

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL

Advisory Council Meeting Notes

April 9th, 2024

The National Advisory Council for the Pacific Northwest National Scenic Trail (PNT) was convened for its ninth meeting at 10:00 A.M. PST on March 5, 2024, on Zoom. Designated Federal Official (DFO) Jeff Kitchens, Strategic Project Manager, and Tom Krekel, Facilitator, opened the meeting with a welcome to the returning Advisory Council members.

In accordance with the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (PL 92-463), the meeting was open to the public from 10:00 A.M. to 2:00 P.M. PST, without active microphone and video functions. The microphone and video functions were activated to allow for public participation during the designated Public Comment period.

Council Members Present*:

Diane Barlow (Chair), Glenn Blakeslee, Frank Bob, Jeff Chapman, Callum Cintron, Michael Cuffe, Mike Dawson, Michael DeCramer, Dan Dinning, Leah Dobey, Melinda DuPree, L Fisher, Phillip Hough, Cliff Kipp, Jeff Kish, Justin Kooyman, Michael Kroschel, Michael Lithgow, Soisette Lumpkin, Ashley South, Adam Sowards, Shelly Stevens, Diane Priebe (BLM), Erik Frenzel (NPS)

Council Members Not Present:

Randy Beacham, Molly Erickson, Robert Kendall, David Kennedy, Michael Liu, Elizabeth Nelson, Elizabeth Thomas, Kevin Knauth (FS)

Forest Service staff present were:

Sally Butts; Lisa Romano; Jeff Kitchens; Jessica Ibarra; Olivia Tong

*Attendance varied through the meeting and throughout the day due to schedule conflicts and technological challenges. As members moved in and out of the meeting, Forest Service staff worked diligently to capture movement and ensure quorum prior to any sensing or voting actions.

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

At the 10 a.m. start time, reminders were shared about Zoom function, including call option and having their names/initials for recordkeeping. The meeting facilitator, Tom Krekel, took attendance of the audience participants. There were more than half of the Council members present, and a quorum was established. Advisory Council members, Forest Service (FS) staff, government employees, and members of the public gave short introductions. Members of the public included Ben Palmer and Chris Bachman (Yaak Valley Forest Council), Jace Hogg (State of Idaho), Ray Stout (Kootenai Valley Record, Libby Montana).

COUNCIL BUSINESS, NOTES, & AGENDA

Advisory Council Chair Diane Barlow thanked the Council for attending the day's meeting and their efforts the past several months. Diane Barlow extended thanks to Lisa Romano, Acting PNT Administrator, for creating the agenda.

DFO Jeff Kitchens began with approving minutes from the January and March meetings. The DFO shared that comments on minutes were included and acknowledged, minutes are most up-to-date and asked if

anyone had anything to add. A Council Member raised concern on statements made about the map of private landowners and confusion over the PNT route. It was asked that a future agenda clarify about these topics and include goal-setting with visitor outreach. Another Council Member asked to correct a comment made under his name for the January minutes, which the DFO incorporated.

Council Chair Diane Barlow motioned to approve the meeting minutes for January 16 and 17, 2024 and March 5, 2024, seconded by Mike Cuffe. Motion passed unanimously.

No public comments were received for the day's meeting. The DFO reminded folks about Zoom etiquette and functions for connectivity. Lisa Romano thanked everyone for joining and reviewed agenda items.

UPDATE FROM FOREST SERVICE REGION 6

The DFO thanked the Council for attending, their support and engagement are valuable. The DFO also thanked Lisa Romano, Acting PNT Administrator, and Council Member Mike Dawson for presenting on the optimal location review (OLR).

Diane Barlow shared there were no updates on the discretionary committee request, they are just waiting for a response from Jacky Buchanan and the regional office. No further comments or questions were shared.

PACIFIC NORTHWEST NATIONAL SCENIC TRAIL – OVERVIEW LAND OWNERSHIP

DFO Jeff Kitchens and Lisa Romano, Acting PNT Administrator, led this topic and shared presentation slides. **See: Handout 1: PNT Optimal Location Review Presentation**

Lisa Romano provided content on land ownership and how PNT designated the trail route and what the designated trail looks like today. The Comprehensive Plan discusses resources, scenery, and backcountry setting. The Plan provides broad purpose of a continuous, non-motorized, public accessible secured trail. Most of the congressionally designated trail route are interim sections that are gaps, where it falls on roads or places public access is not allowed. These gaps could be addressed through federal acquisition or conservation/public access easements with private landowners. Trail corridors will be protected.

Lisa shared a pie chart of land ownership breakdown, portions split between National Forests, National Parks, Private lands, State Forests, BLM, Tribal/BIA, County/City, State parks. Large portion of private lands is timber industrial property. Some sections cross along high-speed roads that aren't safe for hikers. There are different authorities depending on where the trail is located on, the Plan is more of providing directions to federal land managers. Land management should harmonize interests and PNT. The FS coordinates with land managers on how to manage the trail. The Plan has a recommendation for land managers on nonfederal lands. For private landowners, if private land is allowed, documented and agreement. If not allowed, the trail crossing is considered interim and will have to pursue another route.

Discussion:

One Council Member began asking about tribal/BIA but was cut off due to connectivity issue. The DFO responded that the numbers are based on lands identified under trusts and ownership, but not considering lands considered available for tribes under treaty rights or of tribal interest. Lisa stated that the pie chart was developed for the land acquisition section of the Plan and acknowledges tribal lands and treaty rights are important to consider especially as it is not captured in the pie chart.

A Council Member shared that he contacted the county GIS coordinator who mapped PNT onto Washington where it showed property ownership automatically. It was easy to do. He recommended

others to pursue in their jurisdiction. Lisa Romano shared that the FS is partnering with Trust for Public Lands (TPL) for mapping and GIS tools to guide and support land acquisition and resources values. A Council Member spoke that his area in the Olympic Peninsula is mostly dealing with county/city. He would like to be able to tell private landowners that the PNT is moving on with the Olympic Trail that already has easements and is legally permitted in the interim until there is a review. Lisa thanked the Council Member for his comment, the Comprehensive Plan already indicates work has been done for OLR and will dive into more detail.

A Council Member asked if there are obligations to place restrictions on private land use, acknowledging it's a mix of different private owners, or is FS trying to get through their land? Lisa shares that private landowners may have not given approval or are unaware of the PNT. The Congressionally designated route was arbitrarily drawn and serves more as a concept. Private landowners are not obligated to allow public access. The FS will work with them to make arrangements. The DFO adds that there is always a legal provision for existing rights with Congress designations. Private landowners have existing rights over their land and no obligations to the designation. Their rights still stand even if it was federal, state, local designation.

OPTIMAL LOCATION REVIEW (PROCESS OVERVIEW & INTRODUCTION)

Lisa Romano led the topic on reviewing and introducing the OLR. First thing, OLR is not a decision-making process, it is a process to analyze based upon criteria. It is to help agencies and partners strategize how to protect the trail and to develop proposals for relocation. The outcome of an OLR is a report and recommendations that serves as information for planning next steps in implementation. It is not a decision nor NEPA analysis.

Why do we need OLRs? Congressionally designated route provides FS the legal authority to acquire land outside of National Forests from willing parties to protect the designated route. The Comprehensive Plan is a lengthy process. Trail relocation is not easy and a trail marker can't be just moved. It requires an extensive process done systematically. Relocation might even need act of Congress. The Plan requires OLR to be done for relocating the trail.

What does an OLR involve? The Comprehensive Plan identifies the steps for OLR. FS will work with partners on the Plan and with PNTA to initiate work to refine OLR with high-level effort. This will generate momentum for getting work done in a timely manner. The instructions for OLR in the Plan is unlikely to change. At a minimum, the Comprehensive Plan states:

- Partners interested in trail relocation should coordinate with the FS/PNT Administrator to establish a need to conduct OLR.
 - Consider whether it's a good investment and coordinate with the FS.
 - The Plan indicates there may have been work already done that meet the requirements of an OLR and may be used as OLR and trail relocation.
- Once need is established, OLR is initiated and team needs to be assembled, coordinated by the PNT Administrator. The team includes PNT Administrator, representative from PNTA, specialists from relevant land management units, landscape architect/specialist to analyze scenery management.
 - They may identify different specialists for different needs.
- Then, review existing data and gather data on current location of the trail, needs to relocate, and opportunities for relocation in involved areas, existing trails for reroute, site visits for useful insights on the land and scenery.

- Ultimately, develop a report on the team’s assessment and analysis and recommendations.
- OLRs will vary depending on the context, but the general structure of the OLR process be similar.

Discussion:

A Council Member raised concerns as in their experience in different rule-making process where they went through with following the guide, but an internal whitepaper that placed additional requirements and created unnecessary controversy. He was concerned with developments in OLR and wanted to know if OLR doesn’t supersede or affect what is written in the Comprehensive Plan. The OLR should be subservient to the Plan.

- Lisa Romano shared that the input is appreciated, will talk more about what happens after an OLR is completed. It is valuable to consider if OLR may contradict the Plan, though unlikely to happen. The DFO responded that the FS won’t step outside the Plan. If they decide otherwise that there needs to be changes, then there will be another separate public NEPA process to propose to make changes.
- A comment in the Zoom chat added, “It should be explicit – otherwise it will continue to look like the plan is being formed well after implementation”
- Lisa clarified that the Plan is a high-level direction form of guidance, OLR is more site-specific and detailed. OLR is not a decision, it is to inform and develop proposals for trail relocation that would be implemented locally.
- A Council Member shared additional context. First two scenic trails in 1980s/1990s adopted OLR process, but their Comprehensive Plans were adopted through NEPA process in 1982/1983 that haven’t been amended in all that time. The processes developed for conducting OLRs was focused on how to implement the Plans, not how we should think what should happen.

Lisa Romano continued presenting on the Ten Guiding Principles for OLR as best practices for trail relocation that the OLR processes should adhere to. The new location should improve and meet purposes, improve connectivity, and reduce road/motorized miles.

One question from a Council Member asked to clarify the bullet point on adverse effects to adjacent landowners and should not adversely impact treaty resources, whether this includes wildlife. Yes, it was just shortened in the presentation slide.

A Council Member asked how long does an OLR take? Council Member Mike Dawson shared that in Region 9 conducted OLR on the Appalachian Trail (AT) that had 3 year deadline. Some were brief, some reaffirmed that the trail was where it needed to be. Some found that there was minimal controversy as the trail was already on the FS lands. He has been involved in other OLRs that have taken years as it involved different agencies and was located in different landownerships. It depends.

BRIEF BREAK

OPTIMAL LOCATION REVIEW – CASE STUDIES & EXAMPLES

Lisa Romano introduced the section. Mike Dawson will present on case studies on OLRs from other trails. Lisa noted that OLRs may look different because of the different trails, thinking about how OLR will look for PNT. Mike Dawson has experience with working with Appalachian Trail Conference and Pacific Crest Trail Association in developing OLRs. He is one of the few people with extensive hands-on experience in this work. Handouts presented were shared to Advisory Council Members prior to the meeting. Mike Dawson presented on the Optimal Location Review Direction for PNT. **See: Handout 2: PNNST OLR Guidelines**

The document is summarizing information from the Comprehensive Plan that would tell how to conduct an OLR and what is required, with more detail outlined in Page 6. Mike Dawson shared history on how agencies and National Trails System got into using this system. NEPA passed in 1973. Trails were being protected in National Parks, but things left in between were left up to the states for planning and land acquisition with no funding or federal support. Exception was New Jersey that completed land acquisition in three years. Amendments proposed creating a Comprehensive Plan and protecting lands outside the federal agency.

For the AT, FS had to protect the trail within National Forests. Agencies started looking at locations and sent land staff to protect the trail without planning to back it up. FS bought private lands were bought, and some were on unsustainable areas. OLR was brought up to address these issues and provide guidelines.

In Region 8, OLRs were completed in 3 years. These processes are not immediate, half the tread of the trail was moved in the region that Mike Dawson was working in. OLR process is an internal FS process. If OLR suggests that the movement of trail sections, it is subject to follow NEPA requirements. OLR often determines set of alternatives and are found in NEPA process, sometimes OLR is chosen through NEPA. Sometimes new information comes to light through NEPA, then resulting section chosen was not the one under OLR and changes the original plan.

With private landowners, AT Conference was hired by NPS to help, and he met with unwilling sellers in his region. Agencies work with private landowners to decide where the trail moves within their land and negotiate. It is challenging as with NEPA, you need to know where the trail will go. Agencies choose optimal location and talk to landowners who are affected and then look for a location that everyone agrees with. Once established you move to NEPA compliance and make the actual decision. Main outcomes of OLR are the location of trail and the lands needed to protect in that location.

Guidelines for OLR are important by using the same criteria to stay consistent and streamline. Criteria are different from trail to trail due to geography, context of the land, and land ownership. It was different for AT where a significant segment in area had no public lands while PCT was mostly on federal lands. Some criteria are specific, such as public safety – safety near roads, hiker safety, vulnerable groups can be specifically identified through OLR guidelines.

Mike Dawson presented on the Mount Jefferson Wilderness of the Pacific Crest National Scenic Trail (PCT). **See: Handout 3: 2017 Mt. Jeff OLR signed**

Relocation in this OLR didn't deal with private lands, only movement from public land to public land. The original trail had poor drainage and issues of erosion. They adjusted the trail to allow water drainage and prevent against rutting out, and the old trail was rehabilitated. This was done through OLR coordination of public land solving problems on public land.

Mike Dawson presented on the AT OLR process. **See: Handout 4: A.T.Buck Mountain OLR_CNF**
The AT was on public gravel roads and ran through private properties. They conducted a lengthy OLR process, with scenic views being key to the trail. The OLR process picked two potential routes after negotiations with private landowners and the AT route was successfully moved. This was an example of a difficult situation where OLR was successful in moving routes away from social controversy and off public roads.

Mike Dawson presented on the OLR process for the PCT relocation to the A-TREE. See: Handout 5: 20110718_TNF_Hwy49_AT

Council Member Justin Kooyman spoke on this topic as the regional representative for PCTA during when the A-Tree OLR was done. It was a collaboration between the Tahoe National Forest (TNF) and PCTA. TNF reached out to PCTA about OLR process and for support on concerns of current trail location and incompatibility in trail uses. There were the issues of illegal motorized use and the trail being parallel to FS roads. The OLR process was initiated. It determined better trail routes that were more scenic and separated trail from motorized uses and high dry locations in two years. It led to initiating NEPA process. Mike Dawson showed a map of the trail reroutes. Justin Kooyman explained that there was a 7-mile stretch that underwent NEPA and was realigned. The OLR managed to find trail relocation that improved PCT experience and for the agency to provide motorized and mountain bike access so that variety of uses were accommodated. The outcome was celebrated with ribbon cutting ceremony.

Mike Dawson elaborated that there were no issues accessing water along the PNT, opposed to Southern California where water sources are a driving factor for locating trail use. Some places have dozens of campsites, but in other places, due to land ownership or geological features, overnight use sites may be a major OLR factor in one OLR and not in another. These PCT examples may be applicable to certain parts of PNT, but not all.

A Council Member raised questions on how a best hiker route may be up high, whereas a stock route has to be lower and less steep. For example, Mount Zion. How do you plan an OLR process for this, do you find a compromise? Mike Dawson replied there may be a need to rebuild the overly steep route over the top of the mountain for the iconic route. However, going over the peak may not be best for the stock trail because it is unsustainable. This has happened on the PCT, so there is an alternate route that goes around to provide access for equestrians but maintains main trail route for scenic locations for hikers. There is no yes or no answer, it would be best to have two routes for separate user groups and not compromising both into one route. This is why OLR is in place to find a solution for this. There is consideration of construction costs to accommodate for different users, as the Comprehensive Plan is used for.

OPTIMAL LOCATION REVIEW – WHAT COMES NEXT

Lisa Romano, Acting PNT Administrator, presented what happens after OLR. Lisa clarified that OLR is not a decision but may result in a decision on trail location. If agency and local land management pursue the decision, they will work together on implementing. If a trail is relocated onto federal land, then it may trigger some level of NEPA that directs federal agencies to analyze environmental impacts on resources. NEPA requires agency to solicit public engagement and tribal consultation on proposals. Level of impacts on resources affect what level of input, and there is no way to generalize what NEPA level would be needed because many factors are involved.

On non-federal lands, some NEPA may be required because it is a federal action, depending on where the proposed location would be. A decision-making process would be required, involving different public periods. After OLR is done and a decision is signed, then the FS would publish a map of this section in the Federal Registrar. For more detailed NEPA questions, Lisa Romano can try to answer and talk to folks offline. NEPA depends on what is being proposed and where. It is also important to consider construction costs with the proposals.

OPTIMAL LOCATION REVIEW – Q&A

Council Members were offered the opportunity to ask questions during this section.

Q: If NEPA is triggered, what effect will that have on SEPA? Will that be used in place of SEPA?

A: The state doesn't have jurisdiction over federal agency. But if it requires state action, it would still have to comply with SEPA.

Q: OLR needs to happen when a proposed route is outside the corridor. How much would the trail be readjusted within the corridor to not need OLR?

A: Being outside the corridor only triggers congressional action to move the trail, i.e. North country trail. OLR are done for trail segments not expected to leave the trail planning area.

Q: After the Council terminates, is there motivation for regions to conduct OLRs? How does a process get going in the next year or two for the local land manager to be compelled to make the trail a reality?

A: Several responses were provided.

- PNTA will press regions to develop a timeline for completing OLRs and giving Forest districts deadlines for their own units.
- There is local interest present, units are already wondering when they can go forward with these OLRs. They just need to be enabled to move forward, people were just waiting on the completed Comprehensive Plan.
- The Comprehensive Plan drives everything and directs the FS to close gaps by conducting OLRs. Local level capacity will always be a challenge when getting local expertise and working with local units on priorities.
- Highlighting FS ownership, they manage 51% of the trail. The FS has intent and desire for implementing the Comprehensive Plan. To do this, the FS needs extensive support and resources from all stakeholders of the remaining 49%. There are competing priorities over districts and forests which may make the process take longer. Local collaboration will be important for communicating why this process is important.

Q: If the trail tread moves within the planning corridor, does it still require NEPA?

A: Yes. When the agency proposes to build new sections of the trail, it requires NEPA. Some trail construction projects may be approved under a categorical exclusion while others may require a higher level of analysis such as an environmental assessment. If there is ground disturbing activity, there is some level of NEPA required.

Q: With these competing priorities, what is the FS looking from the Council on OLR?

A: This meeting is just informational to get everyone on the same page. Given that the next meeting is the last in May, talk what the Council's next steps are between now and May considering the discretionary committee request is still underway. The FS is pursuing ways for the Council to keep providing feedback on implementation. No matter the formal status of the Council, Council members can still be involved. If the Council has interest as OLRs proceed, OLR teams can depend on Council members to provide input on needs and concerns. They would then be involved in NEPA process. This doesn't require Congress or the agency.

Q: Does an OLR need to be done every time we're looking at moving the PNT off roads and onto trails? Would there ever be a situation when it was not needed?

A: OLR should ideally be done for the entire trail. In instances where the trail should move, it's especially important to do an OLR to ensure that the trail is being moved to the correct place that will best support

the nature and purposes for the trail and associated desired conditions. In some instances, some work has already been done that hasn't been called OLR but meets what is in an OLR.

Q: Clarifying if moving trail to the PNTA route requires OLR?

A: Whenever officially designating the trail, an OLR is required. Some OLR will be easier than others, others will be lengthy. PNTA has a recommended route for hikers, and some trail segments are optimal. OLR may be short and uncomplicated if it results in moving the PNT onto existing trail that skips over NEPA. If proposing to designate an existing trail within the wilderness area, it may have minimal NEPA because it will have no new impacts. If moving outside wilderness areas, it may require NEPA process. If there is no ground disturbing activities, less NEPA is involved. Visitor use levels and impacts on natural and cultural resources are also considerations that local land management may believe warrants NEPA.

Other general comments were made.

- The federal government is good at solving complex questions. This presentation was appreciated. The OLR process will help get best possible route and get the trail implemented. The FS and groups will move forward and get through this.
- The DFO shared that he has been a line officer for national trails and areas. A lot of things were learned over time, much of the initial work done had to be changed and processed reviewed because new things were found. The implementation process is a living process that will change as new information is discovered and involves managing these areas and protecting features that weren't found.
- Council Member Mike Dawson shared that he worked on the AT for 21 years, and it became much improved as there were places the trail was relocated to. Some of those changes were done in five years, some changes have been implemented after many years. He still gets calls about processes involving OLRs from years ago. Consider what is being built for the future generations and what people in the future will accomplish, and not to get discouraged.

BRIEF BREAK

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

A member of the public raised a question. The OLR needs to address grizzly bear core habitat. If the PNT, a nonmotorized route, reaches and exceeds 20 parties per week, which the U of M monitoring indicated it does, the FS is required to manage it like a motorized route. As we know the trail will exceed this threshold of 20 parties per week and is already doing so, how will the FS manage it as the route goes through grizzly core habitats? How are we going to monitor and secure the grizzly core habitat? Will the OLR move the route out of the grizzly core?

Lisa Romano responds that the Comprehensive Plan identifies different management approaches used for threshold levels in these grizzly areas. The Plan recognizes the importance of these areas and resources. She is unable to get into that level of detail to answer because on the ground decisions will be left to local units. This is why OLR is valuable for the entire trail to identify where is optimal and where is not. This lets us dive deeper into these questions about motorized/nonmotorized management and moving out of grizzly core. This was more site-specific detail that the PNT Administrator is unable to exactly answer.

OPTIMAL LOCATION REVIEW – Q&A CONTINUED

Council Members made additional comments. They are looking at grizzly habitats across the trail, including Washington and Idaho, so the entire stretch of the upper part of the trail will have to be looked

into. Another Council member asked for clarification between local level management decisions and state decisions - who manages road density standards? On FS lands, it would be the district manager or the line officer. If a new road is proposed, the line officer would consult with fish and wildlife management to assess impacts and this would be used to inform for the NEPA process. There are concerns over lack of attention to permitting issues in grizzly core areas. For local and non-local, once the trail surpasses the threshold and becomes motorized, there will be issues around permits, road access, and surrounding land areas that may affect endangered species including grizzly bears.

DFO Jeff Kitchens shared that the OLR is a process to identify information. There will be NEPA if there are things identified that isn't considered in the Comprehensive Plan. There will be Section 7 consultation with fish and wildlife service where entities will provide input and will be considered. Outcomes will differ based on the context, but will all involve fish and wildlife service if there are endangered species and historical and cultural resources affected. What local offices and how the decisions come into place during NEPA cannot be foreseen. NEPA consultation will involve tribes and the public.

The DFO shared an analogy to help clarify. Studies were conducted on impacts of use, then NEPA came in. Data findings were incorporated into NEPA process to come to a decision. OLR provides things to consider, but NEPA filter helps arrive at the decision.

A Council Member asked whether the FS made any comments around grizzly habitats. Would there be trail closures around grizzly bear core habitats? National Park Service said there may be some temporary closures but no clear answer. Lisa Romano responded that the comment period happened before her time but isn't sure if there were comments on that specifically. She will need to follow up on this. The Council Member clarified that the decisions were made to relocate grizzly bears and was not open to public comment. The DFO stated he and Lisa will need to retrieve the FS records on what was said around this. A Council Member asked if the final EIS was made this month. There are multiple grizzly bear zones, and it's important to realize they aren't managed the same as determined by the cascade zone. This will be long span as grizzly populations are restored for things to happen, including having a thriving population. It is complicated to have a Comprehensive Plan that touches all these zones on this trail. Management direction is looked at a whole, with local decisions made.

A message was sent in the Zoom chat about reallocation of resources. Main issues are resources and funding, as some areas will be more expensive than others. What flexibility is there to reallocate or is each region out for itself in managing resources? Lisa Romano answered that there is a small authorization from Congress in funding the PNT. Region 6 coordinates with Region 1, while overseen by Region 6 who has authority over the trail. Each forest along the route gets funding based on miles that run through their forest. Colville gets more funding than Olympic because it has more miles. PCT is allocating to each forest every year for maintenance and withholds an amount for proposals on special projects. Teams from each region works with trail partners to decide on funding projects. There isn't a set amount on what forests gets, and there is flexibility and coordination are needed to strategize what funding is needed. Mike Dawson summarized that it is up to the FS to whom funds are allocated, using any system they like to see where the pot of money goes. Every year, representatives go to influence Congress on how much money is allocated to the National Trails System (NTS) and how much to each trail. It is worth putting into that work.

A Council Member asked that though Colville is bigger than Olympic, Olympic has the NPS too. How does the money get allocated? Mike Dawson shared that the NPS has their own budget and may allocate

to NTS. In the past they were limited to national scenic trails. For many years the FS has funded work in the NPS using FS funds.

NEXT MEETING AGENDA, BIN ITEMS, & CLOSE OUT

Tom Krekel, Facilitator, moved onto discussion topics to be covered for the next meeting and asked for suggestions. Council Chair Diane Barlow noted that this will not be the only opportunity for suggestions, and that Council Members can share them at any time with her, Tom, Jeff, and Lisa. There weren't any suggestions or thoughts at this time.

DFO Jeff Kitchens encouraged the Council to reach out to Diane Barlow in next couple weeks to provide ideas on May's meeting, which is the last Council meeting. The Council should take advantage of this time. They have resources from Tom, Jeff, and Lisa, and can have conversations on next steps. The Council can take the time to highlight what they want to talk about further. The meeting is up to the Council and what everyone wants to see.

Diane Barlow stated that the current roster of Council Members will be shared. If anyone objects to having the roster with their contact info to be circulated, let Jeff Kitchens know. This is so that folks can be in touch after the Council is dissolved.

The DFO will form a list of Council Members and their emails. He asked members can share additional contact info if interested and this list will be sent before the final meeting and dissolution of the Council.

Thanks were exchanged as the meeting ended.

MEETING ADJOURNED

HANDOUTS

Handout 1: PNT Optimal Location Review Presentation

Handout 2: PNNST OLR Guidelines

Handout 3: 2017 Mt. Jeff OLR signed

Handout 4: A.T.Buck Mountain OLR_CNF

Handout 5: 20110718_TNF_Hwy49_ATree

Handout 6: snoqualmie.olr signed

MINUTES CERTIFIED BY Advisory Council by Vote on 5/14/24