

**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 Coordinator

**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.
  - o 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?
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o Cmt: we will need to define interior forest, edge effects, and buffers.
  - o We will also need to consider what warrants buffing and what does not.
- Q: Will this group consider both aquatic and terrestrial habitats?
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o 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.
  - o 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”?
  - o 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?
  - o 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
  - o There are 43 acres for potential regeneration harvest, stands are 40 years old and would need regional forester permission.
  - o There are 447 acres of potential second entry.
  - o 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:
    - o 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.
    - o The group discussed creating a timber operations ZOA which could be a way to combine some similar concerns the Roads Subcommittee has been discussing.
    - o 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.
    - o 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.
    - o How is the FS going to reconcile all of the different competing habitat needs?
    - o Is the FS considering regenerative harvest for wildlife purposes?
    - o Is red tree vole impacted by any treatments in the project area?
    - o Is there thinning in the riparian buffer?
    - o All questions were sent to the FS after this meeting.
  - Continued development of ZOA document
    - o As previously discussed, ZOA will be organized by desired habitat and conditions.
    - o The group will need to describe historical, current, and desired future conditions.
    - o 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.
    - o After defining terms the group will move on to describing conditions, then on to ZOA.

<https://jamboard.google.com/d/13A6Ta5Q4FPWzIAd6-QKkyPxQMAAtGO9yTalxRZyj5Wu0/viewer?f=1>

## OCCFC Wildlife ZOA Subcommittee

11/3/22

Participants: Kelly Fuller, Marc Barnes, Jordan Latter, Paul Engelmeyer, Michele Holman, Chuck Fisher, Howard Hoyt, Kegen Benson, Ian Emmons, Mycah Scoggins, Jane Barth

### Ongoing Work

Since its last meeting, this group submitted a letter to the USFS addressed to Chuck with some questions (see Attachment A). Chuck and other USFS staff attended today to provide responses. First, however, lines of communication between the OCCFC and the USFS were clarified:

- Lisa Romano is the main liaison. Send communication to her, cc'ing District Ranger Holman
- For communication specific to the North Fork Smith EA, communication should be sent to the District Ranger who will then get in touch with IDT leader.

### *Framework versus Definitions*

- The OCCFC has requested definitions of interior forest, buffer, edge, and connectivity in order to know what each other means when using a term.
- The USFS doesn't want to define terms like Old Growth or Interior Forest only for the Central Coast District. They need to have frameworks that apply to the entire forest.
- The USFS defines terms in relation to species they are managing for
- They use characteristics to describe interior forest. Doug Glavich would be the best person to do that.
- Terms are defined in a 1995 report published by the Siuslaw NF. Paul Engelmeyer has the document reference. Q: Can't these be used? Cmt: The challenge is that different documents use different definitions. It would be useful for the OCCFC and SNF to work on a framework together to gain mutual understanding. Ideas put forth included:
  - Defining interior forest by forest structure, not edges or as mature forest a certain distance from other features
  - Looking at edge research by Dr. Chen for terms like late seral forest (Marc Barnes has document references)
- Next steps:
  - Ask Doug Glavich to attend a meeting
  - Have Chuck share information from a new climate change assessment model

### *Treatment Stand Selection*

- Areas the USFS can treat in the N Fork Smith project area are determined mainly by stability and roads. They use remote sensing as well as polygon and stand tables. Specialists hold a stand-by-stand meeting to identify prescriptions which they send to the full IDT for review. Later there is contract review.



- The OCCFC members would like to learn more about initial selection criteria, for example, was early seral in the mix?
  - One member shared that their organization has submitted pre-scoping comments stating it would not support any early seral creation. Others expressed interest in discussing early seral opportunities.
- One member urged the USFS not to defer too many stands. There are opportunities re. hardwoods. EAs cover a long time period so fine to put in some stands that will be treated later. Otherwise lose opportunity.
- Next steps:
  - OCCFC member organizations who have submitted comments are encouraged to share those with other members. The comments are publicly available documents on the USFS's N Fork Smith Project website.
  - The group will learn more about stand selection during upcoming IDT meetings.
  - Marc will have his Forester do a GIS exercise once he has access to requested data.

### Looking Ahead

- There was no time to discuss specific species during this meeting. Jane will relay the group's request to be sure have a good amount of time on Wildlife issues during the IDT Kick off session on December 9<sup>th</sup>.
- The group set a regular monthly meeting date and time. It will meet on the Monday immediately prior to the OCCFC's regular meeting. The group will meet from 2-4pm initially via Zoom but potentially in person in the future.
- USFS staff will not be invited to attend the December 5<sup>th</sup> meeting. This group will focus on trying to craft some basic Zone of Agreement statements, for example support for managing for effects on T and E species.
- ACTION: The group will start to draft statements via a shared document in the OneDrive. Jane encouraged Andy to start that document with some of the text he brainstormed during this meeting. Below is some text from your June meeting notes related to developing the ZOA document. Sharing to refresh our collective memories:
  - *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.*

**Attachment A:**

October 10, 2022

Chuck Fisher  
Siuslaw National Forest  
Central Coast Ranger District  
1130 Forestry Lane; PO Box 400  
Waldport, OR 97394

**In Regard To:** The Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative (OCCFC) Wildlife Subgroup  
Wildlife Definitions

Dear Mr. Fisher,

The OCCFC Wildlife Subgroup appreciates the Forest Service's response to our request for information regarding numerous topics related to wildlife management on the Siuslaw National Forest. The Subgroup is actively working together to develop zones of agreement on several of the topics outlined in that request. In particular, we are working to develop a shared understanding of the following topics:

- Interior Forest
- Buffer
- Edge
- Connectivity

To better inform that understanding, our request to the Forest Service included our desire to understand how the agency defines these terms. The Forest Service's response is copied below:

*This is being worked on separately from this effort by the wildlife biologists on the forest and districts. Please note that there is a current national effort to provide a "framework" that characterizes "old growth" as opposed to "defining" the term old growth. It has been discussed internally and is now anticipated that we will provide a "framework" of what these terms represent.*

We are pleased to hear that the wildlife staff is working on this request but believe there is a need to provide some clarification based on this response. We appreciate the information regarding the national efforts to define old growth forests using "frameworks" but are confused how that effort applies to our request and also by what a "framework" means in regard to forest definitions.

Our request also included information on treatment stand selection. The Forest Service responded that "a silviculturist identifies which stands would benefit from treatments." We

would appreciate if you could expand on this statement to better inform the group of how this identification occurs. We assume that stand selection is initially vetted using a combination of tools including remote sensing and FIA data, followed by field verification visits. Could you please respond to these assumptions to provide us a clearer picture of how forest silviculturists select treatment stands? We would also like to better understand how stands are selected for treatment and once a stand is selected, what is the step-by-step process that occurs between selection and final treatment prescription.

Once again, we appreciate your efforts to provide this group with information that will support our work. We look forward to hearing back from you with some additional information.

Sincerely,

Members of the Wildlife ZOA Subcommittee

Andy Geissler

Kelly Fuller

Jordan Latter

Dave Eisler

Marc Barnes

Paul Engelmeyer

## Wildlife Zones of Agreement Working Document from Dec. 5<sup>th</sup> Meeting

In attendance: Andy Geissler, Kelly Fuller, Paul Engelmeyer, Jane Barth (Interim Coordinator)

### Thoughts shared about approach:

- Start at high level to create Zones of Agreement Statements
- It may only be possible to agree upon a very small set of statements at this time. Each OCCFC member has a longer wish list of what they want, but the ZOA's will be a shorter list.
- To come to agreement, it will take hashing out together what each other have learned from own individual research and analysis, hearing from presenters on panels to have a common experience with the same information, and considering trade-offs.
- Ask yourselves and your organizations what areas would like to try to create ZOA statements for; share potential draft statements with each other by adding to this document using Reviewing/Track Changes function.
- Work on statements related to effects calls on specific T&E species.
- Consider how much time and energy to give to ZOA work as compared to local level EA work.
- ZOAs could lead to a Conservation Option within an EA and then negotiation.

### ZOA Statement Draft Language with some level of agreement plus discussion points

- The USFS should design treatments to avoid *likely to adversely affect (LAA)* calls on NSOs and MAMU.
  - Discussion over whether to also include coho and Marten in this statement. Openness to doing so after some further consideration:
    - Hesitation to add coho until learn what it would take to avoid the LAA call, what impacts there would be on operations and hauling seasons. In recent EAs, observation is that LAA calls were made for coho.
    - Hesitation to add Marten because this species is newly listed so don't have references on how to avoid LAA yet.
  - From Andy's original start to this document: There are generally three "buckets" that projects fit into when it comes to consultation with Fish & Wildlife and NOAA fisheries: no effect, may affect but not likely to adversely affect (NLAA), and likely to adversely affect (LAA). The Siuslaw generally designs veg-management projects to fit into the NLAA bucket for NSO and MAMU, this includes the early seral creation on Sand Lake. On the other hand, the Siuslaw generally designs projects to fit into the LAA bucket for Coho salmon. My understanding is that they do this in order to facilitate thinning in riparian reserve areas, which overlay most of the Forest. For example, riparian reserves constitute 83.3% of the acres in the North Fork Smith project area."

- Create large blocks of contiguous habitat (goal of LSR).
  - Items to address if/when work towards more species-specific agreements:
    - concern over effects on specific species while getting to this goal
    - Species' requirements for Blocks of Interior Forest
    - Thinning regimes

#### ZOA Statement Draft Language without sense of any agreement yet

- Embrace and utilize new USFS policy documents (2011 - climate change, connectivity policy 2012, Paul you mentioned a 3<sup>rd</sup> one that I didn't get into my notes.)
- Reinforce and build on policies that aren't being integrated into analysis yet.
- Buffer distances for individual species agreed to be....
- Thinning prescriptions with respect to distance from occupied stands agreed to be... or based upon...
- Time of year for thinning with certain distances from interior forest

#### **Moving this Work Forward:**

- 1- Individuals will share potential draft language in this shared document on the OneDrive in the Wildlife Committee subfolder

[https://cascadepacific-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/connie\\_cascadepacific\\_org/Eqx594kls3IDhKxCSH7hyJIBvwSN6XzcKkieoGBI5nh2dQ?e=J0FcNI](https://cascadepacific-my.sharepoint.com/:f:/g/personal/connie_cascadepacific_org/Eqx594kls3IDhKxCSH7hyJIBvwSN6XzcKkieoGBI5nh2dQ?e=J0FcNI)

- 2- Jane and Paul will work to set up panels on Challenging Issues with 1<sup>st</sup> one related to Interior Forest and Connectivity ideally in January. Andy will provide suggestions for panelist from his literature review. Others encouraged to suggest presenters, too.
- 3- Get clarity within the full OCCFC on who wants to work more on the local EA level and who wants to work more on the ZOA level that will apply to multiple projects over time. This is part of figuring out how to manage the total workload of the OCCFC, which is both local and higher level. The new invitation to weekly IDT meetings (starting in January) will increase workload on EA.
- 4- Learn together out in the field. NF Smith EA field trip will be organized. But are there other field trips you want the Coordinator to help organize?

October 10, 2022

Chuck Fisher  
Siuslaw National Forest  
Central Coast Ranger District  
1130 Forestry Lane; PO Box 400  
Waldport, OR 97394

**In Regard To:** The Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative (OCCFC) Wildlife Subgroup  
Wildlife Definitions

Dear Mr. Fisher,

The OCCFC Wildlife Subgroup appreciates the Forest Service's response to our request for information regarding numerous topics related to wildlife management on the Siuslaw National Forest. The Subgroup is actively working together to develop zones of agreement on several of the topics outlined in that request. In particular, we are working to develop a shared understanding of the following topics:

- Interior Forest
- Buffer
- Edge
- Connectivity

To better inform that understanding, our request to the Forest Service included our desire to understand how the agency defines these terms. The Forest Service's response is copied below:

*This is being worked on separately from this effort by the wildlife biologists on the forest and districts. Please note that there is a current national effort to provide a "framework" that characterizes "old growth" as opposed to "defining" the term old growth. It has been discussed internally and is now anticipated that we will provide a "framework" of what these terms represent.*

We are pleased to hear that the wildlife staff is working on this request but believe there is a need to provide some clarification based on this response. We appreciate the information regarding the national efforts to define old growth forests using "frameworks" but are confused how that effort applies to our request and also by what a "framework" means in regard to forest definitions.

Our request also included information on treatment stand selection. The Forest Service responded that "a silviculturist identifies which stands would benefit from treatments." We would appreciate if you could expand on this statement to better inform the group of how this identification occurs. We assume that stand selection is initially vetted using a combination of tools including remote sensing and FIA data, followed by field verification visits. Could you please respond to these assumptions to provide us a clearer picture of how forest silviculturists

select treatment stands? We would also like to better understand how stands are selected for treatment and once a stand is selected, what is the step-by-step process that occurs between selection and final treatment prescription.

Once again, we appreciate your efforts to provide this group with information that will support our work. We look forward to hearing back from you with some additional information.

Sincerely,

Members of the Wildlife ZOA Subcommittee

Andy Geissler

Kelly Fuller

Jordan Latter

Dave Eisler

Marc Barnes

Paul Engelmeyer

## Wildlife Zones of Agreement

1. Effects to Threatened and Endangered species
  - a. Northern Spotted Owl
  - b. Marbled Murrelet
  - c. Coho

There are generally three “buckets” that projects fit into when it comes to consultation with Fish & Wildlife and NOAA fisheries: no effect, may affect but not likely to adversely affect (NLAA), and likely to adversely affect (LAA). The Siuslaw generally designs veg-management projects to fit into the NLAA bucket for NSO and MAMU, this includes the early seral creation on Sand Lake. On the other hand, the Siuslaw generally designs projects to fit into the LAA bucket for Coho salmon. My understanding is that they do this in order to facilitate thinning in riparian reserve areas, which overlay most of the Forest. For example, riparian reserves constitute 83.3% of the acres in the North Fork Smith project area.

I would propose that the subcommittee generates ZOAs on effect calls for these three species.

I agree on this | \_\_\_\_\_

Commented [GU1]: testing