

Minutes of LSD Subcommittee Meeting, June 23, 2008, Fort Bragg
June 26, 2008

The meeting focused on developing the prescription(s) for late seral development for the Brandon Gulch THP.

Present

Subcommittee: Peter Braudrick, Linwood Gill, John Helms (ch.) Kevin O'Hara, Brad Valentine, and Dan Porter

JAG Members: Linda Perkins, Vince Taylor

Staff: Marc Jameson, Russ Henly, Crawford Tuttle

1. Subgroup statements

The 2-3 page statements distributed prior to the meeting were briefly reviewed:

- Existing stand conditions
- Potential recreational/aesthetic factors
- Old redwood forest conditions

The statement on potential wildlife in relation to late seral stand conditions will be submitted shortly.

2. CRYPTOS and MASAM Runs

The 10 CRYPTOS preliminary runs projecting growth and yield following diverse prescriptions over a 60-year period were briefly reviewed. The model showed relatively little sensitivity to different prescriptions of light, medium, and heavy partial harvests in terms of likely tree size, basal area, volume, and yields. The MASAM model, developed to project leaf area development and run using the same CRYPTOS prescriptions, similarly suggested little difference among the prescriptions tested. The three light, medium, and heavy treatments are all likely to result in rapid crown closure that will limit regeneration and the development of a younger cohort of trees.

3. Criteria to be used for identifying late seral stage

Considerable discussion led to the following criteria and conditions at age 100 years:

1) Species Composition (percent)

	<u>Redwood</u>	<u>Other Conifers</u>	<u>Hardwoods</u>
Higher Site Quality	80-90	5-15	0-10
Lower Site Quality	65-75	15-20	5-15

2) Density (trees per acre)

	<u>Site Quality</u>	
	<u>Higher</u>	<u>Lower</u>
12-28" dbh	30-50	30-50
>30 " dbh	30-50	10-30

3) Vertical structure and canopy density

Defined by species composition and density. Composed of multiple layers/strata.

4) Horizontal structure and spatial distribution

Regeneration will be coincident/incidental to stand treatments. No attempt to manage and no target.

Sprouts will, generally, be thinned to variable extent to promote random stem distribution. Whole clumps will not be removed to avoid minimize establishment of new cohort. Maintain some clumps unthinned to promote slow tree growth. Maintain some suppressed trees to give heterogeneity. Approx. 10% of clumps should be unharvested / unthinned; approx. 10% of clumps to be heavily thinned.

Mostly thin from below (suppressed and some co-dominants).

5) Snags and coarse woody debris

Not less than 2 snags >30" dbh per acre. Creation of this goal was not discussed.

Not less than 2 down logs >20" dbh per acre. Discussed falling to meet this goal if the stand is deemed deficient.

Retain potential recruitment and wildlife trees considering a range of time (short-term during period between treatments, and long-term beyond the final treatment), especially by retaining a range of tree vigor from apparently vigorous to especially those that exhibit low vigor, slow-growth, and dominant Douglas-fir that are diseased, have heavy limbs, and cavities (while recognizing safety issues).

4. Prescription Application

Emphasis on achieving late seral conditions while recognizing recreational/aesthetic constraints and the desire to enhance broad ecosystem values.

JDSF old-growth retention policy will be implemented.

Hardwoods will receive no special treatment but will be retained for wildlife and other values.

One prescription of two entries to be applied -- best estimate of "most desirable treatment".

Entry 1: Time 0 yrs. Prescribe to achieve half-way target goals. Remove ~35% of existing trees. Higher proportions of trees will be removed from those diameter classes with higher numbers of trees. Encourage prescribed burn after harvest.

Entry 2: Time +20 yrs. Evaluate stand conditions and prescribe to reach target LSD goals in additional +20 yrs (40 yr from initiation of first treatment). Remove perhaps ~35% existing trees with higher proportions from diameter classes with higher numbers of trees.

Marking guidelines to achieve diverse stand conditions and operational issues were discussed.

5. Recreational/Aesthetic Considerations

In general -- keep landings and access routes small. If possible, keep cable corridors at angles to trails to minimize visibility. Minimize likelihood of introducing invasive plants.

Roads 360, 362, and 1000 -- special attention to viewsheds and cable corridors. Clean up and plant old landings unless being reused. Design setbacks (which may receive some thinning) near campgrounds and trails to limit visual intrusion. Make trails accessible for horseback riders by providing 10' overhead and adequate width clearance. Obliterate access roads with slash to limit use and assist recovery.

6. Demonstration and Interpretation

Maintain costs and other details of administration and operation for use by other landowners.

Identify key challenges to managing for late seral development.

Evaluate silvicultural prescription for advancing late seral development.

Identify and explain effects on ecosystem components such as understory and tanoak.

Use interpretative signs and self-guiding trails.

Advertise opportunities for "outside" initiatives for demonstration (and research).

Creation of snag-top or snag redwood.

7. Schedule

Sunday, June 29: First draft of Brandon Gulch report to be posted on web and sent to all JAG members.

Sunday, July 6: Comments from Subcommittee, JAG, and public to be posted on website

Thursday, July 10: Second draft of report to be posted on website.

Monday, July 21: Comments due on Web/OR to be discussed at Santa Rosa meeting.

Sunday, July 25: Final draft report posted and sent to JAG.

Aug. 1-2: JAG to review and prepare final Brandon Gulch report.

Aug. 9: Transmit final Brandon Gulch report to BOF and CAL FIRE

John A. Helms, Chair.

June 26, 2008