

NBFC **DRAFT** notes

Meeting Date: Dec. 2, 2020

Location: Online

Approved: January 28, 2021

In Attendance:

NBFC Members and Guests: Lindsay Warness (Woodgrain), Mike Billman (ODF), Nils Christoffersen (WR), Pam Hardy (WELC), Kerry Kemp (TNC), Rob Klavins (OW), John Marshall, Katy Nesbitt (Wallowa County NRAC), Laura Navarrete (USFWS), Jon Paustian (ODFW), Darlene Rochna

Forest Service: Jim Brammer, Adrian Cusick, Roy Cusick, Keith Dunn, , Bill Gamble, Brian Goff, Paula Guenther, Bob Hassmiller, Brandon Houck, Amber Ingoglia, Christy Johnson, Trevor Lewis, Nathan Poage, Paula Gunther, Brandon Hauck

Staff: Jeff Costello (Facilitator)

Significant Topics:

- Debrief of Baker City Watershed & Ellis field tours

Action items:

- Website upgrade: Put some of the science about fire-adapted forests on our website
John Marshall can help us use some of the relevant Osborne panoramas
- Reach out to DCFP re: their spatial patterning research
- Request from FS to provide input on Ellis re:
 - Fuel tx effectiveness – where they're placed, how designed, where most effective
 - tx in MMC
 - elk security: roads, forage and associated tradeoffs
- Request from FS to provide input on relevant monitoring questions
 - specifically questions that will get to the points of concern/disagreement/divergent positions and methods that people will consider reliableThis is within the CFLRP, so there is likely funding for this.
- These notes should be circulated with copies of the Kahler & Lower Jo agreements attached.

Minutes Key

- Meeting minutes do not represent collaborative agreements, unless they specifically say so. They are meant to record three basic things only: 1) the issue discussed, 2) the major points or questions raised in the conversation, and 3) the resolution, if there was one. Unless specifically stated, resolutions are only the resolutions of the people present at the meeting.
- Common Abbreviations:
 - Q: Question
 - A: Answer
 - Cmt: Comment
 - Tx: Treatment
 - Rx Fire: Prescribed Fire
- Highlighted Items are typically those that require follow-up.
(Usually suggestions for future agendas)

Meeting Notes

Preliminaries:

Agenda Review

The purpose of this meeting is entirely to debrief the field trips last month:

- The Baker City Watershed
- The Ellis Project
- o Brief overview of each project
- o Impressions & highlights of what you observed/learned
- o Identify areas where future project-level agreements might be reached
- o Although not formal projects of NBFC, how might we engage moving forward, and how might the USFS see us providing support to them?
- o Identify other key partners whose perspectives might be missing
- o Feedback on improving future field tours & presentations

Baker City Watershed review

South of Baker City

~23,000 acres

Very diverse forest types; mostly dry

to the north there are several areas of cold moist and even high-elevation white bark pine.

Project purposes

- improve likelihood of characteristic fire
- limit fire spread, especially onto adjacent lands
- minimize water supply disruptions
- improve private-public partnerships & other community relationships
- Maintain & enhance local communities & economies

Critical Values

- water supply for Baker City

Objectives

- reduce high intensity wildfire
- improve fire control ability

Proposed Actions

- Commercial & PCT

Current Status

- hoping to have scoping out in January or February

Ellis Project Review

Lizzy is the forest biologist & Ellis ID Team Lead
unfortunately, she's out sick today.

About 50 people at the field trip
(including ~10 FS, ~40 public)

~100,000 acres
both Heppner & Umatilla RDs

Elk Security is a big issue

Current Status

Hoping for a draft EIS this spring.
recently “locked” the project alternatives & data
now beginning the primary analysis.

Discussion:

We are seeking lessons learned that can be applicable across landscapes

Widespread agreement: Both field trips were well planned and professionally carried out.

Good work on managing social challenges – people with differing opinions.

Good analysis/discussion on Elk Security/Roads tradeoff will be critical

Concern: how will we bring in the voices of those not at the table?

- those who have left, and who don't buy the science
- those who haven't been here (tribes)

Suggestion: Osborne panoramas?

Could we put some of this on the N. Blues website?

Is there a way we meet some of the fire goals while ALSO meeting some of the biodiversity & spatial patterning goals? it might require more complex prescriptions.

Suggestion:

DCFP is doing some empirical research on the effects of treatment on spatial patterning
We might learn from them.

Current status:

We've been working with ICO, but sometimes it doesn't work.

The 21" Rule has limited the ability to arrange sp. patterning.

Ellis: there will be treatments in MMC.

Appreciate that there is consideration of the changing climate

- that those stands will likely be warmer and drier in the future -
- looking at more than just HRV, but what the landscape will be in the future

We looked carefully at the Kahler project, which was right next door.

There was collaborative agreement to remove young (<150 years) fir >21"
when they were within 2x the dripline of a legacy pine

- Although that was not implemented because the RO would not authorize a Plan Amendment

Perhaps we could look at the Kahler agreements, and see if we might update them,
or incorporate new science.

Rob: the 21" agreements on Kahler & Lower Jo were context specific, and none stood in isolation.

It was a web of agreements, and we agreed to them as a package.

There are things to learn from them, but don't assume we'll agree to things individually.

The 21" Rule Revision process has changed our willingness to support such things.

Q: Are there any themes we can take from those past agreements?

A: That's a big question.

Don't have the documents in front of me right now to provide a specific answer.

We're willing to respond if asked.

We should consider the elk & forest thinning together.
Thinning creates the kind of forage that elk want.
If we're going to close roads, it needs to be in the places that we have recently thinned.

There will be a nutrition map coming out soon. (like the one on the westside)
They won't use the nutrition if the roads are open.

CTUIR has been very engaged

Q: Will there be an alternative that addresses the tribal interest in elk security?

A: Science says we need at least a 250-acre minimum or 30% elk security

The project as a whole won't make 30%

but some of the sub-watersheds will, and that might be a demonstration.

Suggestion: This is probably a good thing to highlight

Also, please acknowledge adjacent properties & contributions (or detractions)

Baker Watershed

There was a lot of conversation about how to introduce fire there,
perhaps just before rain coming in
so that we can reduce the fire risk

Should the collaborative engage?

FS: it would be helpful to hear about what tradeoffs you see
that both values our overall purpose & need
as well as those that will be upset about losing their "secret spot"
How do we share that information?

Suggestion: The collaborative should take up this challenge.

Q: What are the topics on which this would be most helpful?

A: If the collaborative could weigh in on these, it would be helpful:

- Fuel tx effectiveness – where they're placed, how designed, where most effective
- tx in MMC
- elk security: roads & forage

That's what we heard the most about in our scoping

Q: Have you completed the FRCC data?

A: probably not, but it's in the works.

Rob: would like to see fuels treatments tied to fire management planning
Don't try to reduce fuels across the entire area, focus on the ignition zone.

FS request: Help designing the monitoring would be useful too.

The collaborative should probably meet to discuss this.

Use this to lean in to the stickiest questions ...

... the ones that might actually move positions & expectations

Adjourn: 2:59

Wallowa Whitman Forest Collaborative

Lower Joseph Creek Project

The mission of the Wallowa Whitman Forest Collaborative is to improve the social, economic and ecological resiliency of the Wallowa Whitman National Forest and local communities, through collaboration by a diverse group of stakeholders.

The following positions are specific to the Lower Joseph Creek Restoration Project as described in the 2014 Draft EIS. These positions are relevant to this project area, site specific conditions, and the social agreement that exists at this time through the W-W Forest Collaborative. They should not be considered precedent setting. No consensus should be assumed in any area where the document is silent.

Areas of Agreement

General Forest Acre Vegetation Treatments – The collaborative supports most general forest treatments outlined in the DEIS. General Forest Treatments do not include treatments in RHCAs, MA-15 Old Growth, and Inventoried Roadless Areas / Potential Wilderness Areas.

Stream Work – The collaborative supports the six proposed culvert replacements and other efforts to improve fish passage in the Lower Joseph Watershed.

Trees greater than 21 inches – The Wallowa Whitman Forest Collaborative supports the removal of some trees greater than 21 inches and less than 150 years of age in cases where a mid to late seral tree is within one to two drip-lines, as described in the DEIS, of an early seral tree (in particular Ponderosa pine, western larch and Douglas fir). The Silvicultural Guide and Implementation Plan will be used on site to select trees greater than 21” on a case by case basis. The Lower Joseph Creek Restoration Project is designed, in part, to promote large tree growth and late old forest structure.

Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRA) and Potential Wilderness Areas (PWA) – The collaborative recommends that the Forest Service limit potential treatments in IRAs and PWAs as these areas are defined by the Forest Service to non-commercial fuel reduction treatments and prescribed burning. Preferred techniques include hand crews with chain saws using existing roads and other approaches that reduce impact on the landscape.

Inventoried Old Growth Management Areas (MA 15) – The collaborative supports the proposed commercial and non-commercial restoration treatments in MA15 Old Growth classified as dry forest. The collaborative supports the proposed retention of snags and down woody debris and recruitment of the next generation of trees within MA 15 stands. The field demonstration tree marks of the Blue Mountain ID Team played an important role in achieving consensus. There is no consensus within the collaborative on the proposed treatments in MA 15 Old Growth classified as moist forest.

Riparian Habitat Conservation Areas (RHCAs) –The collaborative supports the proposed treatments in Cat IV RHCAs, except those that fall inside the IRA’s and PWA’s, and those with streams that feed directly into the main stems of Davis, Swamp and Joseph Creek. Potential treatments of less than 1,000 acres would be accompanied by an effective monitoring program.

The Lower Joseph Creek Project should comply with all applicable laws.

Areas of Disagreement

The Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative was unable to come to consensus regarding the issue of other undeveloped lands as defined by the Forest Service in the Draft EIS and how this issue affects the proposed actions.

The Wallowa-Whitman Forest Collaborative also does not have consensus on a specific roads alternative for the Lower Joseph Project.

Kahler Dry Forest Restoration Project
Umatilla Forest Collaborative Group Collaborative Input Statement
October 26th, 2014

The Umatilla Forest Collaborative Group (UFCG) has developed a **statement of input** for the Kahler Dry Forest Restoration Project (“Kahler Project”) on the Heppner Ranger District of the Umatilla National Forest. The UFCG is a group of diverse stakeholders independent of the Forest Service that has been working together since 2011 to advance balanced solutions that meaningfully contribute to lasting ecological, economic, and social [alphabetical] resilience in and near the Umatilla National Forest. This group respects and does not replace legally-mandated public processes for providing input to planned management activities on national forests. The UFCG has developed this statement of accordance with and following the adopted UFCG operating principles (as finalized October 13, 2013).

This document was sent to Umatilla National Forest leadership on October 26th, 2014 in response to reviewing proposed alternatives. **It is intended summarize our three years of learning and discussion about the Kahler Project and effectively capture collaborative recommendations limited to this project at this point in time.** These perspectives may be used as a starting point for future work on any similar dry forest restoration projects and may be subject to change.

This document includes the following:

- A. The UFCG’s mission, vision, and values (p. 2)
- B. UFCG-developed purpose and need statement and additional management guidelines for the Kahler Project (pp. 2-3)
- C. Descriptions of what the group supports based on a discussion held on August 28th. 2014 (pp. 4-5). The categories of activities currently are:
 1. Upland vegetation treatments
 2. Shrub-steppe enhancement
 3. Prescribed fire
 4. Noncommercial thinning
 5. Aspen restoration
 6. Wildlife considerations
 7. Riparian area thinning
- D. Appendix: Timeline of UFCG involvement in the Kahler Project (pp. 6-9)

A. The UFCG's mission, vision, and values

Mission: To develop and promote balanced solutions from a diverse group of stakeholders to improve and sustain ecological resiliency and local community socioeconomic health in and near the Umatilla National Forest.

Vision: UFCG recommendations meaningfully contribute to lasting ecological, economic, and social [alphabetical] resilience in and near the Umatilla National Forest.

Group values: Participants agree that their collaborative efforts should:

- a. Recognize the legitimacy of the interests and concerns of others, and expect that their interests will be represented as well.
- b. Work on tangible, implementable projects in the short-term while also building information and engaging in deliberative dialogue on other issues which appear to have more potential for conflict.
- c. Focus on projects: with the highest restoration need, which can demonstrate long-term benefits, which are aimed at restoring ecological resiliency and natural disturbance regimes, that provide economic benefit to local communities and reliable/stable supply of material, and that protect and restore clean water, stable soils, native vegetation and quality habitat for native fish and wildlife.
- d. Incorporate landscape-scale and holistic information and analysis before making collaborative recommendations; including specifically: adjoining private lands, grazing allotments, and wildlife habitat and corridors

B. UFCG-developed purpose and need statement and additional management guidelines for the Kahler Project

- Restore or maintain ecological resiliency and natural disturbance regimes, reduce/mitigate the risk of uncharacteristic disturbances (fire, insect, storms or weather events, and disease) to federal land and adjacent state and private lands through the use of a variety of tools such as fire, thinning and harvest.
- Protect, restore or maintain clean water, stable soils, vegetation and quality habitat for fish and wildlife.
- Provide a sustainable supply of forest products and jobs through landscape scale ecological restoration that will contribute to maintaining industry infrastructure and socioeconomic stability for local communities.

Additional management guidelines/considerations for the Kahler Project developed with purpose and need, but not formally agreed upon:

Broad strategies:

- Restore species, structure and density in the project area based on HRV
- Strategically manage fuel loads across the landscape
- Pay for (Alternate version: "Strive to pay for") ecosystem improvements through revenue from timber harvest.

- (Alternate version: “Strive to”) Design project prescriptions to be economically viable from a bidders standpoint

Wildlife:

- Enhance Big Game Winter Range Habitat
- Wildlife and fish habitat improvement
- Protect, restore, or maintain wildlife connectivity

Social considerations:

- Social resiliency: Develop collaboration among a diverse group of stakeholders
 - Create a diverse and inclusive process that leads to efficient and effective projects (reduce appeals and litigation.)
- Reduce private agricultural depredation by big game species
- Engage neighboring PVT land partners to increase the scope of work.
- Protect neighboring property values

Management considerations:

- Address and treat or strategically manage:
 - Insect and disease issues
 - Roads for resiliency and access
 - Recreation
 - Allotment grazing
 - First Foods
- Utilize best available science
- Consider variable density thinning and vegetative diversity
- Provide sufficient road access to manage forest for resiliency
- Identify other funding sources
- Consider design elements used in Glaze project

C. Group's statement as of 8/28/14

These statements were developed and voted upon at the August 28th, 2014 full group meeting of the UFCG, and affirmed at the full group meeting on October 23rd, 2014. Each statement here received full consensus from voting members present on August 28th, 2014. These were: Hans Rudolf – ODF; Mark Stern – The Nature Conservancy; Stanley Boatman – Boise Cascade; Rob Klavins – Oregon Wild; Mike Billman – Grayback Forestry; Jay Gibb – NRCS; Rebecca Dittman – NOAA; Lindsay Warness – Boise Cascade; Vince Naughton – Resident; Mark Davidson – Union County; Raymond Osipovich – Grayback Forestry; Rex Storm – Association of Oregon Loggers; Brian Kelly – Hells Canyon Preservation Council; John Buckman – ODF.

1. Upland forest thinning

The UFCG supports the following broad management approaches in the Kahler area:

- a. Restoring species, structure and density based on HRV
- b. Strategically managing fuel loads across the landscape
- c. Use of variable density thinning to help achieve vegetative diversity
- d. Addressing, and treating or strategically managing insect and disease issues

The UFCG supports the upland forest thinning treatments as described in page 5 of the draft July 2014 EIS and copied in italics below, with the exception of the specified basal area range of 30-50 sq. ft/acre, and would like to continue to provide more detailed input as the prescriptions are developed.

The Kahler project proposes to use variable density thinning with skips and gaps to reduce tree density, shift species composition, and promote old forest structure across approximately 10,000 acres within the project area. Approximately 10-15% of each proposed unit will remain untreated in "skips" that are half an acre or larger in size, and approximately 10-15% of each proposed unit will become open "gaps" that are ½ to 2 acres in size. Between the skips and gaps, units will be thinned to a variable density with an average residual basal area that is determined by the unit's plant association (generally 30-50 ft²/acre). There will be an option to remove select young (<150 years old) grand fir and Douglas-fir trees that are 21 inches or greater in diameter and interacting with the crown of a desirable leave tree. No other trees that are 21 inches or greater will be removed. Tree species preference will be for ponderosa pine and western larch. Diseased trees and those with severe mistletoe infestations will be targeted for removal where they are outside historical ranges. Trees may be removed using ground-based, skyline, or helicopter methods. Minimum snag and downed wood standards will be maintained. Thinning of western juniper (7 inches to 21 inches in diameter) may occur within commercial harvest units in order to reduce and/or eliminate its encroachment into upland forest stands and Class 4 riparian areas where it did not historically occur in order to maintain or improve the quality of upland forest habitat, the diversity and productivity of riparian plant communities, and water availability for native vegetation.

2. Shrub-steppe enhancement

The UFCG supports enhancing shrub-steppe habitats through the removal of western juniper and other encroaching conifers within the Kahler area.

3. Prescribed fire

The UFCG supports the use of prescribed fire to help meet forest restoration objectives where appropriate in the Kahler area.

4. Noncommercial thinning

The UFCG supports the use of noncommercial thinning treatments as generally described in the alternatives in the draft July 2014 EIS and copied in italics below to help meet forest restoration objectives where appropriate in the Kahler area.

Noncommercial thinning would occur on approximately 6,135 acres; 1,077 acres outside harvest units and 5,058 acres within harvest units. The noncommercial thinning treatment will cut conifer seedlings, saplings, and small poles, generally up to 7 inches in diameter at breast height (dbh), and western juniper trees less than 12 inches diameter, to help meet forest vegetation needs identified in the Kahler project's purpose and need, including tree vigor improvement for insect and disease resistance, restoring and maintaining a sustainable species composition, increasing forage for native and domestic ungulates, and addressing fire hazard by reducing ladder fuels.

For the noncommercial thinning treatments, tree species would be retained in this order of preference: ponderosa pine, western larch, Douglas-fir, Engelmann spruce, grand fir, lodgepole pine, and western juniper.

Noncommercial thinning units would be treated by hand using chainsaws, or treated by mechanical equipment such as masticators. Stands would meet or exceed minimum stocking levels after treatment, and no reforestation would be required. Created slash would either be lopped and scattered to within 18 inches of the ground surface, mechanically treated (grapple piling, chipping, or slash busting), or hand piled and burned, depending on post-treatment fuel loads and site characteristics or limitations.

5. Aspen restoration

The UFCG supports the aspen restoration activities proposed as written on page 7 of the draft July 2014 EIS.

6. Wildlife considerations

The collaborative has not yet fully addressed these issues.

7. Riparian area thinning

The collaborative has not yet fully addressed these issues.

D. Appendix: Timeline of UFCG's work on Kahler

This timeline summarizes the UFCG's work on the Kahler project, listing major discussions and milestones for quick reference. It is not a comprehensive account of our work or a statement of zones of agreement.

9-26-11

At the first project meeting, the group voted between 6 possible projects to undertake. Kahler was the second most popular project with 17 votes (Thomas Cr. had 23). The original project description provided by Carrie Spradlin, Heppner District, was:

“Kahler is a 30-40K acre dry forest project. Features and dynamics: incorporates the Wheeler Point Fire; plantations; developed roads; 6 grazing allotments; recent Doug Fir/tussock moth mortality; expected bark beetle mortality increase; predominately General Forest land allocation; portions of the Lower JD and Kahler Creek WS. Has been heavily managed in the past and is probably the driest portion of the Forest.”

1-26-12

Specialist presentations taught the group interesting ecological details including: Fire and grazing were more impactful in history. Pine grass, with its root structure 10 times that of the presenting grass, kept weeds at bay. 25% of Kahler has had prescribed burn. Kahler has an Elk Habitat Indicator of 70 – 75%. The highest and best use on the south end is fish production. Henry Creek 303-d listed for temperature. Group needs to be proactive about placing big wood, and discussing restoration in areas that have been “off-limits.” Grazing is early season, short duration. Lack of fences means off by July 15. There is current litigation. Recreation is road-based and hunting.

2-23-12

Began to discuss NEPA timeline.

3-22-12

Prescription discussion: Variable density thinning 50 – 60 sq. ft. basal area with skips and gaps and prescribed burns. Concern for local contracting ability with desired prescription.

4-26-12

Field trip. Visited a Douglas-fir stand, a 2006 thinning, a ponderosa pine stand, and the Wheeler Point fire site with 7,000 acres in the planning area (22,000 acres total).

5-24-12

Tour review with focus on riparian areas. Asked for photos of logging systems, and cost charts for logging systems.

8-23-12

Kahler Purpose and Need developed with list of “Additional Management Guidelines.”

9-27-12

Kahler timeline distributed – implement in fall 2014 – discussion on expediting with external help.

11-12

Project Initiation Letter

1-24-13

PIL Discussion: deficit in elk winter range, so big game emphasis area, private lands integration, most streams are critical habitat. Scoping planned for March. Congratulations to USFS on their hard work. It is a confusing project in many ways.

2-28-13

Scoping Letter and discussed how to comment

3-28-13

Continue discussing best means of commenting on Scoping Letter

4-25-13

(Elgin) Scoping period ended. Project will fall under new objection process. Discussed what kind and level of involvement to have. Anticipate draft alternatives and proposed action.

5-23-13

Elect to use Freedom of Information Act to see Scoping Comments. Discussion of outreach opportunities with field trips, meetings, and other means. Scott Aycock's last meeting.

7-13

Field trip. RHCAs are a large part of the conversation. Will Brendecke covers for John Day. Todd Bucholtz's last meeting; Joy Archuleta will cover for him. Hope for alternatives by Sept. or Oct.

9-28-13

Vinegar Hill fire delayed USFS work. Soil and roads focus. New info: Some moist forest type, some inaccessible units, and some aspen (note unit 9: aspen with spruce encroaching). Discussion on aspen/spruce treatment included girdle spruce, burn, other options. Full consensus – Leave that stand as is; in all other aspen stands remove encroaching conifers and fence. Discussed juniper over 21 inches and reminded that juniper has a role in the landscape.

10-24-13

Emily Jane Davis joins Elaine Eisenbraun as co-facilitator. Group discusses reacting to Forest Service alternatives when they are released and expresses desire to have detailed discussion of these. Karen Coulter presents data from her summer field work with Blue Mountains Biodiversity Project.

11-26-13

New ranger selected. In depth look at maps. S.E. portion of unit is big game classification. Rest is general forest. Emphasis on riparian areas. Concerns about quantity of helicopter units. Still developing alternatives.

1-23-14

New staff introduction: Ann Niesen – Ranger, John Evans – Project Coordinator, Ian Reid – North Fork John Day Ranger. Changes to Proposed Action. Project will use an Environmental Assessment Document. Possible Forest Plan Amendment for some over 21” trees cut at lookout and also for elk habitat which is below standard. Project implementation timeline will be delayed due to staffing transitions.

2-27-14

The ID team is currently developing alternatives and shared a map. The group had some questions about logging systems and road access to units currently slated to be helicopter; in particular, about the possibility of creating temporary roads so that ground-based systems could be used. The ranger and ID team will address those questions at the next meeting as well as provide an update and more detail on the alternatives. The group would like to be able to easily compare the alternatives using a table.

3-27-14

ID team took comments from last meeting into account and reexamined helicopter units, converting some to skyline or tractor. Currently, helicopter will be about 6% /766 acres, skyline 10%/1205 acres, ground-based 84%/10,202 acres. Tim's crew currently painting, coring, and GPSing oversized pine in preparation. Reviewed history of the group's work on this project. Reminder to group that this project was selected because we could draw on previous history of dry pine restoration elsewhere and we need to be looking out for that.

4-24-14

Discussion of Kahler limited to update on project timeline from USFS and preparation for field trip.

5-29—5-30-14

Group field trip to Kahler area. The Forest Service is developing alternatives and we need to be ready to respond to them. ICO (Individuals, Clumps, Openings) method will be used to restore historic conditions where appropriate, such as in even-aged stands. There will be significant basal area reductions, depending on the units. The low end of the residual basal area for one unit that we looked at (unit 90) is 30, and it ranges up to 55-65 in other units (like unit 79) (*NOTE: basal areas were discussed and USFS reevaluated them after this trip.) Removal of some large, young fir using Van Pelt guidelines (over 21” diameter but under 150 years age) will also occur. The FS team did extensive coring and GPSed all trees to test the guide. There will be some treatment of RHCAs (680 acres total; we visited unit 57A), using 75 and 100 ft buffers where hand felling but no mechanical is allowed, and avoiding sediment from activities. No dragging/ground disturbance will be allowed. Goal is to manage RHCAs for natural fire regime within dry forest landscape. Possible effects were modeled. They propose a Forest Plan amendment related to work on elk habitat—(need to get clarifying details on this and bigger picture of elk in the area). About 800 acres will be helicopter units where there is no feasible

road access. They will be by themselves as payment units so they can be dropped out of timber sales and done as stewardship if needed. After all other treatments, prescribed fire will be the final treatment, and safely returning fire to the landscape is a major goal.

6-26-14

Ranger Niesen and team provided additional information on Kahler and information used to plan there, including Pacfish, RHCAs, elk habitat, and marking. Kahler will move from an EA to an EIS. This should not affect the group and timeline. Mark Davidson asked group to show hands of support for the draft EIS as we have seen it so far and marking guides presented by Forest Service today. “We approve of the direction the Forest Service is taking with the potential of some tweaks along the way.” 12 present showed in favor, one abstained because needs more information. FS/NOAA/facilitators did not vote.

7-9-14

A small group meets with Ranger Niesen and several members of the IDT in Ukiah to learn more detail about certain aspects of the project: marking, RHCAs, and wildlife considerations. Group members present (Steve Cherry, Chris Perry, Brian Kelly, Lindsay Warness) are asked to confirm if they are comfortable with the USFS proceeding with their analysis based on what they have heard.

8-28-14

The group discusses the July 2014 draft EIS (which is only Chapter 2 at this stage), and develops some current consensus statements for input into the Kahler project. Several items (wildlife considerations, RCHAs) will require more discussion in the future.

10-23-14

The group reviews, clarifies the purpose of, and affirms the statement, and directs Emily Jane Davis to send it to the Umatilla National Forest. The complete Draft EIS is available but the group has not reviewed it.