

# MINUTES

## Jackson Demonstration State Forest Advisory Group

### Fort Bragg, CA

February 23 - 24, 2009

Monday, February 23 .....	2
1. Call to Order and Introductions .....	2
2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda .....	2
3. Concerns Regarding the Use of the Google Groups Forum and Possible Serial Meetings ...	3
4. Concerns Regarding JAG Progress and Timeliness .....	4
5. Approval of Minutes.....	4
6. Landscape Committee Report .....	4
7. Caspar Creek Watershed Project (Tom Lisle) .....	8
8. Research and Landscape Committee Breakout Sessions .....	11
Tuesday, February 24 .....	12
9. Economics Committee Report .....	12
10. Recreation Committee Report.....	13
11. Landscape Committee Report .....	13
12. Research Committee Report.....	14
13. Landscape Committee Breakout Session.....	15
14. Report to the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection on the Work Plan .....	17
15. Review of Hare Creek Timber Harvesting Plan Tree Marking and JAG Consideration of Additional Recommendations to CAL FIRE .....	17
16. Road 500 Signage Update.....	17
17. Consider Recommendation Regarding How Recreation Planning is Incorporated as a Part of Timber Harvest Plan Development .....	18
18. Update on JDSF Activities. ....	19
19. Next Steps.....	19

## **Monday, February 23**

### Advisory Group Members Present:

John Helms, Chairman  
Forest Tilley  
Mike Liquori  
Brad Valentine  
Vince Taylor, Vice Chairman  
Linda Perkins  
Dan Porter  
Jere Melo  
Mike Jani  
Kathy Bailey  
Linwood Gill  
Peter Braudrick  
Mike Anderson

### Department Staff:

Marc Jameson,  
Russ Henly,  
Lynn Webb  
Helge Eng  
Rosa Hernandez  
Janet Upton

### Meeting Facilitator:

Steve Zuieback, Synectics, LLC

## **1. Call to Order and Introductions**

The meeting was called to order at 9:07 AM.

## **2. Review and Acceptance of Agenda**

A revised agenda was distributed, reflecting the following changes from the original agenda: 1) The agenda was changed to focus on the Landscape meeting on Monday, and the Research Committee on Tuesday. 2) The reports of the Economics and Research Committees were moved to Tuesday. 3) A discussion of natural forestry was added to Tuesday's agenda.

After some discussion of email discussion and the possibility of serial meetings (summarized in item 3 below), Jere made a motion to accept the amended agenda with inclusion of another topic: clarification about JAG members' concerns with and attitudes toward the Google Groups forum. The motion was seconded by Mike A. The motion passed unanimously.

Part way through the meeting, the JAG agreed to delete the 10:45 agenda item (committee breakout sessions) in the revised minutes, and instead continue on with the Landscape Committee discussion through lunch.

### **3. Concerns Regarding the Use of the Google Groups Forum and Possible Serial Meetings**

Jere registered an objection to adding the natural forestry discussion because in his opinion the discussion of this topic on the Google Groups forum amounted to a serial meeting. He felt that participating in the series of emails that have been created on the subject of natural forestry constitutes a serial meeting and is in violation of the Bagley-Keene and Brown Act. He was not willing to take part in a serial meeting and accept that part of the agenda. Jere referred to John's 2/17/09 email which stated: "to prepare for this discussion it is important for JAG members to become familiar with the extensive email correspondence on this topic provided on the Google Groups website". Jere added that he answered John's email by a "reply to all" action, indicating that a lack of understanding of who creates the emails and any correspondence between JAG members create the possibility of a serial meeting. Not really understanding the operation of Google Groups, he immediately got back a reply from Google Groups that either Google Groups did not exist and/or Jere was not authorized to use the process. That indicated to him that information from Google Groups was not really available to the public and to some members of the JAG.

Mike A distributed a copy of "A handy guide to the Bagley-Keene open meeting act 2004". Discussion ensued on how the agenda should be handled to accommodate this concern, and whether the serial meeting/Google groups issue should be discussed at this meeting or at some future time.

Mike A felt the serial meeting issue should be agendized for a future meeting, along with the natural forestry topic.

Vince suggested the serial meeting issue be agendized for a future meeting, with individual members using the Google Groups forum as they deem appropriate. He believed the Google Groups forum is consistent with the legal advise provided by CDF's legal council earlier. The JAG is now in a public meeting and is free to discuss anything it wants, including natural forestry. Members uncomfortable with discussing items from the Google Groups forum could abstain, and would operate with less information than the rest of the members wo read the forum discussion. He is uncomfortable with members not being able to make progress between JAG meetings.

John was not comfortable with the notion that not all members had access to the same depth of information.

Mike A introduced an additional topic of the JAG going in a lot of different directions it was probably not designed to go. He felt the group needed direction to focus on its mandate and move on. Linwood and Mike J expressed similar sentiments.

Vince stated that the JAG has been using the Google Groups forum for 9 months, and this is the first time this has become an issue. John pointed out this is the first time the JAG has had a series of emails, with responses. He himself would not participate in making comments, much less casting an opinion, on the Google Groups forum.

Jere quoted a passage from the handout "A handy guide to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act 2004", stating in effect that a majority of board members of a local public agency may not email each other to discuss current topics related to the body's jurisdiction, and that the prohibition applied only to communication employed by a quorum to develop collective concurrence. The document thus appeared to make a distinction between decisional communication (not permitted) and informational communication(permitted).

John stated his understanding of the material on Google Groups were primarily a posting of reference materials, not a discussion. Russ summarized his discussions with CAL FIRE legal council: Google Groups is somewhat on the edge and is risky. It has the potential for the discussion to shift from being informational to decisional. He gave an example of Recreation

Group emails that he felt were clearly decisional and therefore inappropriate with respect to Bagley-Keene.

Russ raised a second issue of whether Google Groups is a way that the JAG feels comfortable conducting its business, and whether all JAG members feel comfortable using the Google Groups forum. He distributed a second handout entitled "Opinion of Bill Lockyer, Attorney General, No. 00-906", dated February 20, 2001.

Mike J felt the Google Groups forum so far did not constitute a violation, and we need to move on with business at hand, while making sure Bagley-Kene is not being violated. Kathy felt the information on natural forestry was helpful, and it is valuable to have a forum like Google Groups for posting informational material from individuals who would not otherwise address the group.

The JAG decided to agendaize for the next meeting a clarification of how to share information electronically between JAG meetings.

#### **4. Concerns Regarding JAG Progress and Timeliness**

Steve shared his concerns that the JAG was moving too slowly, and groups were spinning. The JAG members are the appropriate individuals but the group is not focused and is moving too slowly. The majority of the JAG members appeared to agree that progress was too slow.

#### **5. Approval of Minutes**

The draft minutes of the January 2009 meeting were approved without changes.

#### **6. Landscape Committee Report**

Brad gave a report of the February 4 committee meeting. There was some divergence in the discussion at the committee meeting. Brad wanted to focus on the principles the JAG would use to make allocation of acreages of successional stages across the landscape. Mike J and Vince wanted to discuss the principles of natural forestry, which Brad felt was more of a focus on methods. They did not come to a resolution on this issue.

Brad would like to get guidance from JAG today on a goal for the landscape committee regarding landscape allocation.

##### **Natural Forestry:**

Mike J and Forest: the natural forestry discussion got shoehorned into one box of what this method could do, and this was not his intent. If we dedicate the entire Forest to natural forestry, it will still allow us to make the forest structure and habitat allocations we wish. It merely requires the manager to get to these conditions by emulating natural processes that were in place before European settlement. Natural forestry is a management process we can use.

Linwood: natural forestry should not detract from the allocation task. Natural forestry management, by virtue of being discussed as the be all and end all, pulled them away from the allocation task that needs to be undertaken. By focusing so much on natural forestry, we postpone the hard decisions of deciding on where to place reserves, where to place a dynamic balance of successional stages, etc.

Dan: natural forestry and landscape allocation are not mutually exclusive. If the purpose of natural forestry is improved forest health from a watershed perspective and increasing the proportion of bigger trees, you can still make allocation decisions for successional stages on the landscape. The real issue is the balance of successional stages each of us carry in our mind as the ultimate goal. Natural forestry is somewhat irrelevant, and there is no pressing need to make this issue more complicated than it is as long as we do not foreclose on options today.

Vince wanted to hear what are the objectives people may have, notably for timber production, that they feel may be in conflict with natural forestry principles.

Brad: they are two different issues: 1) what are the allocation questions, and 2) what methods are we going to use to reach the desired allocation. It is probably unnecessary to debate whether they are in conflict or not.

Kathy: if through natural forestry we will start managing a significant portion of the Forest for large, high-quality redwoods, that will have a tremendous impact on the allocation decisions. These two issues are linked, not independent.

Mike A: it is fine to say that we will manage for large, old redwood trees, but we need to be honest enough to recognize that means that we will at some time rotate these large old trees out (cut them down). That may not be fully recognized.

Vince: natural forestry in the extreme means we can only do what naturally would occur in a Forest. Examples are openings from windthrow or fire, individual tree mortality. We are leaning more towards active interference in order to extract timber, but in such a way that the forest restores itself as closely as possible to the conditions that would result in a natural forest. We should be able to manage a forest for a very long period of time and extract the amount of timber we need, but at the same time, not interfere with these natural processes. It is a powerful allocation principle in that, if you had no other objective for a stand such as research demonstration, recreation, the natural forestry would be the logical alternative because it gives you everything –timber production, habitat and old forest.

Mike A: if natural forestry meets three criteria, 1) it is economically feasible, 2) we agree to rotate the portions of the Forest dedicated to a dynamic balance of successional stages and 3) the research needs of the Forest are met, it should work.

John: the overall natural forestry principle is attractive. It focuses to restore holistically the health of the Forest. We should add an additional principle: in moving toward a natural forest management regime, at any point in time, the Forest has a certain proportion in early-, mid-, late seral stages and reserves. Natural forestry management should embrace all these concepts. The issue is the proportion of these seral stages. Researchers should at any one time have available to them an adequate acreage of each of these seral stages.

Jere, Brad: the JAG's primary task is to evaluate the landscape allocation in the 2008 management plan, and suggest changes if they feel it necessary.

Mike A, Linwood, Mike J: a concern with natural forestry and growing big trees is that people are not going to follow through on their promises to rotate the trees. Ultimately they are not going to accept these big trees being cut down, they want to hug them, and the natural forestry construct becomes a path of growth and no harvest.

Linwood: rotation is a somewhat unfortunate term as it is often associated with clearcutting. We should rather be talking about regenerating trees. When trees reach a certain size, they are fair game for harvest. Depending on the allocation, that size may take longer or shorter to reach.

John: if we accept the notion of having a portion of the Forest in early, mid and late seral, then it follows logically that the largest tree you will have is going to vary across the landscape. In an early seral portion, the largest tree will actually be fairly small, ranging to very large for late successional.

Vince: other than for research and demonstration purposes, there is no reason to have the Forest on a path other than to restore older Forest, leaving aside the question of whether we can do socially acceptable timber harvesting. There is no reason not to manage the Forest in the optimal way.

John: the purpose of the Forest is research and demonstration, not to manage the Forest optimally. The whole of the Forest is for research and demonstration, not just a portion of it. If we are interested in research and demonstration for a diverse audience of interests, then opportunity is enhanced if there is variability in stand structure so that at any time, from now until perpetuity, there are young stands, middle aged stands and old stands. The issue is what proportion. Use Table 7 as an attempt to make that allocation. His goal is not to optimally manage the Forest; his goal is to manage a research and demonstration forest that provides maximum opportunity.

Brad: there is a reason for managing for early seral conditions. There are early seral dependent species out there that require those conditions. If we manage the Forest for older forest conditions and continue fire control, we will end up with a reserve of late seral species.

Kathy: the connectivity/contiguity notion is an essential element in the allocation decision.

#### **Hexagon Model (Dan):**

Dan described the hexagon model as a decision support tool. The purpose of the model is to use data in a consensus setting, to fill in the gaps (there are always gaps).

The good news for JDSF is that we have an abundance of data. We have more information than most people have for any number of forests to make decisions regarding how the Forest is managed and how the landscape units are allocated.

Dan briefly discussed work on connectivity of different habitats going on in the State, primarily southern California.

The management plan section on ecosystem management discusses several key landscape issues, fragmentation, connectivity, edge effects, corridor use versus habitat permeability, and late seral dependent species.

Map 5 is a very credible first iteration for landscape allocation, The hexagon model can help the JAG enhance their understanding of these key landscape issues in a spatially explicit way, using data that staff already has developed.

In the model, the landscape is divided up into a continuous grid of hexagonal polygons. Each hexagon is scored on a variety of values. The different values assigned to each hexagon can be arbitrarily weighted by the user to reflect overarching parameters such as late seral values, connectivity and watershed function. This allows great flexibility in customizing the model to achieve a wide range of objectives. Value scores can to a limited extent be influenced by neighboring hexagons.

John: forests are dynamic since trees grow, changing the characteristics of the forest ecosystem. The mosaic of hexagons changes over time. This is a difficult research topic. It is probably important for the JAG to keep things as simple as possible, for now, and focus on current conditions.

## **Connectivity:**

Dan gave an overview of connectivity analyses. Distinguish between structural connectivity, which is a measure of spatial connectedness unrelated to species and habitats, and functional connectivity, which reflects the interaction between the landscape and species over time, the degree to which the landscape supports the dynamics of species on it.

There is a statewide connectivity planning effort under way. Part of it is driven by the California Wildlife Action Plan which was recently released. Most work has focused on central and southern parts of the State. No work has yet been done on the North Coast.

If the sole purpose is to manage for connectivity rather than diversity, the most effective approach is simply to conserve the natural landscapes. The JAG and JDSF are probably operating somewhere in the middle between these opposites. In that case it is rational to manage the entire Forest for some permeability (species can move through the Forest) and conserve and restore linkages as proposed in the management plan figure 5. Can also conserve and restore stepping stones for mobile species capable of skipping over unsuitable habitat.

Lessons learned from connectivity analyses include: be clear what it is you are trying to connect, use clear criteria and involve end users early on.

JDSF is small. The connectivity issues associated with JDSF are probably best framed in the context of Mendocino county.

The analysis is probably most useful primarily in identifying what to watch for, i.e. what are the values for which connectivity make a difference?

John: important issues for JDSF include: what is the current state of connectivity, where do we want to get to, and how do we get from one to the other? Given that JDSF is a working forest, connectivity changes dynamically. Another important insight: what was connectivity like in the area 120 years ago, and what has been impaired between then and now?

## **Extended Duration Growth Model:**

Vince passed out a handout consisting of a draft basic growth model for long-term development, several hundred years. A simulation was provide from the Brandon Gulch area. The intent is to start on a plausible long-term growth model, not provide authoritative answers yet. Growth functions are based on a statement from Steve Sillett to the effect that growth increases linearly over time. Helge suggested (but did not volunteer) incorporating a growth response to harvest.

Dan raised the idea that growth rates may change over the life of a stand. Information is best for trees up to 90 years. There may not be much information on tree growth rate between 90 years and very old. The disturbance-regime paper the group reviewed a while back showed that inverse J-shaped forest structure may not be that common in natural older forests. Disturbance, natural or human, has a big role.

Linwood expressed the opinion that it was not a JAG function to create growth model.

## **Projected Forest Landscapes (Kathy):**

Kathy discussed her review of projected forest maps by staff. Volumes and quadratic mean diameter were projected by staff under different management scenarios. Recommendations to the Landscape Committee focused on expanding the late seral development areas and older forest structure zone to create what she viewed as more robust, and included: 1) All the existing old growth groves occur in the older forest structure zone. Because there will be management in

the older forest structure zone, existing buffers around old growth groves should be expanded. These buffer zones should be restricted to late seral development silviculture. 2) The North-South connection of the OFZS is thin. 3) Given the ability of large old redwood lumber to better withstand market downturns, recommend expanding the older forest structure zone. There are areas West of the current older forest structure zone, currently not included in the older forest structure zone, that have higher quadratic mean diameter and volume than the older forest structure zone. This area is an opportunity to expand the older forest structure zone. 4) Outside of riparian areas, there is little connectivity between late seral development areas. The North Fork Caspar Creek is relatively close to Camp 3 and could be a stepping stone to a late seral development network. 5) Include Brandon Gulch and Camp 3 THP areas as late seral development areas. Caspar Creek is close to Thompson Gulch, which is close to the Woodlands, which is a late seral development area. Recommend reviewing the Caspar Creek area and study to see how it will fit in with a late seral development designation.

Linda discussed her thoughts on natural forestry and ecoforestry, and handed out a review of the book Ecoforestry<sup>1</sup>, and referred to another book by Herb Hammond. Recurring themes were resolving the conflict between the needs of ecosystems and economic needs.

There was a brief discussion of how to proceed with landscape allocation, and whether the JAG felt they had sufficient information to put pen to map.

John: two competing philosophies for management of the Forest are emerging:

- 1) apply a default level of management and then dedicate areas for research and demonstration, versus
- 2) all of JDSF is a research and demonstration Forest and then create structures to support that.

A brief discussion ensued regarding whether the JAG should get involved in model building (hexagon model and Vince's growth model), and ask staff to support such an effort. The consensus appeared to be that the JAG was not asking staff for a substantial work effort in model building and analysis.

## **7. Caspar Creek Watershed Project (Tom Lisle)**

Tom Lisle from the USDA Forest Service, Redwood Sciences Laboratory, in Arcata gave a presentation on the Caspar Creek study. Broad issues covered included what they have done there and plan to do in the future, the experiment they are proposing in the South Fork, what kinds of research can be done on legacy issues such as prior logging and its manifestations today and opportunities for research on JDSF and involving the JAG.

Since 1962, the RSL has partnered with CAL FIRE in doing research at Caspar Creek. It has been a very successful partnership with no interruptions to the research during that time interval.

The general goal of the study is to discover how forest practices are affecting downstream resources. There are a total of about 20 gauging stations throughout the North Fork and South Fork of the basin. Basic measurements taken since 1962 include high and low flows, sediment yield, suspended sediment, bed load, erosion, aquatic habitat and fish. Gully erosion from head cuts combined with steep banks and gullies below contribute about 50% of sediment measured downstream.

---

<sup>1</sup> Drengon, A.R. and Taylor, D. 1997. Ecoforestry – the art and science of sustainable forest use. New Society Publishers.

The first treatment in the late 1960's and early 1970's focused on selection harvests in the South Fork of Caspar Creek, using the North Fork as a control. The second treatment in the early 1990's focused on clearcutting in the North Fork with the South Fork as the control. The third, proposed treatment will again focus on selection harvest in the South Fork, and switch back to the North Fork as the control area. For the first treatment, peak flow and suspended sediment trended over about 10 years to the conditions before the area was logged. Much of the sediment in the first treatment may have been related to the tractor logging used instead of the silviculture.

Caspar Creek has a role in the community, the State and nationally. State wide it has had an influence of formation of the forest practice rules. In the two million acres redwood region, the approximately 1,000 acres Caspar Creek study (North Fork and South Fork) constitute the only large area where we can research the effects of forest practices on watershed function. Nationally, Caspar Creek is one of the 50 experimental watersheds in the country. One of the strengths of the USFS is the ability to do long term records on the function of watersheds, and large scale research on how they function. This is the kind of research universities cannot do, given limits of graduate students and funding.

Two years ago, 17 of the experimental watersheds, including Caspar Creek, were selected to be included in a special program, the synthesis network, based on the quality and longevity of their data and their location. One of the goals is to use these areas to monitor the effects of climate change. They received funding for climate monitoring stations at Caspar Creek. The climate monitoring conforms to the standards of the International Climate program (ICP).

The goals of the third treatment include:

- 1) investigate the effect of different intensities of selection harvest, using cable yarding, on flow and sediment transport (including two clearcuts about 20 acres each),
- 2) What are the effects of canopy removal on sediment transport and interception.
- 3) Hydrologic response from thinning to accelerate achievement of old growth conditions.
- 4) Effectiveness of restoration to decrease sediment yield.
- 5) Cumulative watershed effects over time. The Caspar Creek study is largely a study of cumulative effects over space. It becomes much more challenging to separate the effects of the Caspar Creek study from those effects still present as a result of historical earlier harvests.

Tom referred to details of the study plan distributed to the JAG earlier, and discussed their proposal for sub-basins in the South Fork. There are not enough areas for replications of treatments. Much of the decisions come down to constraints, both scientific and practical.

They plan to also selectively cut some of the uncut second growth control areas in the North Fork to compare with the previously entered areas in the South Fork. Some of the gentle ground will be tractor logged.

They would like to do all the treatments at once. That way, all the treatment areas experience the same set of rainstorms, and you avoid confounding factors from weather events. Group selection may be a part of the selection harvest menu.

DFG has four transects in the South Fork of climate stations both instream and 300 feet upstream in both directions. All of the PSW data is available online, including 150 publications.

**How get collaborative research started:**

You want to attract university level researchers, and a compelling researchable problem. You need a big land base for watershed and fisheries research. You need a place with background data, such as streamflow and sediment regime. It takes a lot of time to compile that information. You need logistical support, such as roads and security for research installations. Funding is vital. JDSF fits all these requirements.

Proposals to NSF are much more compelling if you have collaboration between different groups, such as USFS and JDSF, instead of going it alone.

### **Research administration:**

University involvement would be a plus. Examples include long term ecological research sites. These are NSF funded. Universities can attract lots of funds and research activities. Another example is the National Ecological Observatory Network (NEON).

The Learning Center is a big plus (the building belongs to PSW, it sits on JDSF lands).

### **Concerns in working with the JAG:**

Tom has no concerns. He hopes to work together to build a constituency for research at JDSF. The interests of the JAG and the Caspar Creek researchers are the same: increase the research activities and the number of players, propagate new research.

### **Contracts:**

We have agreements that run for multiple years. The agreement is up for renewal right now, which is probably not the best time financially for either the RSL or CAL FIRE. The RSL has lost several positions due to attrition. He is however confident they will be able to perform the research they have planned.

### **Discussion:**

Restoration as a research priority at Caspar Creek is difficult due to the fact that sediment sources are low and it may be difficult to measure reductions due to restoration reliably. If he were to study rehabilitation and its effects on sedimentation he would not restrict himself to Caspar Creek but rather take in the whole of JDSF. Sediments are spot effects; hydrological effects would be easier to measure over a large area like JDSF.

Long term extensions of the Caspar Creek study: place a gauging station on the main stem of Caspar Creek, to expand the scope of the study to take in the entire Caspar Creek basin. Caspar Creek is unique in that it has a good population of coho. Noyo would also be a good place.

Overarching unique opportunities for research: the silviculture of redwood forests could be expanded. Look at gradients in ecosystem function across other locations where you can do comparative research. An example is the Angelo forest, near Branscomb.

Thoughts on resource inventories in research forests like JDSF: try to set up the basic stuff to capture trends from disturbed resource conditions.

There is an effort to set up a CAL NEON effort, which we may benefit from investigating to build on JDSF's research efforts.

## **8. Research and Landscape Committee Breakout Sessions**

### **Landscape Committee:**

The following allocation priorities were identified:

Adjacency to other landowners (nonindustrial, industrial, public, conservation)  
Buffer zones  
Visual corridors  
Older forest structure zone  
Late seral habitat development areas  
Connectivity  
Dynamic seral stage allocation  
Early and mid seral stages  
Economic efficiency, costs and benefits of different allocation alternatives  
Managing for the natural age of trees  
Recreation  
Zonal representation  
Legal restrictions

Kathy raised the question of whether we should structure any changes to late seral development and older forest structure zone areas around existing large and old stands. Others thought it may be a starting point, but connectivity and different growth rates may be other factors. Distinguish between areas that are going to be relatively fixed, such as old growth groves, and other structures which will be dynamic over time. There may in fact be a good demonstration/research opportunity in restoring very young, intensively harvested forests to older forest.

The following questions/issues were raised by the Landscape Committee:

- 1) Buffers around old growth.
- 2) Designations for Brandon Gulch and Camp3.
- 3) Older forest structure zone, East-West corridor, possible embellishments.
- 4) Creation of late seral development to the end of the stream, south access to Pentagon Grove.
- 5) Why is the older forest structure zone broken off at mid-Waterfall Grove?
- 6) North Caspar Creek watershed unentered second growth control area – consider late seral development or older forest structure zone designation.
- 7) Tradeoffs (productivity) between late seral development and older forest structure zone around Pentagon grove.
- 8) Convert the upper end of Berry Gulch to late seral development/older forest structure zone rather than the North Fork of Caspar Creek.

There was some discussion of preserving the uncut second growth control stands in North Fork Caspar Creek. Vince and Kathy suggested preserving them. Forrest and Mike A disagreed, and expressed concern about potentially restricting the long term viability of the study.

Mike J suggested the distribution of seral stages on JDSF should be the same as in a pre-European natural redwood forest, with early and mid seral stages comprising 5-35 percent of the Forest area.

The meeting adjourned at 16:45.

## **Tuesday, February 24**

### Advisory Group Members Present:

Peter Braudrick  
Brad Valentine  
Mike Liquori  
John Helms  
Steve Zuieback  
Dan Porter  
Linwood Gill  
Mike Jani  
Linda Perkins  
Vince Taylor  
Kathy Bailey  
Jere Melo  
Forest Tilley

### Department Staff:

Marc Jameson  
Russ Henly  
Lynn Webb  
Helge Eng

### Meeting Facilitator:

Steve Zuieback, Synectics, LLC

The meeting started at 8:30.

## **9. Economics Committee Report**

The Committee met on February 10 at JDSF. Jere, Vince, Forest and Peter attended, with Mike and Helge on the conference line. Peter was appointed to the Economics Committee. A written report from the Economics Committee has been provided to the JAG.

The Committee felt it was appropriate that the JAG has an interest in THPs and revenue generation.

Jere reported on a staff summary of revenues and expenses for the initial implementation period. Projected revenues are \$1,264,100. Projected expenses are \$2,331,423, leaving a deficit of \$1,067,323 for the first fiscal year in the initial implementation period. Staff has estimated that in order to implement the management plan as approved by the Board needed funding is \$5.9 million. Current funding is 39 percent of needed funding.

Comments on needed funding: Vince felt \$100,000 for recreation was not enough. Peter noted the budget for seasonal forestry aides was the same in the current and the needed budget, and stated that the needed budget should have a higher level of funding for forestry aides, because they do most of the field work.

The Committee recommended that budgets be realigned to show the various cost centers or programs, for the Forest. The JAG passed a motion to this effect.

How to leverage resources to advance the science agenda: two possibilities were discussed, grants and taking advantage of a cap and trade program for carbon sequestration. The JAG supported the idea that the Economics Committee gather information on cap and trade programs for carbon sequestration. The Conservation Fund, Chris Kelly has sold carbon credits. Linwood: Craig Blencoe has done work on this for his clients. Dan suggested clarifying the baseline question for the current management plan and Option A plan (what constitutes "business as usual" above which you can sell carbon credits).

The JAG agreed the EC shall evaluate and compare economic impacts of different landscape allocation alternatives, at a less rigorous level than an Option A plan.

## **10. Recreation Committee Report**

The main focus of the report is to create a task force of users to advise JDSF. They had a meeting with Craig Pedersen, Forrest and the public. Craig discussed revisions in the plan from the last JAG meeting. Some unresolved issues remained:

1) What is the role of the Recreation Committee in interviewing and selecting the user group task force members along with JDSF staff? JAG consensus was that it is ultimately JDSF's responsibility to appoint the user group task force, but the Recreation Committee would take an active part in assisting JDSF in selecting the user group task force, sitting in on the interviews and making recommendations on JDSF's selection of user group task force members..

2) Once the user group task force is in place, what is the role of the Recreation Committee? The consensus of the JAG was that the user group task force reports directly to JDSF. The Recreation Committee would stay engaged and attending meetings. The Recreation Committee shall be a liaison between the user group task force and the JAG.

Vince: it is important that the Recreation Committee stay involved with the recreation program and report back to the JAG on progress being made.

Marc passed out a copy of the recreation work plan, dated February 13, 2009. The JAG passed a motion to approve this plan with the addition of a liaison link between the Recreation Committee and user group task force in the organizational chart, with oversight responsibility from JDSF staff.

The timeline for developing the user group task force is as soon as possible. Notices will be published by the Department asking for letters of application.

## **11. Landscape Committee Report**

Brad discussed the parameters that would be use in making allocations of seral stages (see item 8. above).

Linwood: the idea is to look at the allocations in the existing 2008 management plan, evaluate how well these parameters are being addressed, and make changes/tweaks where necessary, as opposed to starting with a blank canvas. Vince: there was not general agreement on that.

Mike L stated it is desirable to define where we are going and how we use what he have to get to where we are going. Is there something in the management plan we are trying to fix? He recommended articulating the overarching purpose of the allocation before launching.

Lynn: an EIR was developed for the 2008 management plan, with several alternatives. It can also inform the Landscape Committee in their work.

## **12. Research Committee Report**

Mike L gave an overview of the current draft of the Research Committee report, including seven criteria for mission-oriented research.

They identified three core areas (centers) of research focus: 1) sustainable forest management, 2) watershed science restoration and aquatic habitat recovery, and 3) redwood ecosystem ecology and dynamics.

Their approach is to identify research priorities that resolve problems or issues, as perceived by stakeholders. Try to avoid things that do not contribute to solving an identified management or policy issue, or problem. Try to steer research to things that have a management or policy application, rather than purely scientific issues.

This approach requires someone to identify stakeholder issues to the research community. It is unclear whether this is the job of the JAG as a whole, the Research Committee or others. They have identified a list of stakeholders to help identify issues. Options could include a workshop, invite individual speakers or the Research Committee going out to interview small groups of stakeholders and bringing back the information to the JAG.

Dan recommended avoiding creating the impression that we have a lot of money to fund a research program. Given that this is currently not the case, a workshop may not be the preferred option.

There was discussion of whether the scope of the mission was too ambitious and general. John pointed out that the above principles will not be used to turn away researchers that do not "fit". Ad hoc research will still occur, such as basic research. The mission is intended to direct CAL FIRE research funding toward desired research. We currently have a very modest budget to influence research, but expect that our funding base will grow. In the absence of a research budget, JDSF can offer the forest, infrastructure, staff and security.

John suggested a motion that the JAG adopt the three areas of research focus above as the basis for a vision for research and demonstration on JDSF, followed by guidance from the JAG on how to move forward. Jere made the motion, seconded by Mike A. There was some discussion of the motion.

Kathy: accommodate monitoring/basic research within the 3 areas of focus. Dan: communicate existing monitoring such as CFI to guide future monitoring.

Vince: this is too broad and complicated. We need to focus our plan. His main interest is not research, so he does not care that much if it fails. He is concerned that if this is so broad that it affects the landscape allocation, the issue of dedicating a lot of acres to a lot of different seral stages in order to support a very broad range of possible research that people might be doing, then he has a big problem with this kind of generalized statement, and you would have a hard time getting his consensus support for it. Otherwise he is fine with it. For example, if it was decided that we need to clearcut another large watershed for a research project, that would be a concern to him because the research program would then impact the landscape allocation.

John: his expectation would be that the research and demonstration certainly will influence the landscape allocation, because it is his interpretation that the whole of JDSF will be a research and demonstration forest. As we deal allocations, we need to consider how the allocation enables the whole of JDSF to fulfill its role as a research and demonstration forest.

Kathy: agree that the whole Forest is a research and demonstration forest, not just designated sub-areas of JDSF. Some basic research on ecosystem function could take place in old growth groves. She does not think these broad research subject areas will in a sense force an undesirable allocation.

Steve: is there a potential conflict between the research mandate above and landscape allocation?

Russ: yes, there probably is potential for conflict, arising from the issue of what range of conditions and what amounts will be available for research. Vince and others have indicated concern about the amounts of early and mid seral stages on the Forest. By limiting those substantially, you are limiting the opportunity for research in those areas. As the JAG goes forward with landscape allocation, it should go back and refresh itself about the goals and objectives in the 2008 management plan along with Board policy and statutes, in order to ascertain how well its work tracks with these policy pieces that are key to its work. Helge: conflict in landscape allocation is inevitable. Conflict is not necessarily a bad thing to be avoided. Constructive conflict may in fact result in the optimal consensus solution.

Mike J: in the past, there has been the perception that the concept of maintaining a wide range of seral stages has been used as an excuse to go out and log. Russ: the 2008 management plan table 6 and figure 5 gives fairly detailed plan for what to do where, and should give the public some reassurance that this will not happen.

Brad: it would be helpful if the Research Committee identify an estimate of what kind of successional stages are needed and their acreages. Mike L: as long as we do not know what the priority research issues are, he is not sure how to answer that. We are beholden to stakeholders, yet we have not interacted much with stakeholders.

The motion eventually passed (12 in favor, 1 abstention).

### **13. Landscape Committee Breakout Session**

There was agreement on two general ideas:

- 1) If Landscape Committee members present a consensus recommendation, individual members shall not lobby alternative opinions with other entities like the Director and the Board.
- 2) Avoid extreme recommendations.

#### **Discussion of natural forestry:**

Natural forestry was used in the discussion to describe forest processes prior to the first arrival of European immigrants.

Linwood: in his practice, they use primarily single tree selection. Grow trees 80-100 years old. Douglas-fir target diameter is 32-36 inches dbh, redwood 36 inches and up. Older trees greater than 48 inches, and old growth trees are off limits to harvest.

His idea of natural forestry would be single tree selection with a variation of age and size limitations. He is uncomfortable with a blanket prescription across the Forest. Most practitioners would like to see a range of ages 80, 100, 200 years. He would have a hard time agreeing with a blanket rotation age of 500 years across the Forest.

Marc: there is an infinite range of gray areas in the natural forestry construct, and they are not well defined nor distinguished from mainstream forest management. The term is not found in the professional/scientific literature.

Dan: natural forest management would allow for larger openings the further you go to the east. Douglas-fir and tanoak are less shade tolerant than redwood, and thus found on lower sites, drier conditions (more fire prone). If we are to emulate natural processes such as fire, that would dictate larger gaps to perpetuate Douglas-fir. Redwood: natural fire intervals were short but low severity. Canopy tree mortality was low, so small gaps and single tree selection is probably the best surrogate for natural processes.

Kathy was less comfortable with large openings on the east side of JDSF given that almost all surrounding neighbors have very large openings. We need a sub committee to write up a summary of what we collectively mean with natural forestry, to guide THP preparation and management.

There was once again discussion of whether to tackle the details of silviculture first to arrive at basic principles to guide allocation, or whether we should start on the allocation exercise to guide the formulation of the silvicultural strategies. It was decided to start the allocation exercise first.

#### **Broad brush tentative changes to the older forest structure zone on map 5 in the management plan:**

Dan, Mike J: consistent with JDSF's logic in tying together old growth areas, it makes sense to place the older forest structure zone where it will do the most good, i.e. around existing older forest.

- 1) Expand the older forest structure zone around Highway 20 along ridge lines, potentially up to Road 232A. Linwood would like more information about this area and the topography before he agrees to this.
- 2) Add the Camp 3 and Brandon Gulch THPs to the older forest structure zone.
- 3) Expand the older forest structure zone north of the Brandon Gulch THP, approximately along the ridge line, perhaps using Road 360/363 as the boundary.
- 4) Consider dedicating the uncut second growth controls in the North Fork east Caspar Creek as reserves. These areas were dedicated for single tree selection harvest in the upcoming Caspar Creek study. Contact will be made with RSL, Tom Lisle, to find out their views on forgoing harvest in these areas.
- 5) Upper Berry Gulch and Thompson Gulch as older forest structure zone. Thompson Gulch is part of the Woodlands Transfer Area.
- 6) Adjacent properties: the Jughandle State Reserve contains a staircase of different geology, including pygmy forest and the transition into conifer forest on JDSF. Kathy proposed extending reserve protection onto JDSF to capture the transition into redwood/Douglas-fir forest. This item was tabled pending further research by Kathy and staff.
- 7) Kathy: North James Creek and Chamberlain Creek get a fair amount of visitor use. She recommended managing road corridors as older forest structure zone and widen the corridors.

#### **Next Steps for the Landscape Committee:**

Mike J and Linwood will do some interpretation of future work for the JAG, on what the three zones of silvicultural focus should look like silviculturally (not spatially). Dan volunteered to help. Things to consider include:

- 1) Targeted ages and sizes.
- 2) Single tree selection and fewer gaps on the West side.
- 3) Larger openings as you go east.
- 4) Species and stand dynamics. Dan recommended outreach on this issue. Ask someone who specializes in stand dynamics how Douglas-fir and redwood differ with stand disturbance in place. He suggested Jim Agee and Steve Norman.

Russ and JDSF staff will obtain information on adjacent lands, who are the landowners and what if any land management they practice.

Contact the Redwood Sciences Lab regarding their view on the future disposition of the North Fork Caspar Creek uncut control areas.

Research the relationship between Thompson Gulch and the Woodlands Transfer Area.

Staff will generate a GIS coverage of the map allocations from today's meeting.

#### **14. Report to the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection on the Work Plan**

John discussed his presentation of the JAG work plan to the Management Committee of the Board of Forestry, on February 3. The Committee asked what priority the JAG is giving to roads and road maintenance in their deliberations up to this point.

The Committee voted to accept the work plan. John volunteered to report back to the Committee on six month intervals. The full Board stressed their desire to see timber harvesting on JDSF resume as quickly as possible.

#### **15. Review of Hare Creek Timber Harvesting Plan Tree Marking and JAG Consideration of Additional Recommendations to CAL FIRE**

Mike A reported on his analysis of the difference in logging costs on this THP, between harvesting trees down to the merchantability limit of 12 inches versus harvesting only down to a lower diameter limit of 18 inches. There was no significant difference in operating costs either way. There is a little more volume when you add the small stuff in. The small material is worth a little less per MBF and costs a little more per MBF to harvest, but revenue generation to the Forest is pretty much the same either way. Revenue to the Forest will be low. He recommended being careful about what you add on to the sale, because the profit margin will be slim.

John made a motion to put a statement in the minutes to the effect that the JAG reviewed the costs associated with the Hare Creek THP, and support the THP as written. The motion passed unanimously.

#### **16. Road 500 Signage Update**

Marc: Road 500 begins at Fern Creek Road. It runs for about a quarter mile through private property before entering JDSF. The property was held by Caspar Lumber Company and then sold to Georgia-Pacific and subsequently Ed Powers. The State acquired access rights in the

1960's through an easement. The public has been using the road for decades although the easement is silent on whether the easement covers JDSF staff only, or JDSF staff and the public at large.

Some members of the public repeatedly travels at high speeds, goes through fences on Mr. Powers' property, and dump garbage. JDSF has a long history with Mr. Powers going back to the time he acquired the property, regarding the issue of getting the public to respect his property. He would like the road gated and the public barred, so the public would have to take a nearby alternative road to access JDSF. There are no gates across Road 500, as CAL FIRE did not agree to install gates.

After lengthy negotiation, CAL FIRE agreed to put up signs on both ends of the road that warn the public they are entering private property, and ask them to drive slowly and stay on the roadway. The sign on the east is on JDSF property; the sign on the west is on Mr. Power' property. After the signs were put up, some members of the public complained that they felt the signs, featuring the words "private property" in bold letters, were having the effect of scaring people away from using the road. Russ and Vince came up with an alternative sign which the JAG approved. This sign was put up on the east end of the road segment, on JDSF. Mr. Powers did not wish to switch out the original sign on the west end of the road segment, on his property. He recently installed speed bumps of substance.

Vince: CAL FIRE's legal position has always been that Mr. Powers shall not do anything to restrict public access. The Department should pursue putting in the new sign. Kathy recommended approaching the county with a request to put up a new sign on the county road west of Mr. Powers' segment.

Vince made a motion to the effect that the JAG recommends to CAL FIRE that they explore opportunities for posting an additional third sign, stating "drive slowly - private property ahead", on the county road west of Mr. Powers property. The Department should not pursue further the existing sign on Mr. Powers' property. The motion passed (5 in favor, 4 against, 3 abstentions).

#### **17. Consider Recommendation Regarding How Recreation Planning is Incorporated as a Part of Timber Harvest Plan Development**

Vince recommended the JAG discuss with staff how to incorporate recreation enhancements as a regular part of THP preparation.

Marc: this is already incorporated in the 2008 management plan, and is to some extent being done, tying into existing facilities such as campgrounds. It is primarily an access and aesthetics issue involving silvicultural modifications and setbacks.

Vince: his idea is not so much to have this be a part of THP development, but rather do the two analyses concurrently, and coupling recreation enhancements with THPs. This is important for the interim, before a recreation plan is developed. He would like to spend some time with staff to develop some simple guidelines.

John: in JAG review, we should as a matter or routine examine opportunities for recreation enhancements. Helge: especially during the initial implementation period, it is important for JDSF to have the flexibility to minimize costs and make potential enhancements contingent on sufficient revenues being generated from timber harvest.

Russ: the user group task force should have a role in this project.

Mike A: JDSF staff has always taken recreation seriously. He recommended leaving the decisions to staff discretion unless they would like advice from the JAG. Staff is limited, and the JAG is already significantly imposing on staff with information requests.

### **18. Update on JDSF Activities.**

Marc handed out a summary entitled "Monthly Activity Report February 2009". Staff is spending a lot of time in training, which is normal for this time of year.

The Hare Creek is still pending in THP review. The Northfork Spur THP and associated Option A plan is nearing completion of the review process. The Dunlap North THP is also close to completion of the review process.

They are continuing marking in the Brandon Gulch THP, and are starting to prepare for marking in the Camp 3 THP.

New THPs under development include Dunlap South, Upper Parlin and South Whiskey Springs. South Whiskey Springs will probably be the next THP, but it is unlikely it will be ready for JAG review before the April meeting.

Dan discussed Kevin O'Hara's new research project in the Indian Fire area, funded in part by Save the Redwoods League. It is a sprout response and monitoring study involving long 'L' transects. JDSF staff will provide help with the study, such as measurements of CFI plots and photographs. CAL FIRE also has forest pathologists studying the effects of the fire. Mike J: had part of the stand at the Indian Fire not had multiple overstory removals done, there would not have been a stand left to study. This justifies the need for some differences in structure and treatments across the property.

Dan requested the JAG gets an update on fish status from the biologists involved in the fish ladder improvement project.

NMFS evaluated study methods for road erosion. JDSF constructed 10 machines and placed them at the outfall of culverts. JDSF monitored them and wrote a study report.

### **19. Next Steps**

We have an invitation to Rob York, Forest Manager at UC Blodgett Research Forest to speak at the April meeting. Questions for Rob to address:

Does research funding come from timber harvests or other sources?

How is outreach and technology transfer accomplished?

How is their landscape allocated?

How would he approach the management of a forest the size of JDSF?

What are mistakes he has made, and lessons learned?

Dan: pending discussion of the utility of a hexagon model applied to JDSF, we will table the development of a JDSF variant of the model.

The meeting adjourned at 16:40.