

## Pilot Thompson IDT Meeting Notes

April 10, 2012

**Attendees:** John Gerritsma, Chris Jensen, Stephanie Kelleher, Jen Smith, Kristi Mastrofini, John McNeel, Nate Goodwine, Tim Montfort, Ted Hass, Greg Chandler, and George McKinley.

### Agenda:

1. Review where we are at with proposal and what needs to be done to finalize it (will include setting deadlines for information from folks)
  - a. Riparian corrections and are these affecting polygons that we put in for surveys? Can in-house surveys cover?
  - b. Identifying temp spurs and possible swing roads
  - c. Of the potential roads identified for decommissioning, which ones do we plan to cover under this action vs. other actions?
  - d. What else?
2. Potential Action Alternatives discussion; based on issues identified so far, how to best package the alternatives, additional alternative themes other than what is listed below?
  - a. Road building
  - b. No road building with helicopter
3. Common to all alternatives
  - a. Non-motorized trails proposal
  - b. Rehab of OHV routes in treatment units (???)
4. Review of PDFs from Pilot Joe – do we foresee any changes to these? New ones needed? (I have attached them to this email, so please review prior to the meeting).
5. Briefly review timeline and when we plan to meet next.

### Notes:

- Stephanie discussed the scoping update letter (sent Friday, April 6<sup>th</sup>) – the proposal is still preliminary and modifications are happening daily.

### Riparian Reserves

- The riparian layer in GIS is incorrect (found out last week that some stream survey information was not incorporated into the corporate layer). Dennis G. is working on developing an updated local layer that incorporates all past stream surveys and new surveys occurring right now in the project area. **This will be available for use around 4/25.**
- Stephanie asked Nate if he anticipated any changes to the current units as a result of riparian changes. Nate- there is a 1-acre sliver that is outside the polygon (this can be surveyed in house); nothing else is expected to change the current shape of the unit (polygon). **Nate will get**

**info to Stephanie so that botany, wildlife, and cultural specialists can account for it in surveys and consulting by COB 4/10/12.**

#### Additional Temporary Spurs and Swing Roads

- Chris J. needs to identify all potential temporary spurs and swing roads so that they can be included under the analysis. Chris- has pretty much walked every unit and is almost done – needs two more weeks – **will have finalized and to Stephanie by May 3<sup>rd</sup>.**

#### Potential Road Decommissioning

- Through a collaborative effort, about 7.7 miles have been identified so far for decommissioning. Medford has some funding available now to decommission approx. 0.75 miles worth of road identified by Mike D. in the Thompson Creek planning area; could occur prior to the Pilot being implemented (pending decision by JG), but would still take credit for it in the EA (will not be part of the final proposed action, but will be discussed as a concurrent action). JG gave the ok to go ahead and so it will be added to the current DNA for road decommissioning in the Ashland RA (NEPA completed under the district-wide programmatic EA for Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Enhancement).
- Still need to send a letter to mining claimants in the project area to notify them of potential road decommissioning. JM needs to double-check with district geologist because a mining claim is missing from the spreadsheet he provided us. **Stephanie will compile a letter to send certified to claimants once the proposal is finalized (May 10<sup>th</sup>)**
- Regarding additional roads identified for decommissioning- If the funding isn't secured and we don't know exactly when these would be decommissioned, can these roads get done under separate EA? Why consult on something when we don't know when/if it will happen for sure (not secured funding)?
  - ✓ Road work could be covered under the programmatic when funding is secured.
  - ✓ Would still be analyzed as a reasonably foreseeable action.
  - ✓ JM will analyze for haul routes and unit access overlay with the roads to be decommissioned to figure out whether funding to decommission can come from TS – **will have info to Stephanie prior to April 25 IDT meeting.**
  - ✓ All other roads not linked to a funding source will be addressed as additional opportunities identified.
  - ✓ **Stephanie will get roads needing to be surveyed to botany by May 4<sup>th</sup>**

#### Purpose and Need Statement to Address Transportation System Proposals

- If an action is proposed as part of the project, it needs to meet the purpose and need. Currently, the three purpose and need statements do not directly tie in with the transportation needs proposed.
  - ✓ We identified needs through a collaborative transportation planning process; not all actions will be able to be included under this project, but JG would like to show that

there is a commitment to follow through with managing for these needs in the near future. How can we accomplish this?

- ✓ It was determined that rehabbing existing hill climbs/trails in treatment units is within the scope of the project.
- ✓ Designating a non-motorized trails system in the project area would be addressed as a reasonably foreseeable action, pending funding and adoption by a trails association.
- ✓ The EA will discuss where roads (identified for decommissioning) might be converted to a trail (the level of decommissioning would need to allow for the retention of a small amount of roadbed as a trail – obliteration wouldn't compliment the potential future action of creating a trail).
- The intent of the project (third purpose statement) is to gauge the level of social acceptance this project has and to build support through collaborative efforts and public involvement. How does this fit in with transportation management proposals for this project?
  - ✓ Through collaborative efforts, transportation needs for the planning area have been identified. Only some of the needs can be directly addressed under this project proposal (EA) because the funding is not secure, the timing is unknown, or it is outside the scope of this project. Again, JG would like to show in the EA how we have identified ways to meet those needs even though they are not part of the current proposal.
- It is important to only include in the final proposal what we know (and have funding for) will be done. Needs vs. funding can get tricky.
- Some of the roads identified for decommissioning are roads that were previously closed, but left in the system in case we needed them for future use. They are completely overgrown now and we have decided that we do not need them for future use. These roads will require little to no funding to fully decommission due to their current state. **SK and JM will work together to clarify which roads are already closed and naturally decommissioned.**

### Alternatives

- SK did a brief comparison of what a new roads alternative would like vs. a no new roads alternative with helicopter yarding included (in terms of acres and road mileage). While the acreage does not change much, the effects can be very different.
- Does the IDT have any additional ideas of other alternatives that we should consider at this time?
  - ✓ Should we consider a no new roads and no helicopter alternative? This would not vary enough to make it worth being a separate alternative; the analysis of no roads and no helicopter would occur under the other alternatives and the impacts would be less than either alternative.
- The scoping period has just begun and we should be hearing from the public in the next 30 days; this will possibly bring forth additional alternative themes.
- There has been a lot of request to analyze helicopter yarding so that the economic comparison to cable/tractor yarding can be well documented and so that if helicopter logging becomes more economical, the action has already been analyzed for.

- GC needs someone to break out woodlands from the DM-Non-Plantation Rx units identified.  
**Greg will put in a GIS request with Dennis G. to do it.**

#### Riparian Reserve Thinning Rx (where are we at with this?)

- Nate, Jen, and Mike went in the field last week to sample mark and discuss possible options for active management while still meeting ACS objectives. Nate developed a marking guide line and prescription to work with, marked 8-12" DBH conifers, used a site tree distance of 155 ft. and assumed a 50 ft. (150 ft. for intermittent streams) no-treatment buffer.
- Still in brainstorming status. Actual buffer areas have not been determined yet.
- Is it appropriate to walk equipment through a riparian reserve?
- 7 stands throughout the planning area have been identified for a riparian Rx. These stands show a need for restoration treatments; 4 cable units, 3 tractor units.
- So far, cable units seem more feasible than tractor units.
- Will continue to review, will include CJ who can provide ideas for alternative yarding options.'
- Specialists will head out to field again to review (to include fish, hydro, wildlife, silvi, logging systems expert, and ???).
- **Fish/hydro needs to determine no treatment buffers, operation guidelines (what kind of equipment and where) by April 19<sup>th</sup>.** Make sure to let SK know if deadline cannot be met.
- Riparian areas within potential stewardship units may provide more yarding options.
- JG would like to have an informal field trip with NOAA and other interested parties as soon as we have some consensus on what we are proposing in riparian areas. **Schedule trip after we meet and discuss at next IDT meeting (April 25).**
- What about horses? Does anyone still do that? Or having Dale Rau provide suggestions re: stewardship options?

#### Other Topics

- What about hazard tree removal along haul routes (OSHA concerns)? Craig will assess the need for this; if needed, if would be best if we can cover within this analysis rather than a separate CX. Logs could be used in adjacent restoration projects? Roads would need to be identified by May 10<sup>th</sup> to be included in the proposal. **Report back by April 25; to discuss at next IDT meeting.**
- JM- identified some new roads in the planning area; an existing old road prism (not in our system) that could be used, re-open? TBD. Also, one additional short spur has been identified; **JM will get added to his roads layer ASAP.**
- We need to double-check mining claim locations; JM is finding active claims in areas that were not identified in info from district geologist.
- Since last IDT mtg, one additional new road was identified because the county road we thought could be used to access the unit is not passable. The road would require crossing a stream and therefore MD would like to consider it a temporary road, if it is not needed for future management.

- ✓ There are also some cultural issues in the vicinity; Lisa is reviewing the area for potential buffer needs.
- ✓ The area is still under emergency closure for OHVs and seems to be working (will be discussed in affected environment). Under the 1995 RMP- RR are closed to OHVs.
- ✓ Unauthorized use needs to be considered and documented in the EA – is closure working?
- **Add a shapefile to the project folder to show all adits and cultural areas (AML crew should have data).**
- **Review the PDF's from Pilot Joe. Have any additions/changes you want ready to review at next IDT meeting, April 25<sup>th</sup>.**