

## August 27-28, 2010 Jackson Advisory Group Draft Minutes

Note: the minutes are organized in the order in which they appear in the meeting agenda, which was not always the same order in which they unfolded during the meeting. Discussion topics were substantially rearranged during the meeting, so a strictly chronological presentation of the minutes would have been confusing.

### Contents:

1. Call to Order and Introductions .....	2
2. Review and Accept Agenda.....	2
3. Approve Minutes of the August 27-28, 2010 JAG Meeting .....	2
4. Landscape Committee Final Revisions .....	2
4. a) Guidelines for Matrix, OFDA, LSD Areas – Information Item .....	2
4. b) Remaining Sections from July 30 Agenda – Action Items.....	3
Section 5 – Recommendations for Presenting THPs for JAG Review:.....	3
Section 6 - NSO Buffers: .....	4
Section 6 - Buffers for Individual Old Growth Trees Outside Reserves: .....	5
Section 7 - Evenaged Management .....	5
4. c) Policy Statement on Development of Old Growth – Discussion Item .....	6
4. d) Demonstration in a Research and Demonstration Context – Action Item .....	6
5. Growth, Yield and Harvesting .....	7
6. Landscape Committee Recommendation on Woodlands STA – Action Item .....	7
7. Recreation Committee Recommendations .....	7
8. West Chamberlain THP Follow-up .....	8
Indian Springs Reserve .....	9
9. Research and Monitoring Committee .....	9
10. Public Comment.....	9
11. Adjourn.....	9
Exhibit 1: Written Public Comments .....	10

## 1. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 8:37. The following were present:

<b>JAG Members:</b>	<b>Department Staff:</b>	<b>Board of Forestry and Fire Protection:</b>
1 John Helms	Crawford Tuttle	George Gentry
2 Jere Melo	Cesar Partida	Eric Huff
3 Vince Taylor	Chris Rowney	
4 Dan Porter	Pam Linstedt	<b>Department of Parks and Recreation:</b>
5 Peter Braudrick	Craig Pedersen	Renee Pasquinelli
6 Linda Perkins	Russ Henly	
7 Mike Jani	Helge Eng	<b>Public:</b>
8 Linwood Gill		Don Taylor, Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association
9 Kathy Bailey	<b>Facilitator:</b>	Nancy Banker, JDSF Recreation Task Force chair
10 Mike Liquori	Steve Zuieback	Ray Duff
11 Brad Valentine		Lorraine Duff

## 2. Review and Accept Agenda

The JAG agreed to move the approval of the draft minutes from the August 27-28 meeting to 16:10. Section 2 of the landscape Committee – silv in a research and demonstration context, was moved to the afternoon.

**Motion (Dan, Mike J):** approve the agenda as amended. The motion passed unanimously.

John reminded the group of the remaining meetings scheduled for 2010: October 22-23, December 1 and December 15.

*Ex Parte* Communication Disclosures:

Jere talked to Mike A. Dan discussed stakeholder engagement with Kathy.

## 3. Approve Minutes of the August 27-28, 2010 JAG Meeting

The JAG agreed to move this agenda item to 16:00, because it would fit with the agenda item "Next Steps, Report Writing".

(Due to time constraints, neither agenda item was addressed at this meeting, so no action was taken on the draft minutes from the August 27-28 meeting).

## 4. Landscape Committee Final Revisions

### **4. a) Guidelines for Matrix, OFDA, LSD Areas – Information Item**

Linwood discussed a document titled Revised Silvicultural Guidelines: September 24, 2010.

Mike J suggested adding language to the effect that cutting cycles are initially 20-30 years in late seral development areas, but eventually harvesting will cease in these areas. An informal show of hands showed 10 in favor, one opposed.

Kathy suggested adding the other goals, such as wildlife and older forests, to the introduction.

The last bullet point under late seral development Guidelines on page 3 was modified to read as follows: "Existing groupings or clumps of redwood, as distinct from single-stem seedling redwoods, will be the source of most harvested redwood trees and most will be thinned to variable levels to promote random stem distribution and variable growth responses."

Jere felt the Constraints section on page 3 requiring about 10 % of the clumps to remain unthinned was really two trees per acre in disguise, and suggested that this language be removed. The JAG agreed to strike the second bullet point on page and substitute the following language: "to promote diversity of stand elements utilize variable intensity of clump thinning across the landscape, ranging from some unthinned to some thinned heavily".

The following two changes were made to the comparison table of matrix, older forest development area and late seral development silviculture:

- 1) Add language describing the situation in which harvest will eventually cease under late seral development silviculture.
- 2) Add the word "demonstration" to research in the silviculture criteria under matrix silviculture, to read: "all methods encouraged under research and demonstration. Outside of research and demonstration, single tree and group selection, commercial thinning".

#### **4. b) Remaining Sections from July 30 Agenda – Action Items**

##### **Section 5 – Recommendations for Presenting THPs for JAG Review:**

Kathy and Vince suggested language requiring that quantitative data on post-harvest conditions in THPs be reported back to the JAG. There was some discussion of putting the Forest on a path to sampling stand-based information, as a demonstration of cost-effective trend monitoring. Helge attempted to caution the JAG against uncritically embracing a stand based inventory approach, which is currently riding a wave of popularity among private forest landowners for ease of use and cost reasons, but is actually distinctly sub-optimal for a research forest due to statistical problems. However, the message was drowned out by multiple JAG members eager to say something.

Section 5 was edited to read as follows:

##### **Section 5. Recommendations for Presenting Proposed Timber Harvests for JAG Review and Providing Post Harvest Results [Draft]**

A summary of proposed timber harvests for JAG Review prepared by JDSF staff should consist of an approximately two-page statement, plus maps, tables or graphs, commenting on the following elements:

###### **1. Goals**

Clear statement of management objectives  
How plans for individual harvest areas relate to plans for neighboring areas and conform to overarching management goals

###### **2. Research and demonstration activities and opportunities.**

###### **3. Current Stand Conditions**

Broad quantitative and qualitative description, including maps, of existing variability and health of vegetation (conifers and hardwoods, diameter and volume distributions) within proposed harvest area  
Description of current wildlife habitat

Description of understory, ground cover plants, and other important floral features  
Aerial photos showing pre-harvest conditions and location of sample mark.

**4. Desired Future Stand Conditions**

Broad quantitative and qualitative description and rationale of desired outcome of harvesting, including desired species mix and projected post-harvest size class distribution data  
Description of desired wildlife, understory, and other flora/fauna conditions

**5. Proposed Prescription**

Include comments on the proportion of existing volume or basal area to be removed, anticipated timing of the next entry, and the extent to which methods are chosen to stimulate regeneration.

**6. Ecological Constraints or Opportunities**

Presence of legacy elements, and problematic soil, topographic or geomorphological features

**7. Logging Methods**

Anticipated use of cable and tractor systems  
Slash disposal

**8. Aesthetic Considerations**

Special considerations given to aesthetic and recreational values and constraints, including existing or potential trails and views

**9. Anticipated Timber Yields**

By species and size class

**10. Economic Analysis**

**11. A general description of post-harvest outcomes relative to items 1-10, above, is reported back to the JAG after the completion of the THP.**

**Motion:** accept the revised Section 5 above. Census vote results were as follows:

1	Kathy Bailey	Unqualified support
2	Peter Braudrick	Unqualified support
3	Linwood Gill	Strong support
4	Jere Melo	Qualified support
5	John Helms	Unqualified support
6	Mike Jani	Strong support
7	Mike Liquori	Strong support
8	Linda Perkins	Strong support
9	Dan Porter	Strong support
10	Vince Taylor	Strong support
11	Brad Valentine	Strong support

**Section 6 - NSO Buffers:**

Kathy noted that the USFWS northern spotted owl recovery plan seems to support the idea of maintaining nest trees over time.

The management plan needs to be revised to reflect current USFWS updated guidelines and regulations.

**Section 6 - Buffers for Individual Old Growth Trees Outside Reserves:**

Kathy discussed her recommendations for changes to this section.

**Motion (JH, MJ):** adopt the following language for Section 6.2 of the landscape committee report:

Management Measures: The intent of this section is to maintain and enhance biological values of old growth trees outside of reserves. This measure is intended to build on the old growth protection measures provided in the 2008 Management Plan. Any exceptions to the following will need approval by, at least, the Assistant Forest Manager and RPF, and will require a field visit. Exceptions may include the need for removal of buffer trees for safety. Apply all of the following.

- In all harvests, buffer all old growth conifers and hardwoods, if by doing so it would protect the targeted old growth trees, by at a minimum, maintaining screen trees that appear to have intermingling limbs, or at some point in time, will grow to have intermingling limbs, with the old growth tree.
- Additionally, determine whether any old growth tree exhibits attributes (as described in the old growth definition) that may biologically benefit from additional buffering: Assess the attributes, and pick buffering trees that best enhance or protect them, if needed. (NOTE: Take care to fully reflect on the old growth attributes and fairly assess the best method/tree-trees available for buffering purposes). Retained buffer trees should be those that will be healthy and wind firm subsequent to the harvest. Common attributes of old growth trees to be screened are those having cavities, large limbs and flat tops.
- For old growth trees that have immediate (same root crown), same-aged replicates (side-sprouts): leave all same-aged/similar-aged side sprouts. [Language subject to clarification.] Where feasible, avoid and/or minimize compaction of the root zone, with an equipment limitation zone based on evaluation of the site conditions around the tree.

Census vote results:

1	Kathy Bailey	Strong support
2	Peter Braudrick	General support
3	Linwood Gill	Qualified support
4	Jere Melo	Strong disagreement
5	John Helms	General support
6	Mike Jani	Unqualified support
7	Mike Liquori	General support
8	Linda Perkins	Strong support
9	Dan Porter	Strong support
10	Vince Taylor	Strong support
11	Brad Valentine	Strong support

**Section 7 - Evenaged Management**

The landscape committee recommended the following changes to the management plan language on page 255 in the management plan: “the total area of the matrix receiving even-aged silvicultural treatments shall be the minimum required for the scientific validity of the research and the achievement of the associated demonstration objectives. This constraint does not apply to even-aged management necessary for addressing forest health or problematic regeneration conditions.”

**Motion:** accept the above change to the even-aged management recommendation. Census vote results:

1	Kathy Bailey	Strong support
2	Peter Braudrick	General support
3	Linwood Gill	Qualified support
4	Jere Melo	General support
5	John Helms	General support
6	Mike Jani	Qualified support
7	Mike Liquori	Qualified support
8	Linda Perkins	Qualified support
9	Dan Porter	General support
10	Vince Taylor	Strong support
11	Brad Valentine	Qualified support

#### **4. c) Policy Statement on Development of Old Growth – Discussion Item**

Vince led the discussion of this issue. He pointed out that the idea of leaving at least two large trees per acre in matrix lands for old growth recruitment was shot down. Despite that, he expressed a desire to have old growth elements within the matrix. He proposed the following language:

“A long-term goal for Jackson Forest should be, consistent with maintaining or increasing harvest levels and accommodating research projects, to manage for the development of limited old-growth components within all areas of the forest being managed for timber production.”

Vince wanted to see a vote of who was in favor of this statement and who was not. JAG members were not inclined to engage in a vote for or against this particular statement. John pointed out the JAG has supported a similar notion many times, but this is a little more specific than what the JAG has supported.

Steve: Vince and others will keep working on section 4c.

#### **4. d) Demonstration in a Research and Demonstration Context – Action Item**

There was discussion of the proposed evaluation process for research and demonstration projects, in the document on page 10-11 in the information package, titled Item 4 d - Demonstration in a Research and Demonstration Context, dated September 16, 2010. The last paragraph on page one was modified to read:

“Similarly, some demonstrations may not have nor need a research complement. However, any research and/or demonstrations activity that involves non-Matrix silviculture in the Matrix, or that would involve silviculture at variance with the silvicultural guidelines for older forest development area and Late Seral Areas, will be carried out only as a part of an approved research and demonstration project following review and approval by the Research and Demonstration Review Body. Any demonstration that departs from silvicultural guidelines must provide new information of significant value. Such projects will go through the evaluation process we propose for non-matrix research and demonstration projects. Proposals for funding separate demonstrations should be evaluated and approved by the same bodies and procedures used to approve research projects”.

**Motion:** accept item 4.d with the above changes. Census vote results:

1	Kathy Bailey	General support
2	Peter Braudrick	Strong support
3	Linwood Gill	Strong support
4	Jere Melo	Strong support
5	John Helms	Strong support
6	Mike Jani	Strong support
7	Mike Liquori	Strong support
8	Linda Perkins	Strong support
9	Dan Porter	Strong support
10	Vince Taylor	Strong support
11	Brad Valentine	Strong support

## 5. Growth, Yield and Harvesting

Helge asked the JAG for clarification on the application of the older forest development area management category. For the purpose of discussion, he designated areas within the OFSZ that were not allocated to either JAG designated OFDA, old growth reserves or late seral development areas as "JDSF OFDA". JDSF OFDA had somewhat less restrictive management than that indicated for JAG designated OFDA. The question was whether the JAG intended for their landscape allocation to redefine all areas of JDSF OFDA as JAG designated OFDA. The answer was yes.

## 6. Landscape Committee Recommendation on Woodlands STA – Action Item

Don Taylor from the Mendocino Woodlands Camp Association (MWCA) gave an overview of their priorities and concerns. Major items included:

1. A 1,500 feet buffer around the Park, on both sides. No major timber harvest would be allowed within this buffer, but vegetation management and thinning may be OK.
2. A trust fund wherein 20% of the proceeds from any timber harvest within the Special Treatment Area shall be placed, and used for maintenance and rehabilitation of the Mendocino Woodlands State Park.

The MWCA are planning a THP within the Park.

Renee Pasquinelli: there is a need to harvest around buildings to protect them as cultural resources. Researchers from the University of Oregon will do a cultural resources survey of the Woodlands this winter.

There was discussion about what management should be allowed within a possible buffer. No harvest seems counterproductive.

Peter and Dan volunteered to work on changes and report back to the full JAG.

## 7. Recreation Committee Recommendations

There was a brief discussion of the recreation committee report's statements about the department's handling of recreation on the Forest. Jere felt the JAG was engaging in staff bashing. During the August 27 JAG meeting, Helge and Craig stated that the first 3 sentences on the top of page 2 of the recreation committee report:

- 1) "CAL FIRE has historically placed a low priority on recreation",

- 2) "Recreation staffing and expenditures have been cut disproportionately multiple times", and
- 3) "Currently almost no funds are being spent on recreation",

are factually incorrect. In a subsequent August 27 email, Vince provided some materials from a 2001 presentation to support these statements. Staff provided a rebuttal to Vince's presentation in a document dated September 21, 2010. Both documents were available in one handout at the meeting. Helge stated that it is the JAG's prerogative to decide whether they want to communicate through subjective opinion or objective facts. Staff are merely providing the objective facts.

Vince stated this was not a problem, apologized for any offense and withdrew his objections.

There was discussion of the larger issue of whether the recreation committee's recommendation are within their scope of work. Vince referred to the JAG's 2008 letter to the director and the Board asking for input on the proper role of the recreation committee. He felt the answer from the director and the Board was the recreation committee should not get in the way of the Recreation Task Force, but should feel free to contribute.

There was some concern that the Recreation Committee's recommendations stands in the way of the Recreation Task Force meeting its obligations. Several JAG members expressed the opinion that the Recreation Committee should let the Recreation Task Force do their work. The Recreation Committee should sit in on Recreation Task Force meetings, and if asked, bring issues to the full JAG.

Vince: I feel staff has been in favor of recreation all along. My earlier statements have been misinterpreted.

Russ: I recommend evaluating the Recreation Committee proposal on its face rather than discuss the scope of Recreation Committee endeavors.

Steve: the full JAG will discuss the Recreation Committee report at their next meeting.

## **8. West Chamberlain THP Follow-up**

Russ discussed an earlier email from Vince, who expressed a desire to take a second look at the use of group selection openings in the West Chamberlain THP.

Vince: most of the JAG was not aware that group selection was part of the THP when they reviewed it. Group selection should be justified to make sure it is of real value. There was confusion at the last meeting and we never got to it. This is contrary to what we are trying to accomplish.

Russ: The THP Committee was aware of the group openings. The JAG approved the THP. Finally, older forest development area silviculture allows for group selection.

Pam: group selection openings constitute less than five percent of the THP. The THP is 150 acres total, there are at most 25 openings, each less than one-fifth acre in size. None of the gaps will contain large trees. Under the late seral development prescription used, large trees will be retained.

Dan: we know two things about regeneration in redwoods: 1) alluvial flats regenerate differently than upland areas. 2) If all that was happening was small single tree gaps, we would see perfect negative exponential ("inverse J-shaped") distributions everywhere. We do not see that, therefore it may be more of a variable opening process. The silvicultural prescription used on west Chamberlain is one of a few that could mimic this process.



### **Indian Springs Reserve**

The JAG decided at their last meeting that the Research Committee would study the issue and make a recommendation on the proposed Indian Springs Reserve. The JAG would abide by the Research Committee recommendation.

Mike L: the Research Committee recommends temporarily setting aside the Indian Springs reserve, and handing it over to the Science Team to make a final determination on a reserve.

Pam: the area affected represents approximately two million board feet of timber, or approximately \$700,000 of timber value foregone.

### **9. Research and Monitoring Committee**

Dan discussed the scope of the Research Planning Team, on page 20 and 21 in the compiled meeting materials.

### **10. Public Comment**

Ray Duff felt the Road 500 situation was intolerable. Loraine Duff hates clearcuts. The JAG should not consider staff constraints, rather the department can hire more staff if they need it.

See exhibit 1 for written public comments.

### **11. Adjourn**

The meeting adjourned at 16:54.

## Exhibit 1: Written Public Comments

Public comment of Ray Duff to the Jackson Advisory Group for the regular September meeting in Ukiah, CA. Submitted as an email attachment to Russ Henly, Asst. Dep. Dir. on October 6, 2010.

1. My comment when asked prior to the ending of the regular meeting was a mention of the continued blockage of Road 500 by severe speed bumps. This was noted as late as this morning by Caspar resident attempting to negotiate Road 500 to the public forest. This is a repeated concern of the Caspar community and other members of the public who want to access the forest for recreation and other uses. A member of JAG also commented his attempt to travel Road 500 was met with scraping of the undercarriage of the vehicle, and he was driving a truck.

I would additionally like to comment on the report of the Recreation Committee. There was comment regarding the first paragraph of the second page of *Recommendations of the Recreation Committee*, to the effect the paragraph in question was “bashing” JDSF staff. As past president of a large recreation group with membership through out the County, and a resident of the County for the past forty years I found the historical appraisal very close to accurate. This is not to say individual staff has not been helpful when asked, but the degree of outreach for recreational purposes has not been reflected in the overall operations of the forest.

Mr. Ray Duff  
45300 Caspar Point Road #46  
Caspar, CA 95420

Public comment of Loraine Duff to the Jackson Advisory Group regarding a meeting in Ukiah, CA September 20, 2010. Submitted as an email attachment to Russ Henly, Asst. Dep. Dir. on October 6, 2010.

Why shouldn't JAG deal with and make recommendations for recreational use of JDSF? To my understanding that is one of the two main purposes of this forest, and it has long been neglected. I know from personal experience recreational concerns and staff designated for this has been consistently disregarded over the past many years. When there has been a CDF staff member designated for recreational concerns there is very little follow through, due often to staff reassignment. Recreational planning and attention of JDSF has been sufficiently neglected in the past. This merits JAG's close attention and appropriate recommendations to secure future recreational staffing, planning, and development that takes place on an ongoing basis.

### Feedback Loops for Timber Harvests

I feel feedback and follow-up on harvests is essential to make sure harvesting is happening in the designated way. If harvesting is going to happen differently, there has to be checks to make sure the different sort of harvest occurs as planned. I think the public needs this assurance as well.

### “Public value” and “Spiritual Value” of Old Growth Trees

How refreshing and delightful to hear these words used during a JAG meeting. There is so little attention in these areas in most JAG meetings. Yes, people do want to see big old growth trees in Jackson. And, clear-cutting in any form or by any rationale is awful.

What Hard-working JAG members!

I am again very impressed with the rigorous, thoughtful and attentive hard work the JAG members use to deal with the innumerable issues, how they can often come to a deeper and mutual understanding of an issue, and how they can appreciate different points of views and values, often resulting in a general consensus. I hope the Board of Forestry appreciates this arduous process and takes your recommendations seriously.

Loraine Duff  
45300 Caspar Point Road #46  
Caspar, CA 95420