Wednesday April 28, 2021

Committee Members in attendance: George Hollister (GH), Doug Albin (DA), Michael Jones (MJ), Charlie Schneider (CS), John Andersen (JA), and Amy Wynn (AW)

JDSF Staff in attendance: Mike Powers (MP), Robert Horvat (RH), Jason Serna (JS), Lynn Webb (LW), Tori Norville (TN), Julie Rhoads (JR)

Guest/Public Attendees: Kevin Conway (State Forest Program Manager), Linda Perkins, Bill Heil, Daniel Gates, Gabrielle Levine, Dan Sweet, Chris Blencowe, Bodhi Alexander, Matilda Miyares, Nick Parrish, Phillip Walkin, Brian Lemmon, Roo Harris, Marie Jones, Mary Rose, and Lynn Pachall.

1. Call to Order and Introductions  Meeting called to order at 0902 by George Hollister. Introduced JAG members, CAL FIRE personnel, and members of the public.

2. Public Comments (P)
   • Why are trees 4’ and over being cut and how many? TN- 10% of trees in the upper diameter classes are being removed, which is around 100 trees over 500 acres.
   • Why are we cutting 4’ diameter trees, which are more fire resilient?
   • Regarding drafting in Caspar 500, will the numbers stated in the THP being adjusted because of the drought conditions? Do not understand the location of the Class II. MP- There are alternatives that we may use, such as Dust-Off.
   • Looking at the logging slash in the plan was harvested here 7 years ago, is that the level to expect on this plan?
   • What is the demonstration on this plan?
   Discussion in the group about answering questions during this session or during field visit. Would try to answer short direct questions here, and bigger issue questions on tour.
   • Are owl surveys done on Caspar? Can you start before those are done? MP- Need to complete surveys, start will be in mid-late June.
   • Are botanical surveys done? MP- They are being completed and will be available to submit next week.
   • The Forest Management Plan should address climate change. The JAG is missing having a member with this expertise. Offering to be part of the JAG.
   • Referenced Bernhart study showing lack of sustainability of the Forest Practice Rules.
   • Need to integrate the Forest Practice Rules, address cumulative impacts, and work with community, First Nations, and recent Executive Order to conserve 30,000 acres by 2030.
   • As JDSF is public land, how is the public engaged, how to get public more engaged, need organized discussion and input. Website and information difficult to find.
   • Advertising on the radio would give better information to the public for participation in these meetings. AW- It would be good to get input on plans in development rather than later.
   • Describe the Recreation Management Plan and the extent of the recreation survey. MP- Currently engaging university researchers for an updated survey. AW- There is opportunity for an improved survey with increase in technology like Strava heat maps. P- The majority of survey was done at Camp 1, didn’t capture mountain biker information. Tourism brought in a lot of
money. We need to address recreation as a form of economic stability. Impact to trails from these projects will likely decrease enthusiasm from visiting tourists. P- Didn’t consider school groups coming to study ecology. AW- The surveyor were also at Scales.

- GH- Forestry needs to be done better, and Jackson is the venue where it will happen. We’ve done a lot of the research, while not widely read, it is valuable. Not always done perfectly. Appreciate members of the public being here.

- Since the Governor is asking for multi-agency review and participation in projects, what is the chance of a one-year moratorium? GH- Reminder that the JAG is an advisory committee and serves at the pleasure of the Board of Forestry. MP- JDSF staff must comply with the Forest Management Plan (FMP). We do not have the authority to agree to the moratorium. KC- That request has been sent to Sacramento and local politicians.

- What about the 30 x 30? KC- They are in the scoping process. Public comments are being accepted. Discussed classifications of DSFs and Parks. JDSF is a working landscape.

- Who decides where THPs will be allocated? MP- Decisions are based on past management activities, FMP, and Landscape Plan.

- Odd to pick so many areas that are used frequently for recreation, seems politically blind.

- Would like to see Lynn’s stand tables before looking at the Caspar project.

- Management decisions are out of JDSF hands, need to direct input to Sacramento.

- Where do public comments go that were submitted for this meeting? MP- We compile and submit to JAG members prior to meeting. Received around 50 letters plus 500 form letters. Making this meeting open to receive public input. P- The public thought these letters would be part of the public record submitted to Santa Rosa. MP- No, that is not the normal practice. P- Maybe keep the letters for review during the next revision of the FMP. CS- Could possibly attach letters to the minutes.

- Recreation and economic on the coast could have more priority in the FMP. Wish these plans were spread out to reduce impacts to economics and recreation. Appreciate mitigations on the Caspar 500 project. GH- Let’s all stay engaged and find ways to make recreation compatible, it is our task to make this work and it is a valuable demonstration. AW- The purpose of this number of plans was to have a library of plans to stagger and choreograph to minimize impacts to recreation. With COVID, users have not been able to talk as much in the woods, a lot of misinformation has been spreading. JDSF staff has been working with recreationalists to minimize impacts. P- Caspar and Red tail are two favorite places getting destroyed in one year.

- Trying to get a copy of contract to see how trails will be restored. Some trails at Caspar were not restored.

- State and National Parks rebranded because of increase of people coming to parks during COVID. Mission adaptation to climate change and recreation use. Why hasn’t the FMP been updated? Why can’t we wait a year to see what happens with the governor’s plan?

- AW- It would be great to have the Board of Forestry again so they can hear public comment. KC- Board of Forestry would be here again in 2026 when FMP is under review. Perhaps they could come again if invited by the JAG.

- JA- Need to discuss threat of wildfire in redwood region similar to what happened in Santa Cruz last year.

- Can’t see any literature that shows taking 36” DBH will decrease wildfire threat. MP- No one is saying that. We’re combining thinning with fuel treatment. JA- Matrix forest designation means taking trees from all size classes. P- Why are you taking bigger trees? GH- We will discuss these questions in the field.
3. Field Tour

Old Berry Timber Harvest Plan

TN- Discussed the silviculture in the North Unit (Matrix/Old Forest Development Area (OFDA)), and South Unit (Late Seral Development (LSD)). The redwood and Douglas fir stand is in the stem exclusion phase, where there is almost 100% canopy cover. Little regeneration in the unit, some regen is dead. Harvest in LSD will target redwood between 18-24” DBH with option to take trees in other diameter classes, trying to grow larger trees. Will open up the OFDA unit more to encourage regeneration. Refer to Old Berry THP handout.

LW- Explained attributes of FMP management designations. OFDA might demonstrate conservation-oriented practices for small landowners. P- Does JDSF do tours to show these demonstrations? LW- Yes, except the last year due to COVID. Caspar was a well-attended tour prior to COVID. We’re always trying to open up for tours.

TN- Discussed definition of Basal Area and how to measure in a variable plot using prism. The objectives of the plan include regenerating redwood (may plant), make stand more fire resilient using slash treatments and possibly prescribed burning, grow large trees, and demonstrate three methods of forest management.

P- Are you treating tanoak? TN- not using herbicide, will remove mechanically in the selection unit. GH- why not doing treatment? TN- don’t want to create an understory of tanoak sprouts. MP- Encountering more Sudden Oak Death on the Forest, we recognize that alone will reduce hardwood stocking so we’re taking a cautious approach.

P- how long since this area was harvested and how different will this look compared to SF Caspar? TN- Last harvested in 1965, Thompson Gulch area was logged originally about 1915. SF Caspar is part of the experimental watershed. That THP looked at how canopy reduction effected stream flow and has many associated studies. That was why Variable Retention was included, which was only 8% of the watershed. P- You don’t need to demonstrate that anymore since you have so many studies there? LW- Not currently in SF Caspar watershed for that objective. AW- Where is the end of those different retention types within SF Caspar? LW- Ogli. JA- FMP dictates how much even-aged management we can do, which is 100 ac/year or 1,000 ac/decade. LW- We have a 100-year agreement with PWS. We have researchers and tours from all over the US, even Japan. JDSF and its partnerships are unique on the west coast and irreplaceable.

P- How are the fish doing? LW- It’s a rough year for steelhead. We do a lot of restoration work but cannot mitigate for ocean temperatures or rainfall. DA- Over his career has observed just by color on aerial photos where JDSF is. California is on the lower edge of coho distribution. JDSF has well maintained stream systems. P- If you walk through industrial ownership realize JDSF is all that is left, that is why public is concerned. GH- JAG has concerns and has discussions when even-aged management is proposed. These stands are moisture stressed. Will see a drought ring in these trees. Tanoak is better at getting water out of the ground than redwood. P- There are too many trees/acre. JA- There were 50 trees/ac prior to European settlement, now there are 200 trees/acre. We need to reduce competition. Reference to CZU fires. P- Feels like we should not keep using Santa Cruz as an example. JA- There is a liability issue with using prescribed fire, bill going through to use gross negligence as the standard.
GH- What are we doing along roads for aesthetics? MP- There are a few options- we could do a manual treatment on smaller stems like lop and scatter, use equipment (masticator) where there is access, pile and burn, and use prescribed fire where safe and we can manage it. We recognize that we need to do more to treat for aesthetics and fuel treatments. P- Why didn’t you burn piles on 408/409? The fuel loading is scary. Is it an issue of having enough resources? MP- Sometimes we have limitations on being able to use equipment, we prioritize areas near neighborhoods. We’re building our knowledge base on how to use prescribed fire. P- No one has been doing prescribed fire on timberland for a while. AW- They just created Fuels Management plan to address these issues. Discussion of practices at RIFI to create biochar, uses, and practicality. GH- Slash piles have amphibians, mammals, reptiles, habitat traditionally found in down logs. Don’t want a simple-minded approach.

AW- Can you discuss the target removal range- 18-24”? TN- We’re looking to grow residual trees into the next size class. Retaining trees with wildlife characteristics. Look next door at Thompson Gulch THP for example. JA- Yes, there is an example right across the road showing the difference between OFDA and LSD. TN- LSD will remove less trees, and retain more trees beneficial to wildlife, like large Douglas fir to create snags. Leave cull logs in the landscape for ‘nurse logs.’ OFDA removes more trees because of the closed stand, we want to get some regeneration going. This will be a good demonstration for small landowners on how to grow larger trees. P- You said this area not logged since 1915, thought that the FMP said nothing that old could be logged? LW- Nothing in the FMP puts a constraint like that regarding last harvest date. MP- Those areas are intended for LSD, allocation which was reviewed in the last FMP. Decided on areas that were good to enhance or improve LSD. JA- The FMP has an Old Growth Policy. MP- yes, trees established prior to 1860 that have one or more characteristics such as greater than 48”, etc. There are 300 acres of old growth stands that are not managed, but this does not preclude potential prescribed burning.

P- Would like to see what these meetings would be like if the public wasn’t here. AW- This is what the meeting is like, there is a lot of discussion. JA- Same type of discussion and walk through the woods.

AW- Is there a potential for a bypass through Caspar while this area is closed? This area connects 2 points, can we negotiate this idea? Can’t use some areas in the Caspar Experimental Watershed, but can we study trail system? MP- We can sit down and study if this would work. We would like to be able to use bypass trails to keep recreation opportunities available and to keep people out of project areas. P- Why are the trails closed longer than active operations? JS- They are closed seasonally and during operations.

Looked at Matrix vs. OFDA mark, discussed ROW. Critique from public on road design. JA- explained historical method of road building i.e.. roads in creeks and skidding downhill. New method is to build roads on or near ridges and to decommission roads along watercourses. P- Concern is taking ground out of production just to reduce logging costs. Roads are wider and more impactful than skid trails. GH- We have this type discussion anytime new roads are proposed. MP- We’ve adjusted based on JAG input. Try to get input early in the project. LW- We may do things a little differently than other landowners because of the county road and our road management corridor.

Discussed ROW mark, removal versus retention of multiple trees in the stand with deformed tops, flow studies in Caspar, tail holding in State Parks.
P- What is the process for providing input to the JAG? JA- We’re given the project information material ahead of time. GH- We often continue discussion about projects after the meeting. MP- There is plenty of time to discuss a project between the JAG meeting and project implementation.

AW- Interpretative Panels would be great here. 552 and other temporary roads revegetate. Can we make temporary road crossing pulls rideable? MP- We can look at that.

P- How much money is expected from this sale? GH- Revenue is reported through Timber Sales Manager. We don’t get into finances of CAL FIRE or JDSF. DA- Or taxes paid to Mendocino County. MP- Revenue goes to a special fund for state forests. GH- The state “borrowed” some of that. KC- That was a loan. P- Who pays for road building? MP- Projects are combined and financed through the value of timber. We sell the timber and the purchaser hires LTO. DA- JDSF has operators for maintenance. MP- We have 450 miles of road to maintain. We can do a public works contract for road or culvert improvements. We annually spend $500k-1 million on road improvements.

Old Berry THP Review Item

Doug Albin motioned that the JAG committee find the Old Berry THP complies with the Forest Management Plan. Second by John Andersen.

Yes: Unanimous
Yes, with Comment(s): N/A
No: N/A
Other: Mike Anderson absent

Caspar 500 Timber Harvest Plan

MP- We are bringing the JAG back to this project since last visit in April 2019. We’ve done more project development and have some changes. Would like to talk about some of the issues that have arisen lately. Hope to get any additional input from the JAG, consider whether current plan is still consistent with the FMP.

CS- The trail up the road is a concern for folks, should we look at that? MP- The Blue Gum Trail was an old logging road into Caspar and not an ‘official’ trail. We’re addressing erosion problems, installing multi-use bridge, and adopting the trail into official trail network. We will reopen this trail as soon as possible after operations. With recommendations from the Mendocino Coast Cyclists, we created a bypass on other side of Road 500 for access from Scales, providing a similar experience to recreational users while trail system is closed. P- Will Road 500 be closed during logging? MP- At times, yes. P- Has JDSF has had a hard time getting money for projects outside the THP process? MP- Funding for other projects - like roads - comes from the revenue generated from the timber sale contract. CS- AW + CS have met with the LTO to discuss trail restoration. P- Who designs the contract? MP- JDSF staff prepares the contract. P- Is there oversight or monitoring? Does public get to see contract? Public is concerned about mitigations and how people are held accountable. JS- Look to nearby THP Orchard for an example. MP- We have the THP and contract for guidance and JDSF staff to monitor for compliance. P- Have seen some good logging, and some not as good. JA- There is also a performance bond which holds LTO accountable to complete work according to the contract. AW- Has that always been there?
MP- Yes. There was some oversight on the reestablishment of the trail in SF Caspar. JS- There was some confusion of which party was responsible to reestablish trail. LW- Also less inmate crews available. AW- Anderson is the LTO for this plan, also worked on Orchard. Worked with Mike to shorten duration of closure. MP- In the past we would keep trail closed for winter, but now we will inspect trail and open when safe. AW- We talked with Anderson about choreographing timing. Working with Myles and Nick. GH- Jason Serna oversees logging. The purchaser and logger are obligated to fulfill contract. It’s JDSF’s responsibility to craft contract to address any issues. P- The ability to oversee contract is important, and most importantly at the end of the project. Need to balance the needs of the Forest Manager and the loggers. P- No one is blaming the loggers, just want accountability, make sure standards are met.

P- Caspar 500 area is the most used part of JDSF for recreation, and this project happened during COVID lockdown, so people were not aware. We have an issue with big trees being harvested. GH- The JAG is very supportive of recreation and getting more people into the forest. P- There is a visual and natural experience at these 500 acres because is easier to access by bikers, equestrians. People feel shut out and are pissed about the process of this THP. GH- JDSF has done a lot to foster use of the process. The uses at JDSF are special. We embrace and deal with conflicts. We find ways to make things work. In the future will see more working forests with recreation, where people can have a good experience. P- Workings forests are working all the time- they’re the best solar collectors. Other landowners hire contractors directly. JDSF needs to do a log sort.

P- Think we need to take a year off logging as proposed by Trail Stewards and Bill Lemos. Need to have a different way of looking the forest other than for timber. They’re our lungs. P- What do we do about this area now? Concerns of the community and neighbors aren’t being addressed.

P- Sounds like we have good luck with the logger doing the work here and reopening some trails as logging process happens. MP- Planning on closing and reopening trails in stages as we can safely. P- Sounds like you have taken into consideration a lot of concerns of recreation which is different than 408/409.

P- Can you provide tables of BA and volume? MP- we can provide that information.

P- People are not getting info because of COVID. When will you provide the moratorium? Is that possible? How can we help you make that happen?

Lots of side conversations and talking over each other.

AW- This is the time to get your questions answered and have a discussion.

TN- The project includes ¼ acre group openings mimicking openings created by an old growth falling. Cluster marking here last done in 1995. Look at clumps of smaller trees regenerated from that harvest. We’re removing 10% of trees larger than 48” DBH. Third party was contracted to do inventory. Marked around 100 of these larger trees.

AW- It’s like editing a fairy ring. How do you choose which to remove? TN- We want to benefit residual trees with good crowns. P- If trees can live to be 1,500 years old, why try to regenerate the stand? TN- The FMP mandates sustainable forest management. P- They’re thinning all ages and size classes. P- How long does it take to get to 48”? TN- There is no range, depends on site and sunlight. P- Why are we doing cluster, what did we learn from ‘95 cut and what will you learn from this cut? LW- Concentrated
removal in one area, want to make sure stump sprout gets sunlight. The gaps maintain refugia, variability on the landscape. This is the second cluster harvest. RH- It provides light in the openings. P- Trees are already growing and have enough light. P- There is a difference in goals and time frame. P- All of these things can work together, all of these things are compatible uses, harvesting renewable resources, recreation, sequestering carbon, fire safety. LW- We’re thinking in 80-100-year time frames. P- This area will look the same in 100 years? LW- That is the intent. GH- Part of the equation is how we put lumber into a house. Not a black and white issue. Want forest growing fast as it can. P- trees with the biggest canopy sequester the most carbon. Density related to growth rings. GH- Discussed growth rates and diameter. LW- Referenced Second Growth Champions paper looking at Scotia Flat, Fritz plot in Big River, and Railroad Gulch. P- What if we left this area alone? What is the impact of reentering skid trails? GH- People think growth rings are denser because they’re used to looking at old growth. Tree coring shows different growth rates in different sized trees. TN- Balancing all of the goals and idea are part of a working managed forest. JA- Agree, we don’t focus on any one thing, why we spend time working with bike groups, wildlife surveys, etc.

TN- We’re demonstrating sustainable forest management, eucalyptus control, and a shaded fuel break. KC- Tori is licensed by the state to put plan together, which is a 300+ page THP which considers all of those concerns. Don’t look at individual trees, look at ecosystem over 100 years. Changes to something you care about is difficult, but as a profession we look at work of our predecessors and the commitment of CAL FIRE to provide public benefits. P- Appreciate the expertise here, we all have expertise, please don’t discount our expertise and it should be considered. GH- That is why we’re here. To readdress public questions about what is being demonstrated here. Group Selection is an alternative to regeneration with even aged. Looking at coming back in and creating multi-aged stand. Continuation of concept started in ‘80. RH- We’re demonstrating timber harvesting is compatible with recreation. P- Working 15 seasons on a working forest, we always had -ologists on staff. MP- We have two environmental scientists on staff. We contract with specialists- botanists, geologists, wildlife biologists, and work with CAL FIRE Archaeologists. P- No one here is doing fisheries work. LW- We have a lot more interaction with outside agencies (CDFW). GH- We should have opportunities to have Robert Douglas on these tours and other experts. If they want to be here, great, but it is not the focus to have specialist on the JAG tour.

AW- More people on this tour than have had in the past. There are openings on JAG. P- Is it common to revisit THPs to reconfirm/rebless THPs? P- Where do indigenous people fit in? It is necessary to have their voice. They can do government to government consultations. AW- They are required to consult with tribal officers on projects. It is difficult to get information to and from tribal members. Their point of view is welcome. MP- We reach out and seek input from tribal governments, sometimes get silence. P- There are different levels of request for input to tribes, can still provide input after project is approved. P- Government to government consultation is happening right now. JAG should know, JDFS should be telling you. AW- That is what we’re here to be updated on.

TN- Updates from last JAG visit- Plan went from 563 to 533 acres to accommodate NSO circle. Adopting Blue Gum trail including $30k bridge. Didn’t previously have a buffer on Parallel Trail, at the request of the JAG we unmarked 100s of trees on the trail. Created Caspar Bypass Trail and Lindquist Loop Trails.

AW- Working on “Purple Skirt” access with approval of CAL FIRE, removing stair treads. LW- The Lindquist trail was built for education and demonstration site. Will be great interpretive trail through third growth where people can see the effects of density management.
Day one of meeting adjourned 1530

Thursday April 29, 2021

Committee Members in attendance: George Hollister (GH), Michael Jones (MJ), Charlie Schneider (CS), John Andersen (JA), and Amy Wynn (AW)

JDSF Staff in attendance: Mike Powers (MP), Robert Horvat (RH), Jason Serna (JS), Lynn Webb (LW), Jeremiah Steuterman (JS2), Julie Rhoads (JR)

Guest/Public Attendees: Kevin Conway (State Forest Program Manager), Craig Pederson (CP), Dan Sweet (DS), Chris Blencowe (CB)

1. Call to Order and Introductions  Meeting called to order at 0902 by George Hollister.

2. Review/Approve Previous Meeting Minutes

   Review of minutes from the May 13, 2020 JAG Meeting. Motion to approve by Amy Wynn and second by Charlie Schneider.
   Yes: Unanimous
   Yes, with Comment(s): N/A
   No: N/A
   Other: Mike Anderson and Doug Albin absent

3. Exparte Communication Disclosure

   GH + JA sent email to Mike suggesting tours as a result of concern about Caspar 500.

   JDSF staff email to JAG communicating about news articles about JDSF issues.

   CS + JA talked about news articles.

   CS + AW met with and discussed community concerns about Caspar 500 with Myles Anderson.

4. Discussion

   MP- The JDSF Work Plan is a draft of what work we’re doing this year. We’ll look at projects and review them in the field. Would like to do a second tour of projects that are already completed. AW- How do we make suggestions on additions to the Work Plan? Would like an Agenda Item or discussion to formally request BOF for Chief Information Officer for JDSF. Would like to see more support from Sacramento to help with outreach. GH- They possibly need more staff for increase in demonstration and outreach. With increase in use, there is an opportunity to interact with people that use the forest. Would take a lot of effort and maybe outreach to schools. Could look at State Parks model for an extent i.e. signage. More groups in the woods with JDSF experts looking at a working forest. This is an important opportunity to interact. AW- Kiosks have been a great base to start from. Story to be told in SF Caspar with interpretive panels. Would be a good way to show work being done on the forest. Work to manage expectations. CB- Public outreach and education is unique to JDSF, to expose people to
forestry along trails and local school kids. In the past, families were exposed to forestry on private property. Education and outreach are important to the industry since most is behind locked gates. Push what a unique resource it is and that it’s something to be proud of. Recognizing increased use this year, JSDF should capture that opportunity to do more outreach. JDSF can show where sustainable forestry and recreation are compatible. Even signs with year harvested and silviculture would be a good visual. CS- Hard to quantify when trails will look good again after an area is harvested, these signs would give perspective and be helpful. Compared to Sonoma County, the only places to ride are the water districts and parks. CB- And no new trails are allowed on State Parks because they’re so regulated. KC- Ways to increase outreach are being discussed in Sacramento. CB- It’s good for the whole industry. GH- Don’t think we need a change to the FMP, need to do more outreach. Need to hire more people? We need to be dedicated to that. MP- With our small staff, known for years what we need more outreach and information. Made change to staffing with Tori to get more info out there with terms understandable to the general public. AW- Does the person need to be local? MP- No, we have PIO in Sac that is dedicated resource management. CP- Information has to come from JDSF to filter through Sacramento. Sacramento needs to figure out more user-friendly media. CB- Public demands readily available information online. MP- We’re talking to legislature and higher levels in Sacramento. Messaging through Sac goes to general public, 40 million people to introduce State Forest concepts. AW- The website is better than it was 6 months ago. Local people are upset and would be the ones to see signage. KC- It would be appropriate for the JAG to write a letter describing situation and request for resources. GH- Can work on request and send to the group. CS- Original JAG had recommendation for hiring outreach position. LW- We’ve triaged, been focusing on work with professionals. Been working on a poster for the kiosks. CS- It’s been 10 years since that JAG recommendation. GH- That money would come out of the JDSF budget. Bureaucracy takes forever to get things done. When people are here that want to get things done, they will make it happen. Most people don’t even look at the website before they visit. Been putting project info sheets up but it seems that people aren’t looking. CS- Talk to State Parks about interpretive signs and programs.

GH- How do we get the attention of BOF? JA- Would be a good idea to be present (virtually) to present our case. Talk to Diaz or Jani. CP- May already be something in the FMP. KC- Don’t forget that the JAG is an advisory to the Director. MP- Because timber is the primary funding source, legislation is reluctant to allow more personnel. Might need alternative or supplemental funding. CS- See Caspar situation as preventable. Should be more proactive so don’t make that mistake again. Be forward thinking about projects, better pulse on community so we can be more proactive in addressing issues. KC- Make a motion that two people write letter. GH, AW, and CS to write letter. CB- How does request relate to Mike and the staff? MP- Would trigger conversation with Sacramento on how we could make this position work. LW- Yes, we’ve been working on short term outreach but need more long-term plans. JA- Would you see Tori’s job go to full time outreach? MP- Ideally would add staff position. CB- Maybe you could use someone with education, not necessary to use RPF. CP- One difficulty with CAL FIRE hiring is the Forester series, hard to hire anyone right now. GH- There are people out there that may love to do education and outreach and even forest tour guides.
GH- Regarding the aesthetic issue, need a working group to discuss. Maybe bring in some of the people at the tour yesterday. Involve JDSF, LTOs, interact with the public. Start at Road 409. What is the public interested in and are there ways to make it better? CS- Not sure aesthetics are the only concern. GH- Once they see aesthetic part, they don’t get past that, beyond abstract concepts, can’t get past the ‘destruction.’ CS- Don’t discount other concerns. CB- Serves the emotional response, concern beyond that, but aesthetics is primary for forest visitors, especially first-time users. People get triggered if it doesn’t look good. AW- i.e. MTS drone footage shows a clearcut but panning out are multiple recent harvests and you can’t see them. CS- Would like to see prescribed fire or BMPs for practices on roads or trails. CB- Caspar 500 will be the model. It has to be done really well. Apply to future plans on trails. AW- Don’t want to burden the staff with working groups. MP- Agree that aesthetics should be priority, room for improvement. Looking at improvements after this contract is completed. CS- We should think about customer service, manage expectation, discussing what Blue Gum Trail will look like, and ways to keep the LTO accountable. LW- We’re working with staff to look at SF Caspar and improve things there. Used to have inmate crews for that type of work. CP- Lots of people are using Boggs which completely burned down. Lots of hiking and biking going on there. Aesthetics are relative and subjective. CS- BMPs would help describe to people what to expect. CB- Work with LTO to ensure they know what we want and what to expect.

CB- Education and outreach are the most important issues of the day. MJ- Can help with research, education, and outreach, part of his job. Can organize workshops, etc. Can help mediate and facilitate conversations. GH- That is what Hopland was doing with research, education, and outreach all these years. CAL FIRE fits that niche. Could have group go out that have worked in these situations. Ask people what they see and ways to improve beyond what contract has in it. If we can handle as is, we don’t have to do it. Different perspective first time vs. frequent users. Make assumptions about wildlife, climate, when can’t get past aesthetics, can’t have intelligent conversation. Caspar 500 needs to be best display. AW- Should take MJ up on his offer. JA- Would be good to have a subcommittee to provide some response to public comments. Could talk in the field about how contracts are administered. What else are issues i.e. stumps and cull decks. GH- Comments from a lot of people about stumps Road 409. DS- Slash on 409 area is a concern. Maybe JDSF can take a different approach to high use areas. Maybe leave higher number of large trees. Educate people that there is an intention to treat these areas sensitively. CP- Clarify “stumps” – important to recognize that lots of people want to do other things on the forest i.e. 4x4 drivers look at things that work/ don’t work to block traffic. Maybe planted stumps are less ugly. GH- Starting on 409, looking at requirements, what are the issue with lop and scatter. MP- Supportive of the idea and will provide staff support. CB- Will be interesting to see how the treatment of the trail in Caspar will compare. MP- Will also be implementing Shaded Fuel Break there. Discussed returning slash back to unit.

George Hollister motioned that the JAG drafts a letter to the Board of Forestry requesting funding for increased outreach to the public and fulfil the intent of JDSF. Second by Amy Wynn.

Yes: Unanimous
Yes, with Comment(s): N/A
No: N/A
Other: Mike Anderson and Doug Albin absent
CS- Could do an ad hoc working research group for information sharing. LW- We’re working on making a brochure for Woodlands visitors. MJ- Could do a one-page handout with QR code to research link. AW- Would like to do the second tour.

Chatted with CDFW personnel moving buckets of down-migrating steelhead at Egg Take. JA- The screw trap on the Navarro River gets thousands of hits on MRC social media. CS- SF Noyo is a stronghold for coho. GH- Bring people out here to show this research.

GH- Fire and climate change are big subjects. Could do a whole day on these topics. MJ- Could host people out in the field. Can organize workshop with experts. Will collaborate with Lynn. LW- We can scout location, local slides for ppt. MJ- No one else is having this discussion in the redwood region about climate and fire. CS- None of us are experts on this subject, we’re all learning together. CB- Also could make a brief info sheet on the website talking about fundamentals and how JDSF is addressing these issues. CS- Yes, a policy neutral white paper describing what JDSF is doing. MJ- The Redwood Symposium series is due back in Mendocino. Would be perfect venue to address issues and current research. LW- SAF is in Sacramento in November. JDSF is hoping to participate and host tour. KC- Boggs was selected since it’s only a day tour. Discussion of possible venues on coast and planned summer tours for SF Caspar.

Amy Wynn motioned that the JAG forms a Forest Management Aesthetic Working Group. Second by John Andersen.

Yes: Unanimous
Yes, with Comment(s): N/A
No: N/A
Other: Mike Anderson and Doug Albin absent

Amy Wynn motioned to approve Work Plan as amended to include June SF Caspar field tour. Second by John Andersen.

Yes: Unanimous
Yes, with Comment(s): N/A
No: N/A
Other: Mike Anderson and Doug Albin absent

MP- Looked at map of current projects, those under development, and areas with potential for management. Any concern with areas we’re looking at? Want to space out the areas of contention. JA- Is the area in Boundary Creek a high recreation area? Do we have ability to go to other areas while things simmer down? MP- A lot of areas on the west side of the forest have been avoided. Not appropriate to concentrate management in other areas to avoid politics. It’s a fine line. Been doing a lot of planning to stagger THPs in different areas, juggling to avoid conflict. JA- Just the submittal of plans upsets people. CS- Part of the issue is the fact that it is in people’s backyards. CB- What years will other plans in progress planned for harvest? JS- Mitchell- 2022 and Jughandle 2023. CP- Mitchell was prepared in 2001 but pushed back as worked through the JAG. CS- Glad we’re doing the fuels management in those western plans. MP- We’re postponing project development in Hare Creek to
avoid another west side plan for the moment. AW- Can we prioritize east side projects? How do these plans affect the Bob Woods Trail? Been out to do trail work there but haven’t been able to use since it’s been closed for so long. Prioritize keeping that open. CS- Spreading plans out is beneficial for recreation, fisheries, etc. and less contentious. JA- If we can show fuel reduction is effective, maybe west side plans won’t have as many issues and we can adjust. DS- Maybe Hare Creek area we could leave more larger trees? GH- Every family forest has some favorite trees. They can be managed in the right context. When there are mandates and regulatory issues, then the demonstration is “don’t have these trees on your land!” AW- Need more incentive to keep those resources. Need to choreograph planning. LW- How to balance planning around other issues like tanoak management. MP- It’s hard because we need details of the plan from development. Like the idea of choreographing with the JAG. AW– Would like to see how Water Gulch turned out. JA- May make more sense to do adjacent plans to reduce NSO surveys, road opening, and other factors. MP- That’s why we want projects planned, so we can juggle. During project preparation we find things we didn’t know ahead. This is causing consternation with the public. AW- No amount of discussion will appease certain people. CS- Would be helpful to have this kind of map with projected dates and anticipated closure times. MP- Everything is moving but could have disclaimer boxes. This is good feedback. CS- Why did the first JAG set aside so much area for recreation in the Camp One area vs. west side? LW- Brandon and Camp 6 were having logging issues that triggered lawsuit. That trail was considered valuable. Links old growth groves from one to another. There was momentum for this area. CP- The interest in Brandon Gulch was because it was logged at the same time. Simply the proximity to the campground. Primary use on west side is hiking and biking. Secondary on east side are equestrians, hunters, camper impacts. Can’t get away from having some impacts. AW- There has been a lot of activity in this area the last 10 years, has there been many public comments? MP- We hear from equestrians which primarily use the east side. We promote the horse camp, which they appreciate. Mushroom collectors use whole forest. AW- Would this map be presented to task forces? MP- Yes, will present. CS- That is why involved with task force, to understand allocations. LW- Need to keep these allocations going, it’s really important. CP- Allocations were negotiations some science based WLPZ, old growth. Discussed allocation MTS is proposing. AW- Recreation has been ongoing in areas of recent harvests.

5. Staff Reports

*Lynn Webb* - Research and Demonstration Program Manager

- Reviewed Research Plan handout and Projects by Focus Area
- Sustainable Forestry
  - Multi cohort,
  - Hardwood management
  - Young stand dynamics
- Watershed and aquatic habitat
  - Caspar Third Experiment
  - Stream enhancement
  - Road maintenance and improvement
- Terrestrial habitat and forest structure
  - e-DNA
  - BADO demographics with USFWS
  - Bat population and species distribution
  - Pygmy forest community
• Managed redwood forests climate change adaptations
  o CFI- Ongoing since 1969, FRI
  o Terrestrial Lidar, need more work
  o CCI Grants
  o Cultivar study
  o Biochar

• Next emphasis: redwood fire mitigation. How to make managed redwood forests more fire resistant. Implement additional treatments in upcoming THPs.

JA- How big was prescribed burn? MP- 50 acres. Didn’t meet expectations, want to burn more. MJ- discussed biochar v charcoal. Want to put some plots in. MP- Reduce fuel from slash. Want to work on our practices and figure out if this is the right application for us.

CS- Have you thought about reframing or quantifying carbon sequestration numbers? LW- Some inventories don’t count lumber, some do. We have great inventories we can use, at least above ground biomass. Understand which forest structures store most carbon. Need to know where there are data gaps. Know we need to address. Don’t argue about single trees, manage the entire forest, same with fire. Look at tradeoffs with different types of stands. CP- Any post-harvest inventory to track what is better for carbon storage. Have CFI, but no specific areas studied. LW- We could do case studies with old inventory data sets. GH- Look at stands in terms of rate of sequestration based on site, age, spacing. JA- When talking to public about ‘carbon smart” forestry, talk about the whole forest, not single trees. Refer to literature looking at the big picture. DS- With active program that is important to communicate that we’re part of the solution.

CS- How to create platform for communication on this topic especially with people here yesterday. AW- Tried to encourage people from yesterday to come today. GH- We come with assumptions because we have background knowledge of plans to comply with FMP, not individual components. JA- We need numbers to back that up. GH- Also the wildlife numbers too, people didn’t know that SF Noyo is the best coho stream. CP- That info could be put up at kiosks. CB- QR code easy way to grab info. MJ- and research updates. CS- Translate science for the public. Discussed social media and public interaction like “Science Fridays” Forester Fridays, Trout Tuesdays etc.

Robert Horvat – Roads, Recreation, and Forest Sustainability Manager
• Camp One camping areas will be open end of May to mid-July when it is closed for operations at Red Tail. Last season was also shortened.
• Rec Task Force meeting is coming up, will focus on connecting trails.
• Camp One used by frequently by equestrians. Proposing turning Round House into a Horse camp with 4-5 sites making road a loop. Backcountry Horsemen doing work at Horse Camp on corrals. CP- Have you thought about Wagon for a horse camp? RH- Thought about it but there are several variables to work out. Converting Camp Host to a camp site. Will convert sites at Red Tail to regular sites. MP- We’ve been tracking use here for a long time. Know it drops off after the 4th of July, that is why we pushed off camp closures until later. RH- General increase in camping since COVID. CS- Have you considered reservation service since it’s hard for people to show up with stuff not knowing if they’ll get site. CP- People have been coming here for a long time doing it like that. KC- JDSF is not appropriate place to do that because we don’t have span of control with gates, etc. CP- It’s not worth the fee. RH- We did increase the fee to $20/site for 2 vehicles instead of $15 plus $5 for second vehicle.
• Working on 4 streamside road upgrades including culvert upgrades, reshaping and re-rocking. Includes Road 100, north end of Road 200, and 2 bridges Park Gulch and NFSF. Completed Parlin and Chamberlain last year. These are the last of the stringer bridges. Material was taken to Parlin for remanufacturing. CS- How were these projects funded? MP- JDSF Program.

• CCC’s are working on LWD project in Bear Gulch. Blencowe is working on LWD project in Hare Creek.

• Looking for grants for decommissioning Road 700 in Big River. Culverts on 720 will be replaced prior to Road 700 decommissioning. Chamberlain Creek crossing at 352 will also be replaced. AW- Road 720 has access up to trailheads, how long will they be closed? RH- High-voltage lines run down that road so will be slow, might be a month. CB- Will it be closed to bikes? RH- Yes. We will rock and chip seal Road 720. Don’t see being able to convert Road 700 to a trail because of the steepness of crossing removals. Will have an issue with decommissioning with their water system. AW- The issue is the climb out. Would like to discuss alternative routes out, potential for making reroutes, alternative routes, can work with parks maybe using Road 705.

Jason Serna- Timber Sale Program Manager

• 2021 Timber Sales
  o Red Tail- 4 bids. Sold to Conrad for $824/MBF for RW and 4.5 MMBF
  o Caspar 500- 3 bids. Sold to Willits Redwood for $872/MBF for RW and 4.3 MMBF.
  o Chamberlain TW- 2 bids. Sold to H&M Logging for $525/MBF for RW, $61/MBF for fir for 3.0 MMBF
  o Soda- 1 bid. Sold to MFP for $295/MBF for RW and 2.7 MMBF

CS- are those good prices? JS- Yes. These are bigger projects with high quality timber. Harvesting 14.5MMBF for about $5.5 million.

GH- How flexible are contracts for extra cleanup work. Important that these turn out well. MP- We’re planning to have tools in place to do that. GH- Can have little things like taking slash back into the unit. JS- Could also pile and burn.

• 2020 Sales Continued Operations
  o Bear Gulch was delayed because of COVID. Finished a couple weeks ago. Just have road work and lopping to finish.
  o Parlin TSA- tractor is finished. 2 weeks cable left. After June, road decommissioning will be done on Road 340.
  o South- Logging finished last year. This year finishing ½ the map points, lopping, tanoak treatment, and research lopping.
  o Moe- 3 yarders working until August. 2 H&M and 1 Roach.
  o Camp 17- Tractor completed last summer. Done with cable in the next couple of months.

• 2021 Sales Active Operations
  o Red Tail- start on Monday in the Pleiades Unit. Yarder coming over from Camp 17 in the next month.
  o Caspar 500- Waiting for NSO surveys and amendment and contract approval. Will do tractor this summer depending on political issues.
• PGE Exemption- will complete west end this summer. Doing 100% cleanup, remove danger trees. Recover value of the tree removal by doing the whole span vs. piecemeal. Chamberlain TW- tractor will get done this summer, cable maybe completed next year.

• Plan Preparation
  o LNF Big River and Mitchell Creek are recommended for approval.
  o Boundary Creek, Old Berry will be submitted soon. Gulch 16 will be submitted after the next JAG meeting.
  o Mitchell Creek is planned for harvest in 2022, Jughandle in 2023, and Railroad Gulch in 24-25.
  o Working around sensitive campers at woodlands. Sound restrictions will be choreographed with managers, working with Cyrus.
  o 2022 plans scheduled to go out to bid are James Creek, Mitchell Creek, LNF Big River, Gulch 16, and maybe Camp 8 South. CP- Can use LNF for education since it is mandated.

MP- On the topic of the government to government consultation- it is a formal process under the 2011 order from the Governor and has to be at the highest level. Can be initiate for any reason. Coyote Valley and Sherwood have asked for consultation to get more information on sites in the Mitchell and LNF Big River plans. Now have given them property-wide cultural resource information. AW- Are there any gaps in survey coverage? MP- We have 70 years of ownership knowledge. There are various levels of coverage including a few property-wide surveys. JA- Do you get any response from tribes during THP review? MP- No. We’ve had to engage them on projects with sites. JA- Would be bonus if they engaged more. MP- Have had one-on-one consultations in the past that have been constructive. AW- Public is saying tribes aren’t aware of projects. There are issues with their own conversations with tribe representatives, not an issue with our process. JA- Have had tribes do tours as a result of regular Native American notifications. MP- Arch information is confidential and guarded to protect those resources.

6. Field Tour

Stop 1- Bridge replacement. This is a 452-acre single tree selection. Portions harvested under shelterwood removal in the 60s and 80s. There is a 50-year age class, and another 30-40 years. The plan falls in the matrix, with OFDA at the east end of the plan. Considering fire fuels management, recreation, and coho issues. CCCs, Trout Unlimited, and Blencowe have done work in the adjacent creeks. Road 300 was installed in the post-war era as part of the easement with neighbors. Still used for recreation. Project will demonstrate how to upgrade and maintain road while protecting coho habitat. Also, will maintain aesthetics while demonstrating sustainable management. Considering fuel treatments on Road 380 as part of JDSF Fuel Break system. Will consider slash treatment, access, aesthetics near campgrounds. Will not be skidding down to 300 to avoid logging slash, debris. Will log up to 380. Plan is predominantly cable. Was tractor logged in the ‘60s and ‘80s using watercourses because of the cutbanks on Road 300. Road building will create cable yarding infrastructure. Tractor areas will be open to other mechanical treatments. There are no trails in the THP area, mostly road-based recreation. There will be no management below Road 300 besides crossing replacement. Looking at how to manage uneven aged silviculture stands without using herbicide. Cable ground harder to treat tanoak. Using cluster selection with thinning between clusters. Remove tanoak in that cluster.
CB- Are you marking the tanoak? JS2- Yes, marking all trees to fall including tanoak. JA- Can’t use herbicide? JS2- No, restricted by the FMP. See that redwood sprouts will outcompete if cut at the same time. MP- Recognizing more and more need for forest tending, monitoring implemented projects, confirm the intent of the project has been completed. JA- Doing that at MRC also, doing more tours. CB- Sort of inhouse monitoring. MP- That is something that hasn’t been done here for a long time, need a mechanism to check back in and use process to make corrections. MJ- What would the follow up be here? MP- Mechanical treatments, herbicide use on the east side. CB- Can we use herbicide on the fuel break? LW- Think that fuel breaks exempt in the FMP. CB- It will be important to treat the fuel break. JS2- We’re keeping shade to reduce brush from coming back. How to target application in fuel break will be a demonstration. Now seeing the benefits of the 2000 PCT. Allows us to come back into this area and do a selection harvest.

Stop 2- Class I culvert replacement. Consulting with CDFW and working with CGS to replace culvert at a restorable Class I. Putting in embedded 9’ culvert. There is a 7’ elevation difference between inlet and outlet. Engineering channel above the pipe. Using 3 v-notched log weirs. Want access ~800’ coho recovery off channel habitat.

GH- What is cost here. JS2- $50-100k. CB- Would include the cost in signage. MP- A new bridge is $1.5 million. JS2- Looked at different designs but had to follow FPRs. GH- Maybe grants available? Would be good for CDFW to know about costs, would be a good demo.

Stop 3- Sample mark. Single tree selection. Want to be able to access tractor ground for fuels treatment.

CB- Looking at info sheet, shows cutting 10-13 MBF/ac. GH- This area doesn’t look like that much volume. JS2- Other areas will have more harvest. CB- Are you managing the grand fir? JS2- Managing like tanoak. What can come out of clumps, what fir can come out of the falling path while minimizing stand damage.

AW- Don’t see and issue with the plan from a recreational standpoint. CS- Not sure best use of conservation funds to put into that crossing. Hard with legacy issues, fixing root cause very expensive. Have to deal with CDFW, but looks ok. JS2- Boundary Creek crossing also needs to be replaced, CDFW wants a bridge. MP- We’re looking at a grant because this crossing only accesses small portion of JDSF. Used by neighbor. CB- What kind of comments would Darcy make if she was still here? GH- Darcy liked to talk about road issues.

JA- Is this sample mark representative of the plan area? JS2- Yes, this was an area entered in the 1960s. Entering these clumps to set up for future selections. JA- Was there a PCT in this area? Used shelterwood removal cut with diameter limit. Discussion of shelterwood removal practice and history. MP- Thinking about long term management of large amount of biomass in the unit. LW- Need to continue fuels treatment. MP- Considering mastication, need to think about whether including in contract or post treatment. JA- How do you get the tanoak component <6”? JS2- Based on FRI. JA- Looking at high component of <2” tanoak that won’t show on inventory. Will there be money to knock back tanoak? Otherwise may release. JS2- Want to keep access open in tractor ground so we have option for reentry for treatments. GH- How to deal with this situation so it doesn’t happen again? Should get rid of the small grand fir. JS2- Agree more grand fir needs to be taken out. CB- If not treating with herbicide, then may be releasing suppressed tanoak, which would be worse. JA- Feel confident with plan, especially with follow-up monitoring. GH- Will you retain large madrone? JS2- Yes, retain
hardwood >24”. CB- Leaving tanoak on the ground? MP- Would be nice to grind up. JS- Would consider firewood sale. JS2- Looking at opportunities for firewood sale, access for users, relationship with fuel treatment, cost, and whole tree yarding. CB- Were there any firewood sales this year? MP- Yes, we try and do that every year. Eucalyptus will be available from Caspar. MJ- This will be a perfect burn unit, jackpot of grand fir and tanoak. JS- Including prescribed burning in the THP.

**Boundary Creek THP Review Item**

| Yes: Unanimous | Yes, with Comment(s): N/A | No: N/A | Other: Mike Anderson and Doug Albin absent |

Meeting adjourned at 1530.

End of Report