

# From Collaboration Roads ZOA SubGroup

A [very rough draft of some of the preliminary topics](#)” (link to the original document)

ID Team, this document contains notes (black font) taken by the collaborative roads sub-group members for the ZOA. The ZOAs are forest-wide – not NF Smith River specific. Rob S. provided

A. **CURRENT CONDITIONS:** (Note, in this section, black text is collab sub-group and blue text is Chuck. Feel free to edit Chuck’s comments as you see fit.)

## 1. ROAD MAINTENANCE

- *Lack of road maintenance is typically a current condition.*
- I think this depends on the road system. Comparatively across the national forest system, our roads are in pretty good shape. It really depends on where it is on the landscape- ridgetop roads have a lower risk to impact the aquatics resources.

## 2. NEED TO LOOK AT OVERALL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM IMPACTS

- *Identify impacts based on the current conditions.*
- Overall, to what? Aquatics, wildlife, public access?

## 3. CURRENT PROCESS FOR ROAD LAYOUT IN TIMBER SALES COULD BE MORE FLEXIBLE

- *What is meant by this?*
- *Not framed as a current condition. Analyze existing roads for timber harvest use in comparison to building new temp roads.*
- Why? Are temp roads a problem? Many times, they are on existing old road templates. Existing temp road templates are part of the existing condition.

## 4. DON’T KNOW WHERE ALL ROADS ARE

- We know where all the roads are. We don’t know where all the legacy templates are located on the landscape and if they are causing resource impacts.
  - In some cases (NF Smith) some roads are not mapped correctly. Or the maintenance level (ML) is incorrectly identified in the transportation database – closed, open, decom. etc.

## 5. ROAD DENSITY TOO HIGH

- *Not a metric. We do not have forest plan standards for road density!*
  - *For NF Smith overall is low. Lowest in the south*
- *This likely varies across the landscape, but the Siuslaw does not intend to add to the road network. We intend to reduce the road network.*
- Too high for what? Aquatics?? We have closes/decommissioned hundreds of miles of roads. We manage for a base road network to allow us to manage natural resources. We remove roads from the landscape consistently and put them in “storage”

## 6. LEGACY ROADS ON UNSTABLE SLOPES

- *We target those roads to decom if necessary.*
- *Often a current condition. PDCs?*
- Yes. This is a legacy that the NFS has left out on our landscapes, and they need to be addressed.

## 7. ROADS CONSTRUCTED BEFORE DOGAMI REGS

- *What is this?*
- *DOGAMI Regs? Unsure of this reference. Believe it may be the NMFS document that Paul E. had discussed in the past. The USFS document that is a response to NMFS in 1993 does not set regulations*

that I am aware of. “Determining the Risk of Cumulative Watershed Effects Resulting from Multiple Activities, 1993”

- We do have roads on landscapes that are at risk of sliding and slumping.

## **8. INACTIVE SPECIES IDENTIFIED AND ACTIONS TO MITIGATE**

- *Unsure what is being stated – wildlife? Roads are more often related to aquatic impacts, but this sounds like wildlife to me.*
- Paul talks about needing to leave logs across temp roads/old templates to allow marten to cross without getting eaten by raptors or other predators.
  - Decommissioning a road within a stand can cause short-term negative impacts on some species and habitat that is should be considered a “trade-off” for potentially achieving long-term positive impacts on that species and habitat.

## **9. NO ID PROCESS**

- *Beyond the scope of the project to identify roads beyond their current ID???*
- *Are they asking about identifying roads on the landscape that are not on the “system”?*
- I am confused by this one as well. We have a comprehensive database for our system roads. James has a really good process for identifying potential legacy templates through Lidar.

## **10. Example from other collaborative: (This is their example statement of current conditions.)**

*The current transportation system includes several different maintenance classes of roads, some of which are open to everyone, and some of which are closed to the public but open for administrative uses. Road densities across the watershed are very high and exceed the Forest Plan objectives. A high percentage of these roads have not been maintained to maintenance class standards, and there is little prospect that additional maintenance funds will become available in the foreseeable future. The current transportation system has had and is having a negative impact on a wide variety of forest values and objectives, including but not limited to wildlife, birds, streams and riparian areas, fish populations, soils and erosion, and the spread of invasive species.*

- *What is the source material for this?*
- *Will the ZOA be watershed-specific or across the forest in general?*
- *Where do the stats come from? (very high)*

-

A. DESIRED FUTURE CONDITIONS: (Note, in this section, black text is collab sub-group and blue text is Chuck. Feel free to edit Chuck's comments as you see fit.)

**1. GIS LAYERS OF ALL ROADS INCLUDING DECOMMISSIONED**

- *In the corporate layer*
- *GIS coverage (zipped) sent for NF Smith River in email dated 3/18/21*
  - The project boundary (NFSmith\_ProjectBoundaryh.lyr)
  - Historic clear-cuts (stands) in the project area (HCC\_Stands\_NFSmith.lyr)
  - The Kentucky Falls Special Interest Area (KentuckyFalls\_SIA.lyr)
  - Ownership in the project area and south to the Devils Staircase Wilderness Area (Land\_Status\_BLM\_OR\_Ownership.lyr)
  - Trails for the forest (Trail\_Event\_NFSmith.lyr)
  - Riparian Reserves (Smith\_RR.lyr)
- *SmithRiverUnits.gdb.zip and boundary.lpk emailed on 1/26/22*

**2. ROADS THAT CAUSE ISSUES FOR THE ECOSYSTEM ARE DECOMMISSIONED**

- *Agreed. This is our typical planning approach. And would be part of the proposed plan for NF Smith.)*

**3. LIDAR IDENTIFICATION OF ROADS (OR OTHER APPROPRIATE TECHNOLOGY)**

- *We do this*
- *Fits more with current conditions.*
- *Can be used to look at changes over time.*

**4. DESIRED ROAD DENSITY**

- *A reduction in road density is a DFC we share.*
- *We intend to reduce road density and can calculate that metric when the miles are identified.*

**5. CONSIDERATION OF CLIMATE CHANGE IN ROAD DESIGN**

- *How? Ideas?*
  - *100-yr flow event planned in for culvert/bridge work.*

**6. MORE CONNECTION AND FLEXIBILITY BETWEEN OFFICE PLANNING AND GROUND TRUTHING PRIOR TO TIMBER CONTRACT**

- *What does this mean in specific?*
- *I think we need to clarify that this should happen during planning. Clarify the timeline of events before reaching timber sales.*

**7. MONITORING EFFECTIVENESS OF ROAD DECOMMISSIONING**

- *Does this occur?*
  - *If we get funds through grants, then monitoring is required. Less monitoring if done with internal funds*
  - *BMP monitoring every year. We select a random road decom to review. Chelsea Monks leads the efforts.*

**8. ESTABLISH AN EVALUATION AND PRIORITIZATION PROCESS**

- *We need to communicate our process and approaches again.*

**9. STANDARDS FOR ROAD DENSITY BY DESIGNATION (AMA LSR)**

- *Not a metric*
- *I am unsure where these metrics would come from.*

**10. EXAMPLE FROM OTHER COLLABORATIVE: (This is their example statement of current conditions.)**

- *Road densities are at a level that provides access for resource management, and recreational opportunity, and that can be maintained to forest service standards. Road segments that cause substantial resource impacts have been relocated, decommissioned, closed, or otherwise addressed to reduce the resource impacts.*

B. MANAGEMENT ZONES OF AGREEMENT (Note, in this section, black text is collab sub-group and blue text is Chuck. Feel free to edit Chuck's comments as you see fit.)

**1. Identify road impacts**

- *Identify legacy roads*
  - (1) This is part of our typical planning process.
- *ID roads contributing to poor water quality or habitat*
  - (2) This is part of our typical planning process.
- *Consider how effective previous road decommissioning has been*
  - (3) This is part of our typical planning process.
- *Use appropriate technology for road identification*
  - (4) Unsure what is requested.
- *Identify current open roads that are fully or partially impassible and take XYZ steps*
  - (5) Part of our typical planning process is to identify roads that are fully or partially impassible; asses needs and feasibility of reopening (or rerouting) in a low impact way, etc.
- *Monitor effectiveness of decommissioning or impacts of roads*
  - (6) Do we do this?
    - (i) If we get funds through grants, then monitoring is required. Less monitoring if done with internal funds
- *Identify common waste disposal sites and take XYZ steps*
  - (7) This used to be a part of our typical planning process. Is this getting addressed in the planning phase?
    - (i) Needs to happen , seeing too much of waste being deposited on outside edge of road, which caused failures in 96 storm event
- *ID roads with effective design standards to use as examples*
  - (8) Are there some?

**2. Physically close roads that meet specific conditions**

- *Transition roads to be decommissioned into recreation trails*
  - (1) Unsure if additional trail miles are part of the proposed P&N – not a focus to have additional trail miles outside of the Hwy 101 corridor for recreation.
- *Consider closing roads that meet a certain threshold for ecological impact*
  - (2) What is the threshold on what part of the ecology?
- *Move towards desired road density*
  - (3) Not used as a metric
- *Differentiate between conditions for fully decommissioning vs. storage for future use*
  - (4) This is part of our typical planning process.
- *Remove potential structural road hazards or public safety road hazards (utilize citizen participation to identify hazards)*
  - (5) PDCs for Hazard/Danger Trees
  - (6) Do not have organized citizen participation. Do you want to volunteer?
- *Close public access to roads at certain times of the year as needed (high fire risk)*

(7) . We tend not to do this unless extreme fire danger and weather align

(8) Used to close roads with gates to protect elk during certain parts of year then open gates for rest of year. Takes people to do that though.

### **3. Establish certain standards for future road construction**

- *Fund road maintenance and decommissioning when roads are planned (including gates at road entrance for use in high fire risk)*

Gate use is limited to admin access roads

- *Long-term road planning (consideration for connectivity)*

(8) This is part of our typical planning process.

- *Culvert design for wildlife (beavers and other species)*

(9) Current standards allow for all species

(10) Aquatic Organism Passages (AOPs) for all aquatic life stages are part of our typical planning process.

- *Set design standards for new or temporary roads*

(11) Depends on the needs of the road to make use safe.

- *Climate change considerations in standards*

(12) Culverts designed to handle 100-yr flow events and AOPs that are 1.3 to 1.5 times bankfull.

(13) Cross drains

(14) Vegetated outfall, overwash paths for storm events

- *Establish process between planning office and timber contract to make adjustment to road plans as needed*

(15) We do this

(16) Transition meetings are when this is occurring.

- *Consideration of roads as vectors for invasive species distribution and human impacts*

(17) We expect roads have been and will be vectors for invasive plant species distribution and try to plan accordingly

(18) Invasive plant species are targeted as found.