Draft Meeting Minutes
Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative
Wildlife ZOA Subcommittee Meeting
3/28/22 11-12pm
Zoom

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	NAME	ORGANIZATION
Andy Geissler	AFRC	Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild
Paul Englemeyer	Audubon	Jordan Latter	
Dave Eisler	Landowner	Kailey Kornhauser	OCCFC Coodinator

Minutes: by Kailey Kornhauser

I. Overview of ZOA Process:

- This is the first wildlife ZOA subcommittee meeting. This group will continue to meet to work through priority wildlife topics and form ZOA drafts for review by the full OCCFC.
- At an upcoming meeting we will be joined by NFS IDT members who can provide a high-level overview of the NFS project to guide our ZOA discussion.
- We will be hiring a subcontractor to do reviews of relevant science literature and identify potential speakers for science panels.

II. Discussion on Wildlife Topics

- The topic of ESA listed species was added as a priority. We already had strategy species on our list of topics but this term needs to be defined.
    - Strategy species may be species of concern that do not make the ESA listings but are still important species to consider.
- Early seral habitat should be added as a topic of high priority.
- Pollinator issues were added as a topic.
- Q: How will we structure our wildlife ZOA? By species or by habitat? Or by larger topics and then get into specifics of habitat?
    - It likely makes the most sense to organize our ZOA by habitat or conditions and then create a range of possible management recommendations based on existing habitat conditions. We can also provide more detailed ZOA for specific species as needed.
    - Cmt: The 2012 planning rule refers to course vs. fine filters (in this case habitat as a course filter and species as a fine filter) we could take the same approach to the ZOA.
- It will be important to capture historical and current conditions in the ZOA. Then the next step is defining desired future conditions and management recommendations for how we get to those conditions.

- We could organize ZOA by land allocations but the topics we are covering span those boundaries.
- It will be important to identify interior forest conditions and map those areas.
    - Cmt: we will need to define interior forest, edge effects, and buffers.
    - We will also need to consider what warrants buffing and what does not.
- Q: Will this group consider both aquatic and terrestrial habitats?
    - This group will begin with terrestrial habitats and either another subcommittee will form, or this group will eventually get to work on aquatic habitat.
- Cmt: An important part of this work will require map layers from the FS and potentially other agencies.
    - We will also need to work with the FS up front to identify project areas that relate to the ZOA topics.
- It would be helpful to take the approach of identifying which resources exist in the project area and then focus on desired habitat conditions rather than starting with specific management solutions.

III. Next Steps

- Kailey will work to set up a follow-up meeting with NFS IDT members to help set the course for the wildlife ZOA discussions. We will have the opportunity to ask general questions about the direction the project is headed.
    - One question for the FS will be in regard to the protocol and training that new wildlife biologists undergo.
- The subcommittee will begin internal work on defining historical and current conditions at the next meetings.

Draft Meeting Minutes
Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative
Wildlife ZOA Subcommittee Meeting
4/22/22

Attendees:

NAME	ORGANIZATION	NAME	ORGANIZATION
Chuck Fisher	USFS	Chandra LeGue	Oregon Wild
Paul Englemeyer	Audubon	Jordan Latter	
Dave Eisler	Landowner	Kailey Kornhauser	OCCFC Coordinator
Howard Hoyt	USFS	Mycah Scoggins	USFS
Lisa Romano	USFS	Iain Emmons	USFS
Marc Barnes	IRM		

Minutes by Kailey Kornhauser

I. Overview of Subcommittee Work

- The Wildlife Subcommittee held it's first meeting on 3/28 and brainstormed topics of interest to the group. The group also considered how to best organize the ZOA topics and discussed creating ZOA for specific habitats or conditions.
- The group also considered historical, current, and desired future conditions.
- The subcommittee plans to identify and define terms like interior forest, edge effect, and buffers.
- When the subcommittee caters ZOA to specific projects they will want to identify which resources exist in a project area and then focus on desired habitat conditions rather than specific management solutions.
- The subcommittee will do a review of available science.

II. NFS Project Status

- The FS reminded collaborative members to sign up for project updates on their website.
- They will be scoping this summer, that is when the NEPA process will officially launch.
- The IDT has been preparing presentations for each resource and will be sharing those to subcommittees or the full OCCFC as it makes sense.
- There is a recreation component to NFS, Kentucky Falls Special Interest is in the project area.

III. Training for New Wildlife Biologists:

- Iain Emmons is coming from the BLM in Utah but has previous experience working on Spotted Owl. He is currently getting up to speed on the FS NEPA process and getting out

into the NFS project area. Iain went over past comments and issues from previous NEPA and is working with Mycah to be prepared to engage with the collaborate on this project.

IV. Discussion

- The FS indicated that it would be helpful to get feedback from this group on flying squirrel, marten, MAMU, and NSO.
- There was agreement that it would be useful to organize ZOA by habitat. Howard has been conducting stand exams in the project area since 2016 and has identified areas of opportunity and limitations on the landscape.

V. Vegetation Management Presentation (Howard Hoyt):

- The NFS project area is remote with many steep slopes. The project area includes 38,497 acres, 11,373 of which were previously clear cut and are now young stands.
- Howard has looked at landscape patterns for rationale treatment to restore natural landscape patterns.
- In general, the proposed action will be to prescribe treatments that make the past clear cuts fit into where the stands would have naturally been, and to create larger patch size.
    - This will involve targeting treatments based on the biophysical environment and identifying areas that we can or cannot treat.
- Q: What timeline is considered for how long it takes for landscape to return to "natural"?
    - The goal is to lead to larger patch size that become more natural over time, initially there will be an impact to match density to what would be similar to natural stands adjacent.
- Q: Will there be lower density in wet or dry areas?
    - The wet western hemlock which makes up about 267 acres would have been lower conifer density naturally. Moist western hemlock which makes up 3401 acres, would have medium density. Dry western hemlock makes up 1328 acres of the project rea.
- They are not planning to model each stand individually but instead create three general prescriptions with flexibility to match natural landscape patterns
    - There are 43 acres for potential regeneration harvest, stands are 40 years old and would need regional forester permission.
    - There are 447 acres of potential second entry.
    - The landscape pattern is different than Indian or deadwood where there were stand replacing fires, here there is more frequent fire that burned south slopes, and they will try to emulate those treatments on some slopes
- Issues and opportunities

    - There is lower site productivity comparatively, because the landscape is very steep without benches and rocky headwalls which is better for tree species diversity.
    - There are previous stability issues for roads and gap placements.
    - MAMU seasonal restrictions on up to 2,291 acres of the project area.
    - Proposing treatment on potentially 4,996 acres.
- For future discussion: we could really talk about connectivity in terms of the maps that Howard presented.

VI. Wildlife Presentation (Chuck Fisher):

- The units in the project area are younger and some need second entry. There are large amounts of hardwood, dense canopy cover. The habitat assessment has stand-by-stand descriptions
    - They want to develop a multi-age forest with large diameter trees with large blocks of interior forest.
    - 307139 is the only stand that overlaps proposed marten habitat buffer.
    - 307080, 307035, 701117 have been identified as stands of concern.
- Flying squirrel concerns:
    - Young stands are refuge for young flying squirrel, thinning below 40 could allow faster rate of expanded habitat. Multi age stands provide better coverage for flying squirrels.
    - Thinning below 40% canopy cover accelerate development but lose habitat immediately.
    - Stands adjacent to each other could be good candidates for multiple types of treatment in one area and monitoring impacts of different treatments.
    - For more information on the thinning effects on spotted owl prey (Wilson & Forsman, 2013).
- A subgroup will be looking at stability with roads hydro silviculture tied together

VII. Discussion Continued:

- Cmt: It is challenging to get stands to a condition suitable for NSO by thinning but we also do not want to create issues for flying squirrel habitat.
- Q: A habitat model indicates where NSO are but how does the IDT determine where to do prescriptions?
    - It is important to model treatments to determine if they will result in the expected habitat.
    - Owl surveys have not been used in the past but it could allow for more tradeoffs if we know where NSO are on the landscape.
    - OSU does an NSO demography study for the past 20 years but they are moving to a higher-level review.
    - It could be useful to hear from the District Ranger on how decisions to survey or model are made.

OCCFC Wildlife ZOA Subcommittee
6/7/22

Participants: Kelly Fuller, Chandra LeGue, Marc Barnes, Andy Geissler, Jordan Latter, Kailey Kornhauser

1. Overview of where we are at:

- This group has met a few times to develop current and desired future conditions and management recommendations.
- The group recently met with IDT specialists to hear their presentations.

2. Next steps:

- Questions after our last meeting with the NSF IDT specialists:
    - The group had asked about owl surveys with the idea being that if the FS didn't find owls on the landscape it would allow for less operating limitations and seasonal closures.
    - The group discussed creating a timber operations ZOA which could be a way to combine some similar concerns the Roads Subcommittee has been discussing.
    - The group would like to discuss the maps Howard presented at the previous meeting and talk about the decision-making process for selecting stands for treatment.
    - The group has requested updated maps that describe not only stands proposed for treatment but also adjacent stands listed with their previous management. The group would also like to see map layers including crucial habitat and proposed marten critical habitat.
    - How is the FS going to reconcile all of the different competing habitat needs?
    - Is the FS considering regenerative harvest for wildlife purposes?
    - Is red tree vole impacted by any treatments in the project area?
    - Is there thinning in the riparian buffer?
    - All questions were sent to the FS after this meeting.

- Continued development of ZOA document
    - As previously discussed, ZOA will be organized by desired habitat and conditions.
    - The group will need to describe historical, current, and desired future conditions.
    - As a group we will need to identify terms including interior forest, edge effect, buffer, and connectivity. This process will begin by reviewing FS definitions, then reviewing definitions in scientific literature.
    - After defining terms the group will move on to describing conditions, then on to ZOA.

https://jamboard.google.com/d/13A6Ta5Q4FPWzIAd6-QKkyPxQMAtGO9yTalxRZyj5Wu0/viewer?f=1