

Pilot Thompson IDT Meeting
10/13/11 @0900

Attending: Stephanie Kelleher, John Gerritsma, Jason Reilly, Ed Reilly, Lisa Brennan, Brett Holcomb, Craig Brown, John Samuelson, Dennis Byrd, Armand Rebischke, Nate Goodwine, Mike Appling, Luke Ruediger.

Notes: Chamise Kramer

Ground Rules/Responsibilities/Opening Discussion

John G. will email to Stephanie K. to pass along to everyone as a reminder. Essentially the same as in Pilot Joe project.

Initiation Letter covers the general bases:

- The proposal is not to treat every acre, but to assess a need for all acres, especially those that fall within the Dry Doug Fir Rx, based on vegetation types and Norm and Jerry's ideas and principles.
- The purpose and need demonstrates the Dry Douglas fir types, but John emphasized that we don't want to ignore the other vegetation types.

Late Successional Emphasis Areas (LSEAs)

J. Reilly discussed the criteria for their designation. There are 2 main drivers:

- Norm and Jerry's approach to landscape planning, specifically the % of landscape that is set aside for dense forests
- The Northern Spotted Owl (NSO) Recovery Plan

Also discussed how/why they are designated, with criteria rooted in the following:

- Fire probability mapping
- Habitat suitability as modeled by NSO Recovery Plan
- Existing habitat conditions
- NSO occurrences

Jason hopes that there will be more team involvement to create them for Pilot Thompson. Unlike Pilot Joe, the LSEA design under Pilot Thompson will look for opportunities to incorporate existing reserves into LSEAs. Reminded people that, as the LSEAs develop, the draft GIS layer will remain in the Y: drive. The final, official layer will be put in the P: drive project folder.

We treated around them in Pilot Joe project; the question was raised: Will they be treated in P. Thompson?

- Norm and Jerry have been pretty silent thus far, but the decision will most likely be left to the ID team. Limited management in them is the most likely outcome, with the goal to maintain 1/3 of dense conditions that currently exist, and to promote the "hang time" concept. There is probably good rationale to do some treatment in some of them, but it would be non-commercial.

ACTION NEEDED: Jason would like to schedule a smaller group meeting with specialists to incorporate their needs into creating the LSEAs, specifically Armand, Jen and Nate.

Areas of Treatment

Nate G. emphasized the large amount of land included in this proposal (1100 FOI's - over 30 sections), and the need to filter to identify areas where no treatment will occur based on the following exclusions:

- LSEAs
- Salamander buffers

- 310' Riparian Reserve for fish-bearing streams
- Red Tree Vole (RTV) buffers
- 1995 RMP vs. WOPR
- Fungi
- Plantations
- Visual Resource Management
- Bats/Adits buffers (250')
- Areas of prior fuels treatments

*Mike Appling can help Nate figure out what's been treated already. There are lots of treatments that occurred in Upper and Middle Thompson drainage between 1996-2006. He's unsure about treatments in Ferris Gulch. Also noted that GPRA has existing fuels work that neighbors the proposed area, and could add to cumulative effects in our analysis.

Nate is starting with the forest lands to see areas of exclusion, but needs help with the other areas to narrow down the treatable acreage as quickly and efficiently as possible. Emphasized that he really wants a structured process to start excluding areas, including a GIS folder in the P: drive with layers all in one spot, EARLY ON. Also wants to document in the EA the acres left untreated and why. No big database is needed, but a GIS rep who can calculate and track the acres excluded would help.

John G. offered a few suggestions to Nate:

- Suggested that deferment will happen at lower elevations in the drainage and will be more obvious, so start there, but Nate pointed out that snow is a limiting factor, and he's been starting at higher elevations because of it.
- Thinks that entry into higher elevation Riparian Reserves might be possible, based on need.
- Major stream stems will be excluded.
- Keep areas ¼ mile from helicopter accessible areas (2-3 minutes flight time 1 way) as a high priority, with the assumption that maybe helicopter operations will be feasible if it means access into larger-volume areas could require a few shorter new roads vs. longer new roads in lower-volume areas without it.
- Reduce the total land base based on feasibility with the current conditions.

John S. mentioned that he will be going out with Ed Hanscomb (sp?) to look at downhill logging opportunities.

Surveys

Stream surveys (via Stephanie K.)

- Stream surveys are needed in some areas; will need to dispense the information to everyone as acquired.
- Areas could wind up being excluded (temporarily) if surveys don't get done in time to meet the initial deadlines. They're not required, but are very useful for a multitude of reasons.

Botany/Weeds

- Armand needs to refine the GIS stuff a little bit, primarily where surveys are done and where 1 more survey is needed. Will be available soon.
- Known areas of protection are a good starting point for areas of exclusion from treatment.
- A few areas of known 180-year old stands that need fungi surveys are currently getting worked into a contract.

-FRGE surveys need to happen in the spring, and areas of potential survey need to be submitted to Armand by mid-February, at the absolute latest, in order to get them into contracts in time to meet survey deadlines.

Wildlife

- Great Grey Owl surveys are done. Did 1 year in Upper Thompson (based on the 2011 S&M Settlement agreement).
- Not a lot of recent available NSO data---10 year-old data in a lot of areas. Hope to have money/resources to conduct surveys?
- Very few RTV surveys exist in area; will basically need to do complete surveys. Can happen in any season.
- Needed mollusk survey work would commence in the spring, once units are refined.
- Fisher exists in the project area—Candidate species

Cultural

- Not a lot of surveys exist, but know that there is a potential for significant sites in parts of the project area that need to be looked at more extensively.
- Can count the AML crews' surveys as they are all certified archaeologists—Lisa will coordinate with them for their information.
- Due to large amount of land base, Lisa will wait until units are finalized to get her surveys done; they have to be conducted/documentated by an archaeologist, per State requirements.

Relevant Issues

- All issues laid out on the Pilot Joe handout remain.
- John G. discussed the added Transportation System Collaborative/Committee/Group:
 - With John McNeel and outside partners, assessing all roads in the project area, with the reasoning being that besides NSO, roads are the biggest issues identified by the public.
 - The committee was created for transparency, to ID opportunities for managing roads as they exist currently.
 - The information will feed into the proposed action to see how road systems will be managed, including OHV routes as they currently exist.
 - Will meet again in early November to begin working on the process
 - It was suggested that Mike Derrig be included in the process, as he's good at finding funding for projects and getting them off the ground.
 - Main goal of the group is to compile data to address the issue of what is the right size/scope of a road system for the area?
 - Development of a proposal for consideration by general public is the goal.
 - Want to focus on social issues (OHVs, fuels/fire, density)

Timelines

- Open house scheduled for October 25th
 - Informative meeting at Applegate School. Key players (Nate, Mike, and Jason) should be there to answer questions.
 - Jason mentioned that the previous power point presentation could be modified and re-used.
- Public Field Trip - November 8/9th
 - Key people should be there to discuss what the project would look like

- 2nd Public Field Trip—End of March, 2012 to see a few units on the ground, weather dependent
- November 1st—IDT meeting in the afternoon
 - 1st scoping period will be over, so initial comments can be addressed.

-Concern expressed by Mike D. and Jen S. about meeting consulting deadlines with heavy workload and so many other deadlines to meet. John G. thinks it will be okay.

Open Questions/Issues

Monitoring: Luke asked if there is any opportunity to incorporate monitoring of Pilot Joe into this project?

- There is still a lag-time to deal with, as nothing has been implemented on the ground yet. BUT, emphasis was placed on the Lessons Learned from the initial planning process, which is a monitoring of sorts.
- Public are very excited about the monitoring component.
- As cutting happens, then monitoring will be possible, says John G.
- Think of it in terms of Design (lessons learned) vs. Implementation (still to come)