

From: [Jake Winn](#)
To: [Cheyne N Rossbach](#)
Subject: Fw: Follow-up Comments to 3/2 Moist Site Pilot Meeting
Date: 07/25/2011 05:15 PM

e-mail comments from Javier and Jerry's response

Jake Winn
BLM, Roseburg District
777 NW Garden Valley Blvd
Roseburg, OR 97470
(541) 464-3275

----- Forwarded by Jake Winn/RBFO/OR/BLM/DOI on 07/25/2011 05:14 PM -----

"Jerry F. Franklin"
<jff@u.washington.edu>

04/20/2011 08:15 AM

To: Javier Goirigolzarri <rms@rosenet.net>, "Jay Carlson" <jay_carlson@blm.gov>, "Jake Winn@or.blm.gov" <Jake_Winn@or.blm.gov>, Norm Johnson <norm.johnson@oregonstate.edu>

cc

Subject RE: Follow-up Comments to 3/2 Moist Site Pilot Meeting

Javier: Apologies for not having responded sooner but things have been pretty busy!

1) What we decided to do was to follow the NWFP guidelines for management in Riparian Reserves, which means that we will propose activities within reserves when we think that they will contribute to the ecological functionality of that area. I think that many of us also feel that a major review of management in riparian buffers under the NWFP is due but that is far beyond the scope of the BLM Pilot Projects; Dr. Gordon Reeves is currently working with the Coquille Tribe in proposing significant reassessments of management in Riparian Reserves and we have felt for sometime that stakeholders and agencies ought to look at the alternative aquatic management approaches, such as that proposed in the Blue River strategy (by some of the H. J. Andrews research group).

We have been working on incorporating partial credit for Riparian Reserves in meeting our retention goals (20-30%) for Moist Forest areas harvested using variable retention harvesting (VRH) as part of the Pilot Projects on Roseburg and Coos Bay Districts. The issue here is that a fundamental goal in VRH is to have the retention well distributed through the harvest unit rather than off on the edges of it, and riparian buffers are usually associated with edges (although some do extend into central portions) of harvest units. Good distribution of retention throughout the harvest unit was deemed so important as a component of VRH in British Columbia that the official (legislated) definition of VRH required that 50% of the harvest unit be within 1 tree height of an edge or aggregate. A rule of thumb we are currently trying out on the Pilot harvest units regarding riparian buffers is that riparian buffers

might be credited for up to 1/3 of the proposed retention with a VRH unit.

2) A. Yes, we are looking at stands between 50 (actually, the ones under current consideration are actually close to 60, I think) and 100 years. We feel that this is a reasonable range to be looking at. The 100 year stand is a natural stand that has not had a previous entry and represents a relatively simple structured maturing Douglas-fir stand. (Of course, the Dry Forest stands that we are entering in Medford District are older than that, as you know, but those incorporate regeneration opportunities in the form of openings within the forest.) Sixty-year old stands have been considered for regeneration harvests by BLM in previous planning efforts and, in any case, many are certainly appropriate for regeneration harvests. Regen harvests on industrial lands are done at significantly younger ages than 60. Perhaps more to the point, from the standpoint of ecological objectives it can be argued that there can be more benefit from VRH treatments than from the generally uniform commercial thinnings that are currently being undertaken in many stands. VRH is certainly a credible alternative treatment for these stands and one that Norm and I feel ought to be demonstrated in the Pilot. As another important point the BLM has a very substantial acreage of stands moving into this age class during the next 15 to 20 years, so looking at alternative treatments seems to us to be very important. Incidentally, we do expect that the VRH treatments will produce greater yields per acre yields than thinning treatments in these stands.

We are working very hard with BLM and USFWS to insure that the prescriptions that we propose and, generically, the places that we propose them (e.g., in relation to owl circles, home ranges, etc.) can be duplicated as part of regular agency management programs. Some of the very best opportunities for this will be in the younger stands coming on line.

B. The subject of Culmination of Mean Annual Increment is one that would require extensive discussion. In fact, culmination of MAI can be delayed almost indefinitely by intensive management, which could be used to argue for very extended rotations, something that could be a part of a different timber management strategy for federal lands. But, in any case, extended dialogue would be required on this topic if you want to pursue it and a dialogue in which Norm would be a central discussant.

C. To the degree that selected stands have older structural elements they will be incorporated into the retention strategy, so they will certainly not be lost. In fact, many of the structural legacies found in these stands probably are more at risk in the kind of uniform commercial thinning that BLM has been conducted and that we have been looking at, since the logging essentially affects the entire extent of the stand. Consequently, it is very difficult, for example, to protect the legacies of large wood (cull logs left behind during the initial harvest) from major impacts of logging operation. It is very easy to incorporate protection/retention of such legacies in VRH prescriptions.

D. We expect that all of the units offered for sale as part of the Pilot Projects will be merchantable. Our VRH treatment in the 100 year old stand, for example, will have

substantial per acre volume in larger diameter material. In the younger stands our VRH treatment will result in not only larger per acre volume removed than in the case of the thinnings, but I would expect that the material would have a considerably larger mean diameter than thinnings in the same stand, since dominant trees are being harvested instead of (primarily) codominant or subdominant trees.

We would like to see some service-type activities associated with all of the Pilot Projects as well as commercial activities, since the notion of trying to conduct all important restoration activities, commercial or not, is part of our restoration strategy. That expect that to happen at Medford and will be pushing on it as part of the Roseburg Pilot, as well.

I will expect to see you in a couple of weeks during the public field review of potential pilot sites at Roseburg and we can continue the discussion of these and other topics there. I do hope that the snow is melting out -- assessing and flagging retention in stands on snowshoes is hard work for an old guy like me! Jerry

From: Javier Goirigolzarri [rms@rosenet.net]
Sent: Monday, March 07, 2011 2:00 PM
To: 'Jay Carlson'; Jake_Winn@or.blm.gov; Jerry F. Franklin; Norm Johnson
Cc: Javier Goirigolzarri
Subject: Follow-up Comments to 3/2 Moist Site Pilot Meeting

Due to family commitments, I was unable to stay at the last pilot meeting beyond 6:00 and so wanted to provide some comments to you all here.

1) On the issue of Riparian Reserves: In contrast to what was said during the several prior meetings & conversations, I was surprised to learn on Wednesday that the reserves would be excluded from any pilot units--at least that is what I think I heard. Jerry & Norm, you have consistently made the case for the desirability of heterogeneity vs homogeneity, whether in the uplands or the riparian areas. And specifically in my notes, whether a regen harvest (opening) would be within the riparian reserve--not very likely--, the retention & structure offered by the reserve could contribute to the overall retention of the unit. Unless I misunderstood, that is now not the case. Can you provide clarification for me & I'm certain the several others I have talked to since would be interested as well.

2) On the issue of stand ages to be considered for treatment: It was indicated that stands between 50 (+/- 5) and 100 (+/- 5) years were being considered for treatment, considerably younger on the upper end than the 150 max age (I think that is what has been stated) which you have prescribed as the upper end controversy avoidance or old growth age. I

am concerned about the regen harvest of stands less than 80 and about limiting the scope of treatments to no more than 100 year old stands. My reasons:

A) The demonstration area is now specifically limited to Matrix Lands. The primary difficulty Roseburg BLM has is in having enough merchantable age/size trees outside of riparian, owl circle, tree vole, etc. impacted zones to maintain a sustainable harvest program. Yes, we are talking about only 250 acres in this demonstration project, but what is the point of demonstrating the unsustainable? Let's save these less-than-80 year old stands for the normal commercial thinning program. The BLM has been successful with commercial thinning harvests where land restrictions have permitted.

B) The 80-year mark is the presumed Culmination of Mean Increment point for well (intensively) managed Douglas-fir on better sites. As Norm indicated, Myrtle Creek is not a better site. Nor have these stands been intensively managed since they are mostly naturally regenerated. The CMI will not be approached by the age of 80. So matrix lands, intended to be the principal source of long term harvest volume will be sub-optimally managed, impacting harvest levels.

C) It has been stated that these young stands contain older stand age elements. That makes these stands prime candidates for commercial thinning treatments to promote further stand structure development. Retention harvest or regeneration harvest is intended to promote early seral habitat with "skips" of treatment. Again, a regeneration prescription is an inappropriate tool here.

D) One of the many challenges faced by the BLM is conducting projects with an economic return to the Treasury and to the County. Younger stands tend to have lower volume per acre, smaller diameters, shorter trees and smaller piece size. This all translates into lower pond value sawlogs with higher logging & hauling costs, resulting in near marginal stumpage values with little positive contribution to fund the agency, the county or other work in the forest.

Yes, I too have said that only we are talking about a demonstration on 250 acres. But why demonstrate something we have no intention of replicating (regen harvest on younger stands) on a large scale? Thanks for listening. jg

Sent by:

Javier Goirigolzarri, CF
Resource Management Services
P. O. Box 237
540 SE Jackson St.
Roseburg, OR 97470

ph 541-957-9001
fax 541-957-9085
RMS@rosenet.net