrated Resource Project
- Southern Appalachian Woodland Oak and Pine

The group agreed to discuss and rank the remaining 19 proposals: 3 extensions and 16 new proposals.

PROPOSAL REVIEW

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

The Committee then began to review each of the remaining proposals. Ms. Douglass reviewed the process that the Committee would use for the remainder of the day's agenda and the next two days of proposal review. Each proposal would be reviewed for up to 30 minutes each in the following manner:

- Primary reviewer makes 2-3 minutes presentation about the proposal and key observations
- Any secondary reviewers provide additional thoughts observations
- Committee Members ask any clarifying questions of the reviewers
- Committee identifies and discusses proposal strengths and weaknesses
- Committee discusses any remaining questions needing clarification or recommendations for the proposal
- Quiet time for each Committee Member to digest information and make personal notes
- Short poll via Chat Box to capture Committee Members' current assessment of whether the proposal is High/Medium/Low potential for funding

The Committee then began working their way through the remaining 22 proposals one-by-one, beginning with review of the proposals for extension and then moving to new proposals. Highlights of the Committee's discussion were captured in the Notes Pod in Adobe Connect so they could be reviewed again during the final deliberations for recommendations and to record any information to be provided to proposal authors as feedback.

The Committee reviewed one proposal before breaking for lunch at 1:00pm and then resuming at 2:00pm until a short break after the fourth proposal. The day's Proposal Review schedule and the names of the Primary Reviewer for each were as follows. All times are approximate.

- 12:30 – 1:00pm ET: Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (Extension); Kat McIntyre
- 2:00 – 2:30pm ET: Four Forest Restoration Initiative (Extension); Karen Hardigg
- 2:30 – 3:00pm ET: Dinkey Collaborative (Extension); Brent Racher
- 3:00 – 3:30pm ET: Idaho Panhandle National Forests Joint Collaboratives Forest Landscape Restoration Proposal; Cecilia Clavet

PUBLIC COMMENT

The period for public comment opened at 4:00pm. Comments were delivered to the committee via phone. The comment order was assigned on a first come, first served basis via email the week prior. Each commenter was given 3 minutes (or a combined 6 minutes shared by 3 presenters) to make remarks and was timed by the Facilitator. The scheduled commenters were:

- Jean Public:
- Sally Russell: Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

- Bill Tripp: Western Klamath Restoration Partnership
- Craig Thomas: Dinkey CLFR Extension
- John Roberts, John Robinson, & Morris Huffman: Idaho Panhandle National Forests Joint Collaboratives/West Central Idaho Project
- Jim Burchfield: not affiliated with a proposal
- Jeff Burrows: Ravalli Roots
- Stephen Kimball: Big Elk Divide
- David Edelson: North Yuba Forest Partnership
- Erin Rogers: Somerset Integrated Resource Project

CLOSING REMARKS

In adjourning the Committee for the evening, Ms. Robertson thanked the Committee for a successful first day of discussions. Ms. Douglass opened the floor for any remaining logistics questions and shared the plan for the next day. Ms. Robertson then adjourned the meeting.

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020
MEETING SUMMARY DAY 2 (JUNE 23, 2020)

OPENING REMARKS

The second day of the CFLR Advisory Committee discussions began at 11:00am ET. Ms. Robertson welcomed everyone back to the meeting and turned the floor over to Facilitator Kim Douglass. Ms. Douglass noted that the Committee had 8 additional proposals to review over the course of the day and reviewed the agenda.

REVIEW OF REMAINING PROPOSALS (CONTINUED)

Ms. Robertson and Ms. Buchanan then elaborated on a refined proposal review process for the next two days which provided for more time for personal reflection.

Ms. Douglass then facilitated the Committee through review of 8 proposals. Using a process similar to Day One, the Committee evaluated strengths and weaknesses, discussed recommendations, and clarified any questions or key items necessary for decision making. The day's Proposal Review schedule and the names of the Primary Reviewer for each were as follows. All times are approximate.

- 11:30 – 12:00pm ET: Montana's Big Elk Divide Initiative; Matt Hurteau
- 12:00 – 12:30pm ET: Ravalli Roots CFLRP; Vernon Sterns
- 12:30 – 1:00pm ET: Colorado Front Range Landscape Restoration Initiative; Jon Bakker
- 2:00 – 2:30pm ET: Southwest Colorado Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative; Kat McIntyre
- 2:30 – 3:00pm ET: Rio Chama; Vernon Sterns
- 3:00 – 3:30pm ET: Western Central Idaho Initiative; Emily Jane Davis
- 3:45 – 4:15pm ET: North Yuba Forest Partnership; Cecelia Clavet
- 4:14 – 4:45pm ET: Western Klamath Mountains Forest and Fire Resiliency Project; Matt Hurteau

The Committee discussed three proposals prior to breaking for a one-hour lunch break at 1:00pm. The Committee resumed their discussion at 2:00pm and discussed the remaining five proposals with a 15-minute break at 3:45.

CLOSING REMARKS

At the close of proposal review, Ms. Douglass asked the Committee to begin reflecting on any thoughts or concerns about the decision-making process for Thursday. Committee Member Cecelia Clavet commented that she wanted to make sure the Committee would have some time on Wednesday to go over any final reflections on the proposal review results so as to be sure there are proper clarifications before Thursday.

Ms. Robertson adjourned the meeting.

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020
MEETING SUMMARY DAY 3 (JUNE 24, 2020)

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Douglass welcomed the Committee for the third day of the meeting. She noted that the Committee had 7 additional proposals to review over the course of the day and reviewed the agenda. Ms. Robertson shared that Committee Member Brent Racher would not be in attendance today and also likely tomorrow due to an emergency and that Karen Hardigg would provide an overview comments that he shared with her in advance. The Committee also had his initial scoring sheet (with High/Medium/Low) which would provide some additional insight into his proposal assessments.

REVIEW OF REMAINING PROPOSALS (CONTINUED)

Ms. Douglass then facilitated the Committee through review of 7 proposals. Using a process similar to Day One/Two, the Committee evaluated strengths and weaknesses, discussed recommendations, and clarified any questions or key items necessary for decision making. The day's Proposal Review schedule and the names of the Primary Reviewer for each were as follows. All times are approximate.

- 11:30 – 12:00pm ET: NEW Selkirks; Karen Hardigg
- 12:00 – 12:30pm ET: North Central Washington - Reducing risk and increasing resiliency in Washington's East Cascades; Emily Jane Davis
- 12:30 – 1:00pm ET: Northern Blues Forest Restoration; Vernon Sterns
- 2:00 – 2:30pm ET: Rogue Basin Landscape Restoration Project; Jon Bakker
- 2:30 – 3:00pm ET: Pisgah Restoration Initiative; Brent Racher/Karen Hardigg
- 3:00 – 3:30pm ET: Restoring Resiliency of the Interior Highlands and Coastal Plain of Arkansas; Ray Vaughan
- 3:45 – 4:15pm ET: Oak Ecosystem Restoration in Southern Illinois; Cecelia Clavet

The Committee discussed three proposals prior to breaking for a one-hour lunch break at 1:00pm. The Committee resumed their discussion at 2:00pm and discussed the remaining five proposals with a 15-minute break at 3:45. Karen Hardigg recused herself from Northern Blues Forest Restoration and did not participate in the review discussion.

CLOSING REMARKS

Following the proposal review, Ms. Douglass, Ms. Robertson, and Ms. Buchanan clarified the process for updating scores and providing that new information back to the Forest Service team for compilation prior to Thursday's meeting. The Committee also took some time to ask any remaining clarifying questions about the process.

Ms. Robertson adjourned the meeting a few minutes early to allow the Committee extra time to spend on their personal review and updated scoring.

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020
MEETING SUMMARY DAY 4 (JUNE 25, 2020)

OPENING REMARKS

Ms. Douglass welcomed the Committee for the final day of the meeting and reviewed the day's agenda. Ms. Robertson then reviewed the deliverables that the Committee was tasked to produce by the end of the day:

- Group of recommended new projects and any recommended extensions
- Recommendation for FY20 funding
- Recommended rank for receiving funding in FY21, combining the list of up to ten new projects and any recommended extensions
 - No more than two new proposals may be selected per Region per year
- Confirm assignments and timeline for writing letter to Secretary

Lastly, Ms. Douglass led the group in a short dialogue asking the Committee to please share what they were excited about with regards to CFLRP after reviewing all the proposals.

CONSENSUS BUILDING ON RECOMMENDATIONS

Ms. Robertson began by responding to Committee questions regarding the tasks ahead. In particular, the Committee sought clarification on process and funding. In addition to the recommended project for FY20, the Committee also decided to identify a combined (New Proposals and Extensions) Top 10 list for FY21 as well as any alternates that could be considered if additional funding beyond the Top 10 became available.

Ms. Douglass then invited the Committee to begin their final consensus-building discussions. The discussion began with Ms. Hardigg sharing thoughts on some themes that had arisen over the past several days that should be taken into account during deliberations:

- Overall scale of CFLR work and cross-boundary approach - many proposals are much bigger. What is the best scale? What advances cross-boundary work?
- Will work get done regardless of CFLR funding?
- To what extent do we invest in new landscapes vs. places that are already successful? How to consider extensions vs. new proposals on the same or similar landscape?
- What qualifies as a "landscape"?
- Historical range of variability (HRV) vs natural range of variability (NRV) vs general "resilience"

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

- How to consider strength of the "need for change"? If we know the need for change, but it was not clear in the proposal, how does the Committee make sense of that?
- Capacity:
 - How do we consider collaboratives (or groups of collaboratives) now working at larger scales?
 - How do we know if needed positions will be filled?
 - What qualifies as adequate prescribed fire capacity?
 - Does the guidance of the groups that wrote these proposals provide any guidance for new proposals/new landscapes/new collaboratives?

Ms. Buchanan then shared the updated rankings submitted the night before by the Committee. These were tallied and a new ranked list of the 16 remaining new proposals was shared. The Committee agreed at the outset once again to reach consensus on their decisions. While unanimity was desirable, the Committee acknowledged that this might not always be possible, and a "supermajority" would be sought. The Committee agreed that they were aiming for an outcome that everyone "could live with." It was agreed that if there were one or two dissenting opinions, the dissenting members would be offered the opportunity to share their thoughts and recommendations and these would be captured in the recorded notes but the Committee would move ahead with the majority opinion. If more than two Committee members dissented, the proposal would move back into discussion for review of strengths and weaknesses and be put up to an additional vote.

The Committee began by reviewing the lowest ranked proposals and deciding to remove these from further consideration for the Top 10 recommendations. These could be considered alternates should there be some additional funding beyond that which would support the top ranked proposals which would be recommended to the Secretary. The Committee then reviewed the top ranked proposals and agreed to move these to the Top 10 list for recommendation. Finally, the Committee spent reviewed mid-ranked proposals which had more disparity in rankings. Each of these proposals was put forth for additional discussion of strengths and weaknesses and other considerations noted above. The Committee worked through the scheduled lunch hour in deliberations. The Committee decided to unanimously recommend Northern Blues (Region 6) for FY20 funding and distilled the remaining proposals from the original list of 19 proposals (16 new proposals and 3 extensions) down to a list of 12 (10 new proposals and 2 extensions) for funding consideration in FY21, should funding become available. The Committee then took a 20-minute break.

Following the break, the Committee re-ranked the 12 new proposals and extensions using an online survey tool (PollEverywhere.com) which allowed the members to see results in real time. This new data point was considered against the rankings discussed at the outset of the day. In the end, the Committee agreed to use the original rankings to determine the recommendations. The Committee also moved one Region 6 proposal to the alternates list since no more than 2 proposals from a Region could be considered in the fiscal year. While the project in Arkansas had a lower score, it was moved ahead of the Colorado Front Range project and others because of this same regional

limitation. After a final review and voting, the Committee agreed on the following funding recommendations to be submitted to the Secretary.

FUNDING RECOMMENDATIONS

FY20:

- Northern Blues Forest Restoration

FY21:

New Proposals: Tier 1

- Rio Chama
- Southwest Colorado Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Initiative
- Western Klamath Mountains Forest and Fire Resiliency Project
- North Central Washington - Reducing risk and increasing resiliency in Washington's East Cascades
- North Yuba Forest Partnership

New Proposals: Tier 2

- Rogue Basin Landscape Restoration Project
- Pisgah Restoration Initiative
- Western Central Idaho Initiative
- Idaho Panhandle National Forests Joint Collaboratives Forest Landscape Restoration Proposal
- Restoring Resiliency of the Interior Highlands and Coastal Plain of Arkansas

Extensions Recommended for Funding

- Deschutes Collaborative Forest Project (Extension)

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

- Dinkey Collaborative (Extension)

Alternates

- Colorado Front Range Landscape Restoration Initiative
- NEW Selkirks
- Ravalli Roots CFLRP

CLOSING REMARKS

Ms. Robertson congratulated the Committee for their hard work in reaching the recommendations and thanked them for their dedication throughout the process. She also thanked the members of the public for listening in on proceedings and their participation earlier in the week. The group spent the remaining time confirming next steps, follow-up Committee activities/administrative meetings, and the schedule for the letter to the Secretary. Ms. Hardigg will be developing the initial draft of the letter. Ms. Robertson reminded the Committee that the results of the Committee Meeting are not considered “official” until the letter is submitted to the Secretary.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 4:00 pm ET.

ATTACHMENTS

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020
ATTACHMENT A: CFLRP MEETING AGENDA, JUNE 22-25, 2020

Committee Agenda as of 6/22/2020:

**USDA FOREST SERVICE
COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM
ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING
Monday, June 22 through Thursday, June 25, 2020
Virtual Meeting**

Objectives:

- Jointly evaluate CFLRP proposals
- Recommend which proposals should receive funding

Log in information:

- Log in to Adobe Connect: https://usfs.adobeconnect.com/wo_fm
 - o Mute your computers
- For audio, dial in to the conference number: 888-844-9904 (9404768#)

Please note that if the time allotted for calling proposal points of contact to ask questions of clarification, or for public comment, is not needed for those purposes, we will use the extra time to continue reviewing proposals.

MONDAY, June 22, 2020 – All times Eastern Time

<u>Time</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>Lead</u>
10:45	<i>Sign into Adobe Connect</i>	
11:00	Meeting Opening <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome / introductions• Context-setting remarks• Overview of agenda & meeting norms	DFO Facilitator
11:15	Opening Remarks <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Remarks by The Honorable Jim Hubbard, Undersecretary for Natural Resources & Environment, USDA	
11:45	Proposal Sifting and Clarification Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review pre-meeting scores• Discuss any clarifying questions as a group	Facilitated

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

- Determine whether there are any proposals to remove from further consideration

1:00 LUNCH BREAK

2:00 Proposal Review Facilitated

(25-30 min. / proposal if reviewing all 22)

For each proposal:

- Committee member(s) gives 2-3 min. overview
- Committee has 2-3 min. of quiet to review
- Committee identifies strengths, weaknesses, recommendations to applicants & any questions of clarification to ask proposal contacts

3:45 BREAK

4:00 Public Comment Facilitated

- 1 speaker per proposal

5:00 Closing Comments/Adjourn DFO/Facilitator

- Review of day
- Key questions for tomorrow
- Closing remarks

(Committee Chair, facilitation team, and FS staff will debrief for 20 minutes or so to discuss whether any agenda modifications are needed for Day 2.)

TUESDAY, June 23, 2020

10:45 Sign into Adobe Connect

11:00 Opening Remarks

- Welcome DFO
- Agenda review Facilitator
- Review any additional questions of clarification that Committee members may have identified overnight All

11:15 Proposal Review (continued) Facilitated

1:00 LUNCH

2:00 Proposal Review (continued) Facilitated

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020

3:30	BREAK	
3:45	Proposal Review (continued)	Facilitated
5:00	Closing Comments/Adjourn	DFO

WEDNESDAY, June 24, 2020

10:45	<i>Sign into Adobe Connect</i>	
11:00	Opening Remarks	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome• Agenda review• Review any additional questions of clarification that Committee members may have identified overnight	DFO Facilitator All
11:15	Proposal Review (continued)	Facilitated
1:00	LUNCH	
2:00	Proposal Review (continued)	Facilitated
3:30	BREAK	
3:45	Proposal review and/or Clarifying questions if needed	Facilitated
5:00	Closing Comments/Adjourn	DFO
5:30	Committee Members Individually Update Their Proposal Scores (by 7pm)	Panelists
7:00	FS Staff Compile Updated Scores	

THURSDAY, June 25, 2020

10:45	<i>Sign into Adobe Connect</i>	
11:00	<u>Opening Remarks</u>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Welcome• Agenda review• Review any additional questions of	DFO Facilitator All

USDA Forest Service
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Advisory Committee Meeting: June 22-25, 2020
clarification that Committee members may have
identified overnight

11:15	Discussion of Revised Scores and Consensus-Building on Recommendations <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Orientation to revised spreadsheet FS Staff• Reflection on revised scores Facilitated• Consensus-building on recommendations	
1:00	LUNCH	
2:00	Consensus-Building on Recommendation (continued)	Facilitated
3:30	BREAK	
3:45	Consensus-Building on Recommendation (continued)	Facilitated
4:15	Recognition of Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Appreciation for Committee members' Service• Process debrief / evaluation• Status of Committee/Next Steps	DFO Facilitated Facilitated
5:00	Adjourn	DFO

ATTACHMENT B: COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND FOREST SERVICE STAFF

Committee Members:

- Jonathan Bakker, University of Washington School of Environmental and Forest Sciences – Professor
- Cecilia Clavet, The Nature Conservancy - Senior Policy Advisor, Forests and Fire
- Matthew Hurteau, University of New Mexico, Department of Biology – Associate Professor
- Emily Jane Davis, Oregon State University - Assistant Professor and Extension Specialist, Ecosystem Workforce Program Associate Director
- Karen Hardigg, Rural Voices for Conservation Coalition - Director
- Kathleen McIntyre, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency - Forest Health Program Manager
- Brent Racher, Restoration Solutions LLC – Manager and Owner
- Vernon Stearns, Intertribal Timber Council – President, Spokane Tribe of Indians – Fuels Manager
- Ray Vaughan, WildLaw – Retired, Founder and Director

Forest Service Staff:

- Lindsay Buchanan, Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program Coordinator
- Jessica Robertson, CFLRP Designated Federal Officer (DFO)

Contractor Support:

- Kim Douglass, Facilitator, CI International
- Chandler Emberlin, Notetaker, CI International