



Draft Meeting Minutes
Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative
Roads Subcommittee Meeting
4/3/23 11:30-1:30pm
Zoom

Attendees (in alphabetical order):

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Fran Recht	Pacific States Fisheries Program
Paul Engelmeyer	Audubon
Paul Lullay	Hampton Lumber
Alyssa Bonini	Coordinator

Action Items:

WHAT	WHO	WHEN
Reach out to Chuck Fisher (USFS) for clarification on: <i>a. Whether Statement 6(a) is covered by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regulations.</i> <i>b. Whether large wood recruitment is used to improve watershed health and recruitment in upper portions of the basin.</i>	Alyssa	4/14
Incorporate revisions to ZOA Statements document and share with Subcommittee/Collaborative. Collaborative to consider Statements at next monthly meeting (April 24).	Alyssa	4/14

Minutes: by Alyssa Bonini

I. Welcome & Introductions

- Alyssa Bonini introduced herself as the new Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative (OCCFC) Coordinator and shared her background. Alyssa can be contacted at abonini@triangleassociates.com and at 503.522.0091 (cell).
- Subcommittee members introduced themselves and their background on the OCCFC.

II. Review Feedback on Draft Zones of Agreement (ZOA) Statements

- Subcommittee members reviewed feedback on Statements 5 (c-d) – 9. Any extra time will be spent re-visiting Statements 1-5(a-b). Questions relating to several Statements arose, including:
 - o Question whether the term “decommission” in Statement 5 includes revegetation efforts.
 - o Question in Statement 6 about whether Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP) requirements apply only in fish-bearing streams. Fran shared that any new culvert on fish-bearing streams is subject to AOP.
- Discussion about supporting the public to use technology and online apps (i.e. [iNaturalist](https://www.naturalist.org/)) to identify and report invasive species on their phones.

- Important to consider the recreation potential of public lands when talking about installing gates, and the risk of locking folks in by mistake.
- Subcommittee members requested that Alyssa follow up with USFS about:
 - o Whether Statement 6(a) is covered by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regulations.
 - o Whether large wood recruitment is used to improve watershed health and recruitment in upper portions of the basin.
- The Subcommittee finished reviewing each of the 9 ZOA Statements and is ready to review them with the full Collaborative Group at its next meeting on April 24. Alyssa will incorporate comments and circulate a clean version of the Statements document to Subcommittee members and to Collaborative members in advance of the April meeting.

III. Wrap up & Next Steps

- Subcommittee members decided that they do not need to meet in May. Instead, they will present their draft ZOA Statements to the full Collaborative Group at its April 24 meeting.
- The Subcommittee will address comments/proposed revisions arising from the Collaborative meeting at a June Subcommittee meeting as needed.

Roads Subcommittee

Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative

Draft Meeting Minutes
Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative
Roads Subcommittee Meeting
6/5/23 11:30-1:30pm
Zoom

Attendees (in alphabetical order):

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Fran Recht	Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission
Paul Engelmeyer	Audubon
Paul Lulay	Hampton Lumber
Alyssa Bonini	Coordinator

Action Items:

WHAT	WHO	WHEN
Reach out to USFS for clarification on the following questions: <i>a. Does USFS have an Effectiveness Monitoring Plan?</i> <i>b. Is AOP required for amphibians on non-fish-bearing streams?</i> <i>c. How do AOP requirements relate (if at all) to Stream Simulation Design Requirements?</i> <i>d. What is USFS's current policy on herbicide use for plant removal on the Siuslaw (vs. manual removal)?</i>	Alyssa	6/9
Incorporate revisions to ZOA Statements document and share with Subcommittee/Collaborative. Collaborative to consider Statements and test consensus at next monthly meeting (June 9)	Alyssa	6/9
Send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on July 10, 2023 from 11:30am – 1:30pm on Zoom.	Alyssa	6/9

Minutes: by Alyssa Bonini

I. Welcome & Agenda Review

- The Coordinator welcomed Subcommittee members and reviewed the proposed agenda.

II. Review Feedback on Draft Zones of Agreement (ZOA) Statements

- Subcommittee members agreed to test consensus on as many of the Draft ZOA Statements as possible during the meeting. Statements that the Subcommittee reach consensus on will go before the full Collaborative group for consideration at its June 9 meeting:

- Subcommittee members reviewed each of the existing 9 Draft Statements. The following questions arose for the USFS:
 - o Does USFS have an Effectiveness Monitoring Plan?
 - o Is Aquatic Organisms Passage required for amphibians on non-fish-bearing streams?
 - o How do AOP requirements relate (if at all) to Stream Simulation Design Requirements?
 - o What is USFS's current policy on herbicide use for plant removal on the Siuslaw (vs. manual removal)?
- Subcommittee members added a 10th draft statement (statement #1 in the document) representing the interest of the Subcommittee that USFS ensures adequate funding for each of the ZOAs, and includes completeness and effectiveness monitoring.
- **Consensus:** A quorum of the subcommittee reached consensus on each of the 10 Draft ZOA Statements by following the consensus process outlined in the Collaborative's [Operating Protocols](#), and reserve the right to revisit any of the draft ZOA statements upon the future receipt of new information from USFS.
- The Coordinator will convert the document into a PDF to share with the full Collaborative group in advance of its June meeting.

Action Item: The Coordinator will convert the document into a PDF and share with the full Collaborative group in advance of its June meeting.

III. **Wrap up & Next Steps**

- The Subcommittee will decide if they need to reconvene in July to discuss feedback from the Collaborative on the Draft ZOA Statements. If the Collaborative reaches consensus on each of the ZOA Statements, the Roads Subcommittee may not need to meet in July.
- The Coordinator will send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on July 10, 2023 from 11:30am – 1:30pm on Zoom.

Action Item: The Coordinator will send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on July 10, 2023 from 11:30am – 1:30pm on Zoom.

Roads Subcommittee

Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative

Draft Meeting Minutes
Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative
Roads Subcommittee Meeting
10/6/23 3:00-4:00pm
Zoom

Attendees (in alphabetical order):

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Fran Recht	Pacific States Fisheries Program
Jim Fairchild	Audubon
Paul Lulay	Hampton Lumber
<i>Alyssa Bonini</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>

Action Items:

WHAT	WHO	WHEN
Upload approved Roads Subcommittee September meeting minutes to the OCCFC website.	Coordinator/CPRCD	10/13/23
Share Roads Panel questions with panelists to help them prepare for the October 26 Roads Science Panel.	Coordinator	Complete
Send a <i>tentative</i> calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on Monday, November 6, 2023 from 12:30pm-1:30pm on Zoom.	Coordinator	Complete

Minutes: by Alyssa Bonini

I. Welcome & Agenda Review

- The Coordinator welcomed Subcommittee members and reviewed the proposed agenda.
- The Subcommittee voted to approve the September meeting minutes. Approved minutes are available on the OneDrive and will be uploaded to the OCCFC website.

II. Planning for the Roads *Virtual* Science Panel – October 26 1:00-3:00pm

- The Roads Subcommittee will host a virtual science panel on October 26 from 1:00-3:00pm, featuring speakers Dr. Chris Frissell and Tom Leroy.
- Subcommittee members discussed the run-of-show and desired outcome for the panel.

- The proposed purpose of the panel is below:
Panelists will discuss potential impacts that permanent and temporary roads have on aquatic habitat and forest stand connectivity on the Siuslaw National Forest. The discussion may offer insight and suggestions on how to effectively establish restoration prioritization. This moderated panel is open to the public.
- The panel's desired outcome is for attendees to gain a better understanding of roads' long-term impacts on ecosystems and learn how USFS will balance the need to fund ecosystem and habitat recovery in relation to the practical need for roads on the landscape.
- Subcommittee members have the following questions for panelists to consider:
 - a) Can you speak to current (not past) road design? Has new road design alleviated old risks/impacts?
 - b) Do you have suggestions for practices that USFS could employ to reduce the impact of roads? What practices would you recommend USFS prioritize / What are the most critical if there is not funding available to do everything?
 - c) Do you have any benchmarks for road density and impacts to aquatic habitat? East side vs west side?
 - d) When a road is there, how can we improve it to reduce its impacts? What have you seen work successfully? (Strategies like relocation, etc.?)
 - e) What are the top five things that work well (i.e., disconnect ditchwater from streamflow, etc.?)
 - f) How do you see your studies and research guiding USFS decisions on the Siuslaw?
 - g) What will it take to upgrade the water barring on legacy roads to provide maximum environmental protection?
 - h) Where should USFS prioritize its actions if there is insufficient funding to fully decommission legacy roads?
 - i) Are USFS Legacy Roads and Trails appropriations still available to fund USFS work on roads? How does USFS prioritize those funds, and how would Chris and Tom prioritize those funds to benefit watershed health?
- The Coordinator will share these questions with the panelists. Subcommittee members are encouraged to continue sending questions to the Coordinator.

Action Item: Coordinator will share Roads Panel questions with panelists to help them prepare for the October 26 Roads Science Panel.

III. Discussion: Roads ZOAs + Prepare for NF Smith Presentation

- Subcommittee members reviewed USFS questions about the draft Roads ZOA document, which are included in the annotated document and in [Appendix A](#) of these minutes.
- Subcommittee members reflected that they did not feel they would change any of their ZOAs based on current USFS responses.
- However, Paul Lulay, Hampton, felt dissatisfied with the USFS's answer to ZOA #1, clarifying that the ZOA's intent was to emphasize that there are important areas in need

of funding where available, and that monitoring is one of them. He stressed that the Roads ZOAs deserve resources when they are available.

- It was requested that when working with the Collaborative and public, the USFS explain its actions in plain English, rather than citing to the relevant regulation or direction.
- Paul L. observed that the ZOAs seem to be more specific than the PPAs.
- Subcommittee members have the following questions to ask USFS at the October 13 OCCFC meeting:
 1. Can USFS maps show current road conditions on the landscape?
 2. Can USFS list road density and impact reduction as its own purpose and need? It seems related to other goals especially relating to connectivity in the Late Successional Reserve. It was noted that USFS forest plan does not prescribe a density target.
 3. Resource specialists evaluate roads and make recommendations. How is this evaluation documented in the NF Smith EA? If funding doesn't exist to address unauthorized roads, can USFS indicate a future plan for that road?
- An annotated version of USFS questions about the Roads ZOA is available on the Subcommittee's [OneDrive](#).

IV. Wrap up & Next Steps

- The Subcommittee discussed its initial purpose, which was to draft ZOAs. The group does not feel the need to update their ZOAs based on USFS responses and prefers to crosswalk the ZOAs with the NF Smith PPAs as a full collaborative.
- The Subcommittee will tentatively meet in November if there is a need to update the ZOAs based on what is learned at the October 13 OCCFC meeting. If there is no need to update the ZOAs, the Roads Subcommittee will sunset until there is a need to draft additional ZOAs or revise existing ZOAs.
- The Coordinator reviewed action items and will send a tentative calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting, which will take place as needed on **Monday, November 6, 2023 from 12:30-1:30pm on Zoom.**

Action Item: The Coordinator will send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on **Friday, November 6, 2023 from 12:30-1:30pm on Zoom.**

Appendix A

Questions for USFS from Roads Subcommittee on Roads ZOA Responses, 9.11.23

- 1. Budget Allocation-** Ensure adequate funding for the Zones of Agreement below, as well as monitoring of the completeness and effectiveness of those tasks.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): Forest Service (FS) strives for adequate funding. Timber sales pay for road maintenance with funds through KV, Stewardship and special roadwork. However, some of funding for roads is out of our control. This is because Congress decides the appropriations level for the Forest.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): *How to make sure that USFS money is being used to match priority projects. Where USFS has control, how does USFS use monies effectively and how does it monitor? Help OCCFC understand USFS funding priorities, especially road risk analysis (see ZOA #3).*

Monitoring: What is the status of the issues identified in the Watershed Analysis (1995)? Success could look like a list of priorities related to watershed recovery and can say USFS has accomplished 95% of these. A lack of news about that makes OCCFC believe that nothing has been done/minimal progress has been made. Help OCCFC understand what work has been done to date on the issues identified in the 1995 watershed analysis.

- 2. When performing an Environmental Assessment (EA), Categorical Exclusion (CE), and all project planning where road treatments or impacts may be considered, the SNF should prepare an accurate map layer of all roads, including legacy roads.** DOGAMI LIDAR information, field visits, and other available technology should be utilized to locate and map all roads. Mapping these roads including their current condition will support better decision-making regarding treatment alternatives during resource management project preparation. Available resources can then more efficiently and effectively address risks created by these roads.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS is required to create a road map as per 36 CFR 212, and strives to create the most accurate road map possible.

FS uses the most up to date LIDAR and other information as possible.

Using the term “all” roads could be problematic because “all” includes unauthorized roads. Roads that FS did not create or approve. We may not know where “all” the unauthorized roads (and trails) are located.

Q: Does the OCCFC want a specific road layer?

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Yes, all roads.

- *Open roads (existing USFS roads)*
- *Decommissioned roads*
- *Closed roads in different colors.*
- *Road density – “for this catchment, the road density is X”*

Can USFS staff add unauthorized roads as they come across them in the field? Color roads by classification and use?

3. Update the Road Risk Analysis Maps in the Travel Analysis Report Appendices G and H (2014) within the project boundaries with current condition information

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/siuslaw/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprd3795314>

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS has a lot of information on roads in the INFRA database. INFRA is an internal database that has information on constructed features on USFS lands, such as roads, trails, buildings and related.

Q: Does the OCCFC want to learn more about this and if it fits in with ZOA #3?

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): YES. Make sure to include historic roads and current roads located in floodplains. What attributes is USFS maintaining for each of these roads? Mark unauthorized roads and roads that have plans to be decommissioned in the future, etc. The shape file in GIS system should have a table of attributes attached to each item.

4. Evaluate the level of access needed for continuing or future uses to avoid inefficiencies in time and money that occur if a road must be reopened to get to areas that now need management or additional road decommissioning further up the system.

- Make clear the considerations about the areas’ desired future condition when evaluating road system elements (e.g., wildfire fighting, remediation, research activities, habitat block creation purposes, recreation, etc.)

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): We are required to do this as per 36 CFR 212 and as per guidelines in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) and Forest Service Manual (FSM).

Q: Is there a particular way that the OCCFC is requesting this evaluation be documented?

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Spatial and tabular form.

5. Reduce road-associated problems (e.g., by road risk map layer) by:

- Closing or decommissioning Non-Key roads when:
 - Roads are in the “wrong spots,” e.g., midslope roads and in unstable areas
 - Are stream-adjacent roads
- Relocating Key roads away from legacy riparian areas, headwall cutting areas,

and stream- adjacent roads when a reasonable alternative access is created or maintained.

- c. Fixing roads and culverts where resource impacts have been identified.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS is required to these as per FSM 7703.25.

FS does strive to do this during project planning, although we use more info than just the road risk map layer.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Resource specialists evaluate roads and make recommendations. How is this evaluation documented in the EA? If unauthorized road without funding, indicate future plan for it (ie “plan for future closure, etc”) Attributes can be attached in a tabular form.

6. Promote Habitat Connectivity and Species Recovery

- a. Decommission and revegetate unneeded roads (see #3 above) to promote habitat connectivity in areas where blocks of interior forest opportunities have been identified.
- b. Ecological assessments for roads should include connectivity within and across adjoining basins (outside of planning area).
- c. Avoid new roads, including temporary roads in areas meeting, or on the way to meeting Late Successional Reserve desired conditions.
- d. The Collaborative supports the SNF goal to reduce the road network to the basic key road needed level, by prioritizing work based on resource impact reduction.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): Roads are assessed by resource specialists who make management recommendations.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1608) requires revegetation of temporary roads authorized under a contract, permit, lease, or other written authorization within 10 years of termination of the written authorization. Also see FSM 7703.21 & 24

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Revegetation should take place within (before) 10 years, if needed for habitat connectivity.

7. Promote Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP)

- a. Ensure new culverts at road crossings meet new Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP) requirements and follow Stream Simulation design when designing new road-stream crossings on fish-bearing streams.²
- b. Prioritize and pursue repairs for culverts where aquatic organism passage is required.

Note: Although the Collaborative reached consensus to support Statement 7 as written as a “first step”, the statement alone is not sufficient. The Collaborative may choose to revisit or expand this statement in the future.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS does make sure that new culverts follow current AOP requirements.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): How are older culverts prioritized for AOP upgrades? Habitat?

8. Reduce the number of temporary roads built

- a. In project planning, work to reduce the number and mileage of temporary roads required to implement the project; utilize the existing road network when possible, unless new temporary roads result in less overall impact.
- b. Upgrade temporary roads if necessary to reduce risk of sedimentation and hydrological impacts;
- c. Quickly close or decommission temporary roads after use.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1608) directs that roads be designed to standards appropriate for their intended uses and requires revegetation of temporary roads authorized under a contract, permit, lease, or other written authorization within 10 years of termination of the written authorization. See FSM 7703.21 & 24.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): In the EA, are new temporary roads specifically identified, and is USFS identifying existing temporary roads? If not, is it possible to share roads status as part of the attribute table (temporary roads, unauthorized roads, etc)? Is there a justification for the need to construct temporary roads and is that justification/need clear and transparent in the EA? How are they documenting what they are doing so the public can understand?

9. Consensus not reached on Statement 9

The OCCFC is deciding if this should be a stand alone ZOA.

Chelsea Monks (FS Botanist) and Katie Richardson (NR Staff officer) are working to provide specifics on this topic and will be addressed outside of the Roads ZOA.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): We are required to report on herbicides as per National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1608): § 1601. Renewable Resource Assessment (e) Report on herbicides and pesticides The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the amounts, types, and uses of herbicides and pesticides used in the National Forest System, including the beneficial or adverse effects of such uses.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): This topic has moved to the Herbicides & Invasives Subcommittee and will be addressed there.

10. Reduce Fire Potential

- a. Gate roads or otherwise block public access during times of high fire risk, but still maintain access for administrative use in order to fight wildfires.
- b. Prohibit open fires on SNF land except in campgrounds with established fire pits during fire season.
- c. Prioritize the provision of higher levels of enforcement of fire restrictions and prohibitions.
- d. Roads determined to be Key Forest Routes should be maintained at a high level for quick response of emergency vehicles of all sizes and visibility for safe travel.
- e. Identify ridgetop roads that should be maintained to serve as firebreaks and control lines.
- f. Identify key water sources at the district level and maintain road access to these key water sources.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): This ZOA, as it is written, doesn't meet our current policy and guidelines.

FS has fire danger operations, guidelines, public use restrictions and related that we follow.

Does the OCCFC want to talk more about the Siuslaw fire program? –

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Yes. The OCCFC would like to know what USFS is doing to manage fire on the SNF and what more could be done. What is USFS doing to engage the public, especially people that use the Forest but that may not be on the listserv or actively look for fire warnings? How can the SNF reduce the human caused fire danger?

²[https://www.fs.usda.gov/restoration/Aquatic_Organism_Passage/glossary.shtml#:~:text=Aquatic%20Organism%20Passage%20\(AOP\)%20%2D,%2C%20diversion%2C%20dams%2C%20etc.](https://www.fs.usda.gov/restoration/Aquatic_Organism_Passage/glossary.shtml#:~:text=Aquatic%20Organism%20Passage%20(AOP)%20%2D,%2C%20diversion%2C%20dams%2C%20etc.)

0%2D,%2C%20diversion%2C%20dams%2C%20etc.

Roads Subcommittee

Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative

Draft Meeting Minutes
Oregon Central Coast Forest Collaborative
Roads Subcommittee Meeting
9/11/23 3:00-4:00pm
Zoom

Attendees (in alphabetical order):

NAME	ORGANIZATION
Fran Recht	Pacific States Fisheries Program
Paul Engelmeyer	Audubon
Paul Lulay	Hampton Lumber
<i>Alyssa Bonini</i>	<i>Coordinator</i>

Action Items:

WHAT	WHO	WHEN
Share follow up questions that Subcommittee members have for USFS on the Roads ZOA.	Coordinator	Complete
Look into whether a summary of the Toledo meeting was produced and will share findings with the OCCFC.	Coordinator	10/6
Send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on Friday, October 6, 2023 from 3:00pm-4:00pm on Zoom.	Coordinator	Complete

Minutes: by Alyssa Bonini

I. Welcome & Agenda Review

- The Coordinator welcomed Subcommittee members and reviewed the proposed agenda.
- The Subcommittee revisited action items and approved meeting minutes from its last meeting on June 5, 2023.

II. Review USFS on Draft Zones of Agreement (ZOA) Statements

- Subcommittee members reviewed USFS questions about the draft Roads ZOA document. An annotated version of USFS questions about the Roads ZOA is available on

the Subcommittee’s [OneDrive](#). Questions arising for the USFS are included in the annotated document and in [Appendix A](#) of these minutes.

- Members understand that USFS is likely facing challenges surrounding its ability to fund projects adequately, but feel it is important to convey to USFS member expectations around project funding.
- It was requested that to the extent possible, the USFS should identify all roads (active, closed, decommissioned, temporary, non-USFS roads) and make spatial and tabular data on those roads available to the OCCFC and public.
- Paul Lulay, Hampton, noted that timber sales mark temporary roads but sometimes USFS approved adjustments to those temporary roads plans if the adjustments won’t adversely affect the timber sale outcome. It would be helpful to see where those temporary roads are and what the attributes of those roads are.
- Paul Engelmeyer, Audubon, requested to know if the roads management actions illustrated in the tables below (Watershed Analysis, 1995) have been completed. It would be helpful for the OCCFC to know what USFS’s watershed recovery priorities are and what percent of those priorities have been accomplished, if any. He added that a lack of news about USFS priorities makes him believe that nothing has been done or minimal progress has been made, and it would be helpful for the OCCFC to understand what work has been done on the issues identified in the 1995 Watershed Analysis to date.

Table 16 cont.: Restoration Opportunities By Issue

ISSUE III cont.: MAINTAIN RESOURCE VALUES BY RECOGNIZING INHERENT INSTABILITY IN LANDSCAPE

MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITY BY AREA	ECOLOGICAL GUIDANCE	SPECIFIC RESTORATION PROJECT(S)
BU #4 cont. Waste Area Stability	Locate and map waste areas and stabilize current ones Geologic contact zones are inherently unstable	Stabilize 5 acre Spencer Creek waste area Develop a plan for future waste area disposal sites
BU #5: Maintain road stability	Not as unstable as most of watershed, especially Upper Wassen and Vincent Slopes less steep - lower debris torrent occurrence Includes slump terrain - Deep seated instability Upper Wassen/Vincent highly Managed/Roaded	Lower priority of mid-slope road stabilization Problem roads requiring attention : 32.1; 21-9-20.1 and 21.0 (BLM portion); 9.1; 21-9-8.0 and 8.1; 21-9-3.3, 3.4 and 3.5; 21-9-30.1; 21-9-18.0

Table 16 cont.: Restoration Opportunities By Issue

ISSUE III cont.: MAINTAIN RESOURCE VALUES BY RECOGNIZING INHERENT INSTABILITY IN LANDSCAPE

MANAGEMENT OPPORTUNITY BY AREA	ECOLOGICAL GUIDANCE	SPECIFIC RESTORATION PROJECT(S)
BU #3: Maintain slope stability	-Those shorter northeast facing slopes have concentrated areas of instability so use caution with management. -The basaltic influence may make this area more stable than areas to the southwest (see landslide susceptibility map)	Maintain slope stability on northeast facing slopes Decommission BLM road 1.4 off of Gold Creek Partnership with private to decommission roads - especially mid-slope roads Develop quarry restoration plan for Roman Nose quarry
BU #4: Maintain road stability	Highly dissected area warrants special road consideration Roads are limited to tops of knife ridges predominantly	Close problem roads: BLM Spencer : 20-10-25.0, 25.2, 25.3; 24.4, 24.5; 13.3 plus spurs, 11.0, spur off 11.2 Johnson: 20.1,20-9-29.0,18.1, spur off 19.1, 19.2, 7.1, spur off 7.0, 17.1, spur off 8.0, spur off 8.1 Coon Creek ridge Road 16.0, 15.3-15.9, 15.4, 15.6 Lower Moore Creek Ridge Road; 21-10-2.0; 20-10-36.0 USFS 4811 948 monitor sediment production on 4811 958 - Old Wagon Road 4811-955 **23-942 (high priority) Lower 4820

Action Item: The Coordinator will share follow up questions that Subcommittee members have for USFS on the Roads ZOA.

- Paul E. requested that the Coordinator look into whether a summary was ever produced of the Toledo meeting. The Coordinator will look into it and report back.

Action Item: The Coordinator will look into whether a summary of the Toledo meeting was produced and will share findings with the OCCFC.

III. Wrap up & Next Steps

- The Coordinator reviewed action items and will send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting, which will take place on **Friday, October 6, 2023 from 3:00pm-4:00pm on Zoom.**

Action Item: The Coordinator will send a calendar hold for the next Roads Subcommittee meeting on Friday, October 6, 2023 from 3:00pm-4:00pm on Zoom.

Appendix A

Questions for USFS from Roads Subcommittee on Roads ZOA Responses, 9.11.23

- 1. Budget Allocation-** Ensure adequate funding for the Zones of Agreement below, as well as monitoring of the completeness and effectiveness of those tasks.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): Forest Service (FS) strives for adequate funding. Timber sales pay for road maintenance with funds through KV, Stewardship and special roadwork. However, some of funding for roads is out of our control. This is because Congress decides the appropriations level for the Forest.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): *How to make sure that USFS money is being used to match priority projects. Where USFS has control, how does USFS use monies effectively and how does it monitor? Help OCCFC understand USFS funding priorities, especially road risk analysis (see ZOA #3).*

Monitoring: What is the status of the issues identified in the Watershed Analysis (1995)? Success could look like a list of priorities related to watershed recovery and can say USFS has accomplished 95% of these. A lack of news about that makes OCCFC believe that nothing has been done/minimal progress has been made. Help OCCFC understand what work has been done to date on the issues identified in the 1995 watershed analysis.

- 2. When performing an Environmental Assessment (EA), Categorical Exclusion (CE), and all project planning where road treatments or impacts may be considered, the SNF should prepare an accurate map layer of all roads, including legacy roads.** DOGAMI LIDAR information, field visits, and other available technology should be utilized to locate and map all roads. Mapping these roads including their current condition will support better decision-making regarding treatment alternatives during resource management project preparation. Available resources can then more efficiently and effectively address risks created by these roads.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS is required to create a road map as per 36 CFR 212, and strives to create the most accurate road map possible.

FS uses the most up to date LIDAR and other information as possible.

Using the term “all” roads could be problematic because “all” includes unauthorized roads. Roads that FS did not create or approve. We may not know where “all” the unauthorized roads (and trails) are located.

Q: Does the OCCFC want a specific road layer?

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Yes, all roads.

- *Open roads (existing USFS roads)*
- *Decommissioned roads*
- *Closed roads in different colors.*
- *Road density – “for this catchment, the road density is X”*

Can USFS staff add unauthorized roads as they come across them in the field? Color roads by classification and use?

3. Update the Road Risk Analysis Maps in the Travel Analysis Report Appendices G and H (2014) within the project boundaries with current condition information

<https://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/siuslaw/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprd3795314>

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS has a lot of information on roads in the INFRA database. INFRA is an internal database that has information on constructed features on USFS lands, such as roads, trails, buildings and related.

Q: Does the OCCFC want to learn more about this and if it fits in with ZOA #3?

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): YES. Make sure to include historic roads and current roads located in floodplains. What attributes is USFS maintaining for each of these roads? Mark unauthorized roads and roads that have plans to be decommissioned in the future, etc. The shape file in GIS system should have a table of attributes attached to each item.

4. Evaluate the level of access needed for continuing or future uses to avoid inefficiencies in time and money that occur if a road must be reopened to get to areas that now need management or additional road decommissioning further up the system.

- Make clear the considerations about the areas’ desired future condition when evaluating road system elements (e.g., wildfire fighting, remediation, research activities, habitat block creation purposes, recreation, etc.)

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): We are required to do this as per 36 CFR 212 and as per guidelines in Forest Service Handbook (FSH) and Forest Service Manual (FSM).

Q: Is there a particular way that the OCCFC is requesting this evaluation be documented?

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Spatial and tabular form.

5. Reduce road-associated problems (e.g., by road risk map layer) by:

- Closing or decommissioning Non-Key roads when:
 - Roads are in the “wrong spots,” e.g., midslope roads and in unstable areas
 - Are stream-adjacent roads
- Relocating Key roads away from legacy riparian areas, headwall cutting areas,

and stream- adjacent roads when a reasonable alternative access is created or maintained.

- c. Fixing roads and culverts where resource impacts have been identified.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS is required to these as per FSM 7703.25.

FS does strive to do this during project planning, although we use more info than just the road risk map layer.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Resource specialists evaluate roads and make recommendations. How is this evaluation documented in the EA? If unauthorized road without funding, indicate future plan for it (ie “plan for future closure, etc”) Attributes can be attached in a tabular form.

6. Promote Habitat Connectivity and Species Recovery

- a. Decommission and revegetate unneeded roads (see #3 above) to promote habitat connectivity in areas where blocks of interior forest opportunities have been identified.
- b. Ecological assessments for roads should include connectivity within and across adjoining basins (outside of planning area).
- c. Avoid new roads, including temporary roads in areas meeting, or on the way to meeting Late Successional Reserve desired conditions.
- d. The Collaborative supports the SNF goal to reduce the road network to the basic key road needed level, by prioritizing work based on resource impact reduction.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): Roads are assessed by resource specialists who make management recommendations.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1608) requires revegetation of temporary roads authorized under a contract, permit, lease, or other written authorization within 10 years of termination of the written authorization. Also see FSM 7703.21 & 24

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Revegetation should take place within (before) 10 years, if needed for habitat connectivity.

7. Promote Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP)

- a. Ensure new culverts at road crossings meet new Aquatic Organism Passage (AOP) requirements and follow Stream Simulation design when designing new road-stream crossings on fish-bearing streams.²
- b. Prioritize and pursue repairs for culverts where aquatic organism passage is required.

Note: Although the Collaborative reached consensus to support Statement 7 as written as a “first step”, the statement alone is not sufficient. The Collaborative may choose to revisit or expand this statement in the future.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): FS does make sure that new culverts follow current AOP requirements.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): How are older culverts prioritized for AOP upgrades? Habitat?

8. Reduce the number of temporary roads built

- a. In project planning, work to reduce the number and mileage of temporary roads required to implement the project; utilize the existing road network when possible, unless new temporary roads result in less overall impact.
- b. Upgrade temporary roads if necessary to reduce risk of sedimentation and hydrological impacts;
- c. Quickly close or decommission temporary roads after use.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): The National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1608) directs that roads be designed to standards appropriate for their intended uses and requires revegetation of temporary roads authorized under a contract, permit, lease, or other written authorization within 10 years of termination of the written authorization. See FSM 7703.21 & 24.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): In the EA, are new temporary roads specifically identified, and is USFS identifying existing temporary roads? If not, is it possible to share roads status as part of the attribute table (temporary roads, unauthorized roads, etc)? Is there a justification for the need to construct temporary roads and is that justification/need clear and transparent in the EA? How are they documenting what they are doing so the public can understand?

9. Consensus not reached on Statement 9

The OCCFC is deciding if this should be a stand alone ZOA.

Chelsea Monks (FS Botanist) and Katie Richardson (NR Staff officer) are working to provide specifics on this topic and will be addressed outside of the Roads ZOA.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): We are required to report on herbicides as per National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1608): § 1601. Renewable Resource Assessment (e) Report on herbicides and pesticides The Secretary shall submit an annual report to the Congress on the amounts, types, and uses of herbicides and pesticides used in the National Forest System, including the beneficial or adverse effects of such uses.

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): This topic has moved to the Herbicides & Invasives Subcommittee and will be addressed there.

10. Reduce Fire Potential

- a. Gate roads or otherwise block public access during times of high fire risk, but still maintain access for administrative use in order to fight wildfires.
- b. Prohibit open fires on SNF land except in campgrounds with established fire pits during fire season.
- c. Prioritize the provision of higher levels of enforcement of fire restrictions and prohibitions.
- d. Roads determined to be Key Forest Routes should be maintained at a high level for quick response of emergency vehicles of all sizes and visibility for safe travel.
- e. Identify ridgetop roads that should be maintained to serve as firebreaks and control lines.
- f. Identify key water sources at the district level and maintain road access to these key water sources.

USFS Response to ZOA (8.9.23): This ZOA, as it is written, doesn't meet our current policy and guidelines.

FS has fire danger operations, guidelines, public use restrictions and related that we follow.

Does the OCCFC want to talk more about the Siuslaw fire program? –

Roads Subcommittee Response (9.11.23): Yes. The OCCFC would like to know what USFS is doing to manage fire on the SNF and what more could be done. What is USFS doing to engage the public, especially people that use the Forest but that may not be on the listserv or actively look for fire warnings? How can the SNF reduce the human caused fire danger?

²[https://www.fs.usda.gov/restoration/Aquatic_Organism_Passage/glossary.shtml#:~:text=Aquatic%20Organism%20Passage%20\(AOP\)%20%2D,%2C%20diversion%2C%20dams%2C%20etc.](https://www.fs.usda.gov/restoration/Aquatic_Organism_Passage/glossary.shtml#:~:text=Aquatic%20Organism%20Passage%20(AOP)%20%2D,%2C%20diversion%2C%20dams%2C%20etc.)

0%2D,%2C%20diversion%2C%20dams%2C%20etc.