March 8th Public Workshop – Additional Notes/Comments

Access –

- Seek temporary access, or non-permanent easements from private landowners
- The location of demonstration sites in this first phase should be accessible to the public.
- Ramp-up in future to go into areas without access, but have been identified as needing restoration. The demonstration project should not be focused on trying to treat all these hard to reach areas.
- What do you do when you treat all the easy to access and economically viable areas? The harder to treat areas should be incorporated into phases of the project instead of left all at the end.
- Apply economic commonsense, it's not a "driver", but it should be a consideration.
- "Driver" = criteria for selection developed earlier in meeting.

Communication –

- Communicate with landowners early in the process, and continue throughout the project.
- Make sure to identify & address any/all priorities from CWPPs in the areas to be treated. Keep communicating the issues of fire hazard and how the Pilot is addressing this by making the forests more resilient to the public.
- As the Pilot is developed/implemented over time, make available to interested private landowners in the area resources for treating their own lands (ODF, NRCS, etc.)
- Make these notes available to the public for review, reflection, and provide an opportunity for additional comments.

Context –

- We've done a lot in this watershed already. There is always going to be a need for more work in terms of maintenance. There are other ongoing projects in the area (i.e. fuel breaks).
- Keep the emphasis on QUALITY, this will build social support. The demonstration can be very powerful, keep context in mind.
- Keep in mind that "Restoration" is the driving force.
- A broader picture is needed.

Economics:

- Increase economic viability

- Low volume/acreand limited access – important to develop opportunities that will work
- Ability to maintain treatments long-term should be used as a filter
- How do economics play into this first (demonstration) phase of the pilot? How will we do things differently in terms of long-term planning (other projects in the watershed)?
- Economics and roads go hand in hand, BLM's pockets are not deep, and all the work cannot be done with service contracts. "If we can't pay for it, it won't get done."
- Landscape restoration – need to find a way to do it commercially without destroying what we are trying to preserve (balancing act, part of Franklin/Johnson principles)
- BLM should alter approach to stewardship; do like the Forest Service. O&C receipts to counties plays into this as well as it being a policy changing request.

Methods:

- Consider new, innovative approaches to yarding systems. How can we do this better?
- Smaller contracts might work better (if packaging as smaller projects/TS), this might present more administrative issues for the BLM.
- Helicopters – seek out various ways of using helicopters. Instead of one tree at a time being hauled out, bundle in the woods and take them out at once. Look at aerial yarding methods.
- Make sure that we create a demonstration project that can be applied across the landscape.
- Cover a range of site conditions for this first phase, demonstration project. Include areas that are hard to reach and some that are easily accessible, in terms of economics and for public viewing.
- Dealing with the soft screens: the NEPA process's development of alternatives provides an opportunity to focus on various ways to address some key issues.
- What happens post-treatment? There needs to be a provision for monitoring and enforcement for the project to be effective.

Old growth –

- Trees that are not 150 years old can still constitute old growth in southern Oregon's dry forests.
- Old growth trees are not always conifers; many oaks in our area are much older than 150 years old.
- Some stands do not have legacy trees. Those stands may have trees that are only 100 years old that would become future legacy trees. Manage to protect and create resiliency for those trees.

- Not a strict criteria to go by age!
- N/J's guideline to avoid trees > 150 yrs was largely established to take the social debate about old growth off the table by drawing a line.
- The Applegate Valley does not have a lot of stands that are 150 yrs or older: Leave large trees in stand, build resilience and resistance.

Roads –

- There is a concern with new roads.
- BLM has not done an inventory of roadless areas like the Forest Service has.
- According to the FS, it takes 5,000 contiguous acres without roads to be considered a roadless area.
- There is no sacred boundary, we can collaboratively define areas we would want to treat as a roadless area.
- In the Middle Applegate watershed, there is only one area that might be considered a roadless area and should be managed accordingly: Long Gulch/Wellington Butte area (general group consensus).
- It is important to look at the integrity of habitat as well as acknowledge large roadless areas (enhance characteristics)
- No hard consensus that we should completely stay out of an area that has few roads. (Example: Upper Applegate has had some work done – non-commercial thinning, fuels reduction, Rx burning).
    - There may be restoration management opportunities in places where large tree thinning is not an option and should be considered.
- Concern that if road building is off the table, some treatments might not be financially viable.
- Can we treat roadless areas without adding roads? (this ties in with the previous bullet)
- It is important when we talk about roads to:
    - Define whether a road will be permanent or temporary
    - If smaller scale project (stewardship/service contract), could smaller vehicles be used that would not require a full-sized road prism for access?
    - "Not all roads are created equal"
- Do closed roads (behind a gate) count as a road in terms of a roadless area?
- How temporary would a road be? Who will have access in the long-term?

- How do we maintain a stand if we close temporary roads?
- Skid roads need to be removed and restored (decommissioned). Concern that this does not happen adequately, not a good management strategy.