



1 plaintiff's counsel agreed with the suggestion of the defendants' attorneys, that no schedule issue at  
2 this time and that the Court set a further scheduling conference/status conference in March 2018.  
3 Counsel anticipate that by this time the NEPA determinations will be made as to each project and, if  
4 it turns out the Summit Project will go forward in 2017, plaintiffs' counsel indicated they would  
5 proceed via a motion for injunction. Thus, the Court **ORDERS:**

6 1. A further scheduling conference/status conference is set on **March 2, 2018**. The  
7 parties **SHALL** file a joint scheduling report/status report no later than **February 23, 2018**;

8 2. No later than **June 16, 2017**, counsel for the defendants **SHALL** file a status report  
9 indicating the results of the USFS determination as to whether it will conduct a further NEPA review  
10 as to the Summit Project;

11 3. In the event the USFS determines that no further NEPA review is warranted as to any  
12 of the three projects, counsel for the defendants **SHALL** give notice to counsel for the plaintiffs  
13 within 24 business hours;

14 4. The USFS **SHALL NOT** allow the logging operations to begin as to any of the three  
15 projects unless it has first given plaintiffs' counsel 15 days' notice of the intent to begin the  
16 operations.

17  
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19 Dated: May 5, 2017

/s/ Jennifer L. Thurston  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE