

Pilot Joe IDT Meeting Notes

May 10th, 2011

Attendees:

Ed Reilly
John McNeel
Josh Robeson
John Samuelson
Brett Holcomb
Nate Goodwine
Jason Reilly
Craig Brown
Ted Hass
Mike Derrig
Luke Ruediger
Stephanie Kelleher (notetaker)

Agenda:

- ✓ Final NEPA Proposal
 - Roads & Road Decommissioning
- ✓ Economics/ Loren Kellogg's suggestions
- ✓ Comments Received
- ✓ PDFs/Chapter 2/Prescriptions
- ✓ Chapter 3 & 4: Specialist sections

Roads and Road Decommissioning:

- John McNeel, roads engineer, handed out a write-up he did on the rationale and details for road decommissioning when there are reciprocal right-of-ways (ROWs). He summarized the history of Reciprocal ROWs, the regulations we must adhere to, and explained that ROWs can be for a road or for lands. To briefly summarize, there are regulations that restrict BLM from decommissioning a road that has a Reciprocal ROW if private industry (holder of rec. ROW) wants to maintain their rights to the road.
- In relation to this Pilot project, this affects roads 38-4-1 and 38-4-1.1. A culvert may be replaced on the 38-4-1 and would not be decommissioned. Road 38-4-1.1, a small spur off the 38-4-1 road could be decommissioned. The cost of the replacing the culvert is \$11,000.
- Pulling culverts would require that in the future it is BLM's responsibility to replace and this can be very expensive.
- Ted would like to go on record that he does not think reciprocal ROW stipulations are very environmentally friendly. We should be careful where we propose roads in the future.
- Document in the EA work that has been done in the project area -> culvert work, road obliteration (Existing Condition: other roadwork is going on in the project area; Josh has this information and will get it to Ed)
- There is a miner in the area that says he has a valid mining claim; our records indicate that there are no valid mining claims in the project area. More research and verification needs to take place.
- **DECISION:** Include obliteration of road 38-4-1.1, analyze for in EA.
- Other road proposed on ridge -> to Unit 32-1
 - 2 Survey & Manage species plant sites (requires a 25 foot radius buffer) Needs location verification by botanist to validate -> Ted will work on getting this field verified by botanist this week.
 - Options if verified: forego road or plant site (bryophyte on tree)

- If no road is built in section 32, both Units 32-1 and 32-4A would be dropped.
- We could design the road to avoid the large trees, adverse haul otherwise.
- **DECISION:** Develop alternative with road, describe impacts and identify mitigation (drop road or go around trees, depending on feasibility). This would only apply if the road stays in the project. If there is no way to work around the S&M sites, the road and units will be dropped from the project.
- Haul routes – Josh will identify and put a table together.
- The road used to access Unit 26-1B, by way of Unit 35-2 (SW ¼ SW ¼ of Section 26) needs some maintenance done. Hydro suggests rolling dips for better drainage. The barricade that used to block this road was removed by someone (wildfire, or public). The road will be re-barricaded immediately after blading. It will then be re-opened temporarily for the TS and then will be bladed, water barred, and re-barricaded after hauling is completed.

Chapter 2 and proposed action details

- Ted has built tables and adjusted acres for dropping units 27-1 and 34-2.
- Nate will summarize and give a brief description of prescriptions for Ch.2
- When we manage vegetation, non-commercial treatments = Integrated Veg. Management, we need to adopt a more comprehensive approach to naming.
- In other words, we do want to just call these units fuels units, Nate is working, with the assistance of fuels specialists, to write a unique prescription for each unit.
- Nate's prescriptions are generally density management, in plantations and non-plantations. The prescriptions are similar to what was done in the Deadman's Palm EA. The EA will break apart units and provide a more clear explanation of each prescription.
- We use Forest Operations Inventory (FOI) polygons because they identify stand characteristic changes.
- Keep in mind, the FOI is not always accurate; the use of aerial photos to manually draw polygons to show separation of vegetation classes will be more accurate.
- Unit 31-3A and 31-4A – Include option to pre-bunch and bring in small equipment vs. road building and improvement.
- Loren Kellogg, OSU Professor and logging systems expert, will assist with the cost analysis for this, if we so desire.
- Evaluate three (3) logging system methods:
 1. Original proposal: ½ tractor and ½ cable (cheapest)
 2. Tractor/bunch and cable (most expensive)
 3. Cable all with no pre-bunching (middle expensive)
- John S. ran basic economic analysis. Costs are based on the package (other parts of the sale).
- EA discussion, use range \$ value/%?
- Options not chosen to be discussed in considered but eliminated section of the EA.
- Hydrologist, Mike D., is pro-cable: has expressed road upgrades and riparian reserve concerns.

- Rubber tire skidder (Kellogg's suggested option) would not require road improvements. Use of skidder would occur in the rest of unit where there are no riparian reserves.
- Other known plant sites need to be buffered (locations identified, but still need to be flagged or flagging needs to be updated).
- Project Design Features (PDFs) (from China Keeler EA) have been added to Chapter 2 and need to be reviewed for relevance and any new PDFs need to be added in.
- Chapter 2 will have a complete considered but eliminated from detailed analysis section.
- The IDT had a brief discussion on what mitigation is and when it is used vs. when document in considered but eliminated.
- There was a brief discussion on where we are with the current Resource Management Plan (WOPR) and that there is still no clear direction on what to do. Transition language and/or guidance are coming soon from the State Office.
- **DECISION:** One action alternative -> As long as showing how/why we reached the proposed action alternative (i.e. describe in detail other action alternatives considered but eliminated from detailed study and rationale for their elimination), we meet the legal requirements for range of alternatives and according to Luke, should be socially acceptable.
- Scoping comments have started to come in; we will continue to accept comments, however, at some point, they may have to be addressed post-EA.
- Internal and external comments have shaped the design direction.
- Note: non-commercial areas will be treated as pile and burn, not broadcast burning. Some units may allow for this, but many do not (this info will be incorporated into table of units)
- Commercial units: under burning will be kept as an option

Summary of action items:

- ✓ Include 39-4-1.1 road decommissioning in EA
- ✓ Take closer look at mining claims
- ✓ Botany issues – Ted on it
- ✓ PDFs need to be reviewed (Ed and Josh will make sure stuff gets updated)
- ✓ Update map to reflect changes in proposed action -> one action alternative
- ✓ Reports are due: May 27th
- ✓ Chapter 1 & 2 will be done soon