

11. Appendices

Contents

Page

1. JAG Membership	
2. Charter	
3. Committee Membership and Charge	
4. Goals and Principles	
5. Landscape Allocations	
6. Research and Demonstration	
A. General Principles	
B. Core Elements for Research-Oriented Framework	
C. Criteria for Selecting Centers of Excellence	
D. Science Workshop Summary	
E. Administration and Governance	
7. Economics	
A. Revenue Needed to meet 2008 Plan budget	
B. Camp 3 Research and Costs	
8. Stakeholder Meeting Outcomes	
A. Silviculture Practitioners Workshop, Oct. 2009	
B. Science Workshop, Feb. 2, 2010. (See Ch. 3, P X)	
C. Agency Workshop, Santa Rosa, Oct. 2010	
D. Public Meeting, Fort Bragg, Nov. 2010	
E. Conservation Groups, San Francisco, Dec. 2010	
F. Conservation Groups, Boonville, Dec. 2010	
G. Landowner/University/Prof. Societies, Jan 2011	
9. Maps	
10. Consensus Votes	

APPENDIX 1

Jackson Demonstration State Forest Advisory Group

Appointments by CAL FIRE Director Ruben Grijalva
and Approved by the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

Mike Anderson	Licensed Timber Operator, Registered Professional Forester (RPF)
Kathy Bailey	Environmental Advocate (Sierra Club)
Peter Braudrick	Recreation, former State Parks superintendent
George Gentry	Executive Officer, Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, Board liaison to JAG
Linwood Gill	Registered Professional Forester
John Helms (Chair)	UC Berkeley, Emeritus
Mike Jani	Industrial Forest Land Manager, Mendocino Redwood Company
Mike Liquori	Physical Scientist (Hydrology/Geology)
Jere Melo	Local Community, Ft. Bragg City Council, RPF
Linda Perkins	Environmental/Conservation Advocate
Dan Porter	North Coast Regional Ecologist, The Nature Conservancy
Vince Taylor (Vice Chair)	Environmental Advocate/Local Community
Forest Tilley	Small Private Forestland Owner, RPF, former JDSF manager
Brad Valentine	Biologist, California Department Fish and Game

Facilitator

Steve Zuieback	Synectics, Ukiah
----------------	------------------

CAL FIRE Staff Support

Russ Henly	Assistant Deputy Director
Helge Eng	Deputy Chief, Demonstration Forests
Marc Jameson	JDSF Forest Manager (Ret. Nov. 2009)
Pam Linstedt	JDSF Forester II
Lynn Webb	JDSF Forester II, Research and Demonstration Program Manager
Craig Pedersen	(Insert Title)

APPENDIX 2

JAG Charter and Duties

Mission

The mission of the Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) Advisory Group (Advisory Group, JAG) is to provide advice/recommendations to:

- The Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (Board) and Director, Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE) regarding issues relevant to review of the JDSF Management Plan for possible changes during the Initial Implementation Period.
- Director/CAL FIRE and the Board regarding ongoing implementation issues
- Board and Director/CAL FIRE on policy matters relevant to JDSF.

Duties

A. During the initial implementation period (not to exceed three years) the Advisory Group shall provide input on the following:

1. Desired future forest structure condition goals for the Forest and the forms, amounts, and spatial designation of silvicultural treatments to be applied to attain those goals.
2. Long-term goals for a wide range of forest structures, including but not limited to:
 - a. The extent and general location of areas to be dedicated to late-seral development and older forest structure zones, where timber production will be secondary to habitat development.
 - b. The extent and general location of areas to be dedicated to old forest structure zones (OFSZs). The OFSZs will maintain or develop key old forest features. The OFSZs will be available for timber harvest.
3. The Management Plan's approach to (a) protection residual old growth and (b) restricting the extent and conditions under which herbicides may be utilized to control native hardwoods.
4. The process of conducting a recreation users survey, establishing a recreation user group, and developing a new recreation plan for the Forest. This plan would indicate the desired extent and location of recreation areas, corridors, roads, trails, and facilities that will be managed to enhance the full spectrum of appropriate recreational opportunities given JDSF's management goals.
5. The need to modify other elements of the Management Plan, as requested by the Director.

B. On an ongoing basis:

1. Review of ongoing implementation of the Management Plan, as requested by the Director.
2. When requested by the Director of Board, provide periodic recommendations on forest management policies and the Management Plan.
3. Review and comment on proposed even-aged harvesting.
4. Provide advice to the Director, CAL FIRE staff, or the Board on other specific issues as determined by the Director, CAL FIRE staff, or the Board.

C. JDSF Advisory Group responsibilities defined in the JDSF Forest Management Plan are hereby incorporated by reference.

D. The JDSF Advisory Group will inform the Demonstration State Forest Advisory Group (DSFAG) on the effectiveness of the implementation of the JDSF Management Plan.

APPENDIX 3

JAG Committee Membership and Charge

Work Plan

Facilitate JAG organizing its work, learning the content of the current Management Plan, evaluating the Plan, getting the JAG the information it needs to move forward with its tasks, and coordinating the development of the JAG's final report at the conclusion of the Initial Implementation Period.

Members:

Helms (chair): Taylor (Recreation), Melo (Economics), Liquori (Research and Demonstration), Bailey (Landscape), Tilley (Timber Harvest Plan Review), Braudrick (Outreach). Henly (staff)

Landscape

Review and develop recommendations on landscape allocations (Management Plan Map Figure 5 and related Plan elements such as found in Chapter 3) and desired mix of forest conditions over time.

Members:

Bailey (chair), Gill, Perkins, Taylor, Valentine, Jani. Jameson and Henly (staff).

Research and Demonstration

Develop the framework for research and demonstration in the context of collaboration with others, scientific basis for management, key research questions to be addressed, mission-oriented research, administration/governance and funding; monitoring, basis for adaptive management.

Members:

Liquori (chair): Porter, Helms, Valentine, Taylor. Webb (staff).

Recreation

Provide initial input to JDSF on user needs, particularly in relation to THPs being considered during the Initial Implementation Period, recreation elements of the Management Plan, and the process of establishing a Recreation User Group.

Members:

Taylor (chair), Braudrick, Tilley. Pedersen (staff).

Economics

Review and comment on current and projected revenue flows, operating costs, cash flow, and funding needs for JDSF, as well as the broader economic implications of the management of the Forest.

Members:

Melo (chair): Liquori, Tilley, Braudrick, Taylor. Jameson and Eng (staff).

Outreach

Review and make recommendation related to outreach on research, demonstration, education, recreation, and Forest management in general.

Members:

Braudrick (chair), Helms

Timber Harvest Plan Review

Conduct field reviews of THPs on behalf of JAG as requested.

Members:

Tilley (chair): Melo, Taylor, Braudrick, Perkins. Linstedt, Webb (staff).

APPENDIX 4

November 2008 – JAG Agreements on Goals

1. **RESEARCH, & DEMONSTRATION:** Improve the amount and quality of information concerning economic forest and timber management, forest ecosystem processes, watershed processes, performance of forest protection measures, that is available to the general public, forest landowners, resource professionals, timber operators, the timber industry, and researchers.
2. **EDUCATION AND OUTREACH:** Engage the public and community about the forest's research and demonstration activities through education and outreach, and recreation.
3. **WATERSHED AND ECOLOGICAL PROCESSES:** Promote and maintain the health, sustainability, ecological processes, and biological diversity of the forest and watersheds during the conduct of all land management activities.
4. **TIMBER MANAGEMENT:** Manage the forest on the sustained yield principle, defined as management which will achieve continuous yields of high quality timber products that contribute to local employment and tax revenue, consistent with environmental parameters related to watershed, wildlife, fisheries, and aesthetic and recreational enjoyment and constraints related to providing a diverse, dynamic matrix of forest habitats and seral stages for researchers.
5. **RECREATION and AESTHETIC ENJOYMENT:** Plan for and provide enhanced levels of low impact recreational opportunities that are compatible with forest management objectives and healthy ecological processes, that are consistent with historic recreational use characteristics, and that allow for engagement of recreation user groups.
6. **INFORMATION, PLANNING, & STAFFING:** Develop, maintain, and update management plans and other planning documents and processes. Manage and support the information needs and staffing needs of all State Forest programs. Communicate with the public, and actively seek input from the public regarding management of the Forest.
7. **FOREST PRODUCTS:** Maintain a program that provides an opportunity for the public and small businesses to purchase forest products.
8. **PROPERTY CONFIGURATION:** Improve the boundary layout of the State Forest to facilitate management logistics and increase demonstration and research opportunities.

APPENDIX 5

Landscape Allocations

APPENDIX 6

Research and Demonstration

Appendices are currently together with main doc and will be inserted here – Appendix letters need to be corrected.

APPENDIX 7

Economics

A. Harvest Levels Needed to Raise \$6 Million

Question 3 from the Work Plan: “What revenue requirements are needed to meet the desired budget?”

Given Information: JDSF staff estimates that the revenue requirements to implement the Management Plan, as adopted by the Board of Forestry, are about \$5.974 million. For the purpose of this table, revenue requirements are rounded to \$6.0 million.

Given Information: The Management Plan provides for a timber harvest of between 20 to 25 million board feet (MMBF) per year, not to exceed 35 million board feet (MMBF) in any single year.

Assumption: JDSF is directed to cover its costs by raising revenues. The primary source of revenue has been the sale of timber. For a number of years, while JDSF had an active timber sale program, the basis of bids was for a single price per thousand board feet (MBF), regardless of species. This allows for a simple calculation to show the relationship between a level of harvest, based on the bid price for timber, to raise \$6.0 million.

<u>Bid Price, \$/MBF</u>	<u>MMBF to Raise \$6.0 million (1) & (2)</u>		
\$50	120	million	board feet
\$100	60	“	“
\$150	40	“	“
\$200	30	“	“
\$250	24	“	“
\$300	20	“	“
\$350	17	“	“
\$400	15	“	“
\$450	13	“	“
\$500	12	“	“
\$550	11	“	“
\$600	10	“	“
\$650	9	“	“
\$700	9	“	“
\$750	8	“	“
\$800	8	“	“

(1) Timber volumes rounded to the nearest 1 million board feet to match the JDSF Management Plan harvest numbers.

(2) This table reflects the Economics Committee understanding for a full budget to implement the Management Plan as adopted by the Board of Forestry. See a similar table for actual estimates for FY 2008 – 2009, prepared by Helge Eng.

APPENDIX 7 Economics

B. Camp 3 Research and Costs

On October 8, 2008, a subcommittee consisting of Jere Melo (Economics Committee Chair) and Lynn Webb (Staff) met to review the JAG report, "Recommended Late-Seral Forest Development Prescription for the Camp Three Timber Sale". Based on our own interpretation of the tasks listed in that report, we prepared an initial outline of tasks, and in some cases, made a rough estimate of the time required. This was considered by the CAL FIRE staff, and on October 29, Director Grijalva clarified the work to be done within the current available CAL FIRE resources. We assume that all JAG members have received that letter.

Accordingly, on November 13, we met for a second time to prepare this report based on the Director's letter. Through discussion with CAL FIRE staff, we have estimated the time necessary to complete the tasks and used "Cost to Government" daily rates as follows*:

- Forester II \$670/day
- Forester I \$560/day
- Biologist \$562/day
- Assistant II \$393/day

Fiscal Year 2008-2009

Task: Remark the Camp Three Sale

Units A, B, C & D total 224.5 acres. We assumed a production of 6 acres per day to flag the boundaries and to remark the harvest trees, or 38 working days, using a crew of a Forester I and a Forester II.

Forester I, 38 working days X \$560 per day	\$ 21,280
Forester II, 38 working days X \$670 per day	\$ 25,460
Total	\$ 46,740

Task: Install CFI plots in the Control Unit and in Harvest Units B & C

The task is to install five (5) full, 1/5-acre CFI plots in each unit and ten (10) basic plots, 1/20-acre in size, also in each unit. Due to the need to take increment cores, we assume a production level of 0.7 plots per day for the full size plots and 1.0 plot per day for the basic plots, using a crew of a Forester I and a Forester II. This works out to a total of 51.4 working days, and we assume a cost of supplies of \$1,000.

Forester I, 51.4 working days X \$560 per day	\$ 28,784
Forester II, 51.4 working days X \$670 per day	\$ 34,438
Supplies	\$ 1,000
Total	\$ 64,222

Task: Establish and Monitor Bird Species Presence Plots

This task is to monitor for the presence of bird species. The assumption is that a biologist would spend two days to establish plots and a half day on ten separate days for this work.

Biologist, 2 full days +10 working days X 0.5 X \$562 per day \$ 3,934

Fiscal Year 2008-2009 Grand Total \$114,896

Fiscal Year 2009-2010

Task: Refresh Plots in Harvest Units B & C

Following timber harvest, plots will need to be refreshed in Units B and C. That will also be a good opportunity to make a list of harvest trees, residual trees and damaged trees. We assume a production of 1 plot per day, 30 working days, using a crew of a Forester I and an Assistant II.

Forester I, 30 working days X \$560 per day	\$ 16,800
Assistant II, 30 working days X \$393 per day	\$ 11,790
Supplies	nominal
Total	\$ 28,590

Task: Input Plot Data, Process Data using current CFI Program and Prepare New Subroutines to process CFI Results.

We assume production of two days for a Forester I and an Assistant II to enter the plot data. Because data processing is essentially instantaneous on existing software, a nominal cost is assigned to that step. Some new subroutines for processing outputs is necessary, such as the 50th to 80th percentile growth analysis, use of increment cores to establish a prior inventory, and assignment to clumps or individual tree status.

Forester I, Input Data, 2 working days X \$560 per day	\$ 1,120
Assistant II, Input Data, 2 working days, X \$393 per day	\$ 786
Process Data	nominal
Forester II, New Subroutines, 2 working days X \$670 per day	\$ 1,340
Total	\$ 3,246

Task: Monitor Bird Species Presence Plots

See description for same in 2008-2009 FY, also for each subsequent year.

Biologist, 10 working days, X 0.5 X \$562 per day \$ 2,810

Task: Demonstration, Interpretation and Education

This task requires planning and design, materials and construction and the installation of one station to interpret the Camp Three Timber Sale. It also requires development of a professionally designed questionnaire to evaluate public reaction and understanding of this example of forest management.

Forester I, plan and design station, 2 working days X \$560 per day	\$ 1,120
Materials	\$ 1,500
Forester I, construct station, 10 working days X \$560 per day	\$ 5,600
Forester I, Install station, 1 working day X \$560 per day	\$ 560

Forester II, plan and print brochure, 10 working days X \$670 per day \$ 6,700

Total \$ 15,480

Fiscal Year 2009-2010 Grand Total

\$ 50, 126

Fiscal Years, 2014-2015 and 2019-2020

Task: Re-measure the Plots and Process the Data

At five and ten years after timber harvest, the plots will need to be re-measured and the data input and processed. We assume that the 1/5-acre CFI plots will be re-measured at the rate of 1.5 plots per day and that the 1/20-acre plots can be re-measured at the rate of 2.0 plots per day.

Forester I, 40 working days X \$560 per day \$ 22,400

Forester II, 40 working days X \$670 per day \$ 26,800

Forester I, input data, 2 working days X \$560 per day \$ 1,120

Forester II, input data, 2 working days, X \$670 per day \$ 1,340

Process Data nominal

Total \$ 51,660

- This cost estimate is based on use of current “Cost to Government” amounts, not including an allowance for inflation

Ten Years Cost Estimate, Including a Year For Harvest

2008-2009 \$ 114,896

2009-2010 \$ 50,126

2010-2011 \$ 2,810

2011-2012 \$ 2,810

2012-2013 \$ 2,810

2013-2014 \$ 2,810

2014-2015 \$ 54,470

2015-2016 \$ 2,810

2016-2017 \$ 2,810

2017-2018 \$ 2,810

2018-2019 \$ 2,810

2019-2020 \$ 54,470

Total \$ 296,442

APPENDIX 8

Stakeholder Meeting Outcomes

A. Silviculture Practitioners' Workshop

The major outcomes from this Workshop are included within Chapter 3 of the main document, Page X.

Note: This statement may have to be included here in the Appendix as a cross-reference.

B. Science Workshop, Berkeley, Feb. 2010

Notes:

1. *Does JAG want this included?*

2. *From Mike L.: This summary was sent to all participants, and the few comments received were incorporated into the version we sent to JAG. All of the comments received from the invited attendees (including the facilitator and Rick Standiford) indicated they were quite happy with the compiled notes.*

3. *If included, check for correct Appendix letter and insert reference to the Workshop in main doc. – probably under “Centers of Excellence?”.*

Invited Workshop Attendees:

- Hartwell Welsh – Humboldt State University
- Kate Sullivan – Humboldt Redwood Company
- Kim Rodriques – UC Cooperative Extension
- Kevin O'Hara -- UC Berkeley, Silviculture
- Steve Norman -- US Forest Service
- Ron LeValley -- Mad River Biologists
- Frieder Schurr -- UC Blodgett Forest
- Pete Cafferata – CAL FIRE
- Rick Standiford -- UC Systemwide
- Dorinda Nyberg -- Moderator

KEY THEMES & TAKE-HOME MESSAGES (EXECUTIVE SUMMARY)

The convened experts broadly agreed that the Landscape Allocation for a “World-Class” Research and Demonstration Forest should be constructed using a Hypothesis-Oriented Framework that defines an organizational structure for testing and improving forest policies and practices throughout the Redwood region. Such a framework could be organized around models, ranging from simple conceptual models to more detailed quantitative models that would provide some organizational rigor and could eventually improve the ability to predict potential impacts associated with management practices. This type of framework would provide stakeholders with reliable information for how to manage forests in a sustainable manner. It would allow the entire forestry community to leverage knowledge gained at JDSF throughout the Redwood region (and beyond), while also ensuring that management within JDSF meets the goals and objectives defined within the management plan. Embedded within this Hypothesis-Oriented approach should be:

- **An Adaptive Management Framework** that rigorously tests the assumptions around existing policies and practices that occur within the Redwood region. integrates monitoring, research, and demonstration in ways that improve practices and policies of interest to the forestry community

- **Sufficient diversity of structural conditions** exists (and is maintained over time) across the landscape such that current and future researchers will have a complement of varied conditions upon which to conduct research

A **primary goal** of this Hypothesis-Oriented Framework would be to test and refine Forestry policies and practices within the Redwood Region (and perhaps beyond) that can support continued extraction of resources in a sustainable manner without unraveling our watersheds and negatively impacting sensitive resources. Such a goal should more effectively lead to:

1. The recovery of endangered species, and
2. Restoration of old-growth redwood forest ecosystems

There was also broad agreement that the landscape allocation should reflect a focus on strategic “**Centers of Excellence**” that define a somewhat narrow, yet multi-disciplinary research focus for the forest that helps to resolve critical issues facing forest management within and beyond the Redwood region. Two suggested Centers of Excellence aroused a substantial degree of interest by all the workshop participants:

1. **Seek to Understanding the dynamics between habitat and structural relationships with Redwood Ecosystems** – specifically focused around upland species, among which would perhaps including a sub-focus of how to manage for older forests. Use models as the basis for our existing understanding. Formulate the models on existing structure of the landscape. Aim to be predictive so that the data can be validated through experiments.
2. **Seek to understand how to achieve the recovery of watersheds by way of a focused approach to Coho salmonid recovery** - drive to restoration of coho habitat/riparian habitats/watersheds as fast as possible. Get really good about recovering fish. Test new rules. Invest heavily in restoration to see if we can recover the species. Construct more complete management system, so that we can export principles, policies and practices to other lands.

These two centers should follow parallel research pathways that could provide analytical and methodological references and thus support their mutual development.

In developing the Landscape Allocation, **JAG should think more about how JDSF can integrate opportunities across the entire Redwood landscape.** A landscape-based, cooperative approach increases the relevance of JDSF to many stakeholders. Also, the ability to manage at landscape-scales is greatly improved by collaborating with other landowners throughout the Redwood region (since there is probably limited opportunity within JDSF to address landscape-scale issues given its size, limited range of variability, and other management constraints. Building a Research Cooperative would:

- Leverage funding resources from a broader array of cooperators, agencies and granting entities
- Establish JDSF as a center of research that provides the staff, money and support for the cooperative

- Provide collaborators that can also support adaptive management efforts by engaging in evaluations of policies and practices throughout the region
- Leverage the unique capacities of JDSF to do manipulative studies that cannot be easily replicated by other land-uses, recognizing that generally,
 - Parks and Conservation blocks can provide references
 - Industrial landowners typically offer more active production-oriented forestry
 - USFS lands have different management constraints than typically apply to lands operating under Forest Practices regulations
 - Habitat Conservation Lands offer other management models
 - Descriptive studies can be conducted anywhere

The Experts briefly reviewed existing landscape allocation proposals under consideration by JAG and generally found that while containing some good ideas and concepts, generally:

- The Management Plan proposal is too focused around silviculture and lacks any defining hypotheses
- The Natural Forestry default is too rigid and lack's sufficient diversity
- The working Research Committee's approach is too nebulous (in its current form). Needs more thoughtful framework built around *Centers of Excellence*.

As an interim approach, the allocation balance as expressed in the Management Plan is pretty close to where it needs to be in the short-term. It is similar to Blodgett's allocation in its distribution, and it offers sufficient flexibility to respond to opportunities. As an interim allocation prior to developing a more definitive hypothesis-based approach, this is probably enough.

Constructing the Hypothesis-Oriented approach to allocation should start by:

1. Synthesize information for the existing landscape
 - Begin by developing simplified (cartoon) conceptual models
 - Use the conceptual models to begin constructing more quantitative models using existing inventories and data to test what we think we know and don't know about the key relationships in each Center of Excellence
 - Start simply, and increase the level of sophistication as knowledge develops
 - Note that many existing models can be found within the existing scientific literature (and other forest management experiences). The key for JDSF is to refine and integrate these tools so that the results are relevant. Look to Watershed Analysis and similar tools.

-
- 2. For Watersheds: begin active restoration of coho as soon as possible (recovery is urgently needed!)
 - Active restoration focused on wood placement, fish passage and other habitat improvements (e.g. reconnect floodplains, etc.)
 - Intensively monitor to document what works (and what doesn't)
 - Apply experimental methods using testable hypotheses
- 3. Develop limiting factors models
- 4. Formulate and test various working hypotheses (including peer-review from cooperators)
- 5. Define upland units on wildlife/ecosystems needs (watersheds probably not useful unit structure for uplands)
- 6. Define riparian units using geomorphic reaches
- 7. Begin to define a desired future condition trajectory for all stands (or management units). Every manipulations is based on testing hypotheses.

In addition to the above activities associated with developing the scientific basis for the Hypothesis-Oriented allocation, several relevant tasks include:

- Form cooperatives and adaptive management frameworks that can be used by those cooperatives (possibly integrating with the Monitoring Study Group and others)
- Hold a symposium of land/ocean recovery of salmonids (look to NSF as a resource here)
- Develop JDSF expertise center (staffing, partners, resources, etc.)

Over a period of years, this effort should target the development of formal management systems (combinations of regulations, policies, practices and Adaptive Management) that would make models available to other land-owners. Start using the context of the existing regulatory framework, and actively refine as information evolves.

From a structural perspective, the Experts suggested that the building blocks should be units that integrate a) existing conditions, b) desired future conditions, and c) data-driven models that define research objectives (hypotheses).

The concept of shifting mosaics were not considered appropriate, as they can complicate studies by introducing greater complexity in legacy conditions (e.g. seed banks, etc). Instead, strong support was voiced for stable units that persist over time so as to provide that stability required for long-term studies. Specific recommendations for data and infrastructure needs are provided.

With regard to measuring (and thus ensuring) an adequate diversity of structural conditions on the forest, the experts advised JAG to keep it relatively simple, by using existing silvicultural classification systems (e.g., modified Oliver and Larsen as discussed in a paper by Dr. Kevin O'Hara's) as the base. Additional detail (silvicultural systems, habitat relationships, etc.) can be integrated as our collective sophistication of these landscape-scale processes and functions naturally evolves (and as the language develops to better describe these variations). Identify units (primarily around sub-watersheds or similar eco-system units) and keep those units stable. Units might consider defining classes of treatment types in a manner similar to Blodgett Forest (subject to variability within the units). Over time, as models evolve,

Move toward defining measures of diversity using hypothesis-based approach described above.

C. Agency Workshop, Santa Rosa, Oct. 2010 Attendance X

(Summary to be provided by Russ)

D. Public Meeting, Fort Bragg, Nov. 18, 2010 -- Attendance 60

1. Growing wood for carbon payments?
2. Improve camping opportunities. Should recreation be a profit center?
3. Does JDSF really require \$6 million when current operations are \$2 million. Can we see documentation?
4. Why is stumpage of \$200 per thousand so much lower than \$800 mill price?
5. Demonstration of good management practices for landowners should be highest priority on JDSF, not research.
6. How much redwood is sold overseas? Is there international interest in redwood research?
7. Need woods operations/contracts/sales for small operators.
8. There has been a lot of pain and suffering in the local logging industry. JDSF has lost veteran administrators who did a great job getting THPs up and running.
9. Consider setting aside areas not open to humans. Need emphasis on aesthetics, protection of rare species. No clearcutting. Encourage biodiversity and fungi. Ensure that recreation does not harm conservation.
10. Need to eliminate use of herbicides that wipe out biodiversity. What are JAG's recommendations?
11. Ten years ago couldn't find a place to camp. Does JDSF give full support to recreation vs. timber management. Big constituency does not want Forest to step back into the old way of doing business. Need to recognize a groundswell of support for recreation.
12. Forest THPs and plans don't seem to adequately address wildlife, large tree retention, habitat. Would like more trails for biking and hiking.
13. Glad to hear about protection of areas. Need areas for OHVs that don't degrade land.
14. Know that recreation and timber harvesting can go together on a public forest.
15. Agree that proper use of OHVs needed. Need biologists and botanists to provide input. Probably not possible to eliminate use of OHVs on Forest, but need reasonable compliance, e.g., "greensticker" associated with fee payment, law enforcement? Cal Poly Pismo Beach study shows revenue of \$100 million of economic activity in the area. Are there similar opportunities at JDSF?
16. Families in the logging business also love forests and forest recreation for their children just the same as everyone else.

E. Conservation Groups, San Francisco, Dec. 2010 Attendance X

F. Conservation Groups, Boonville, Dec. 2010 Attendance X

G. Landowner/University/Professional Societies Attendance X

APPENDIX 9

MAPS

(See File “REPORT FINAL – Appendix Map”)

APPENDIX 10

CONSENSUS VOTES

Each consensus vote be inserted here and referenced to text

Disagreement Comments received to date to be organized and numbered and maybe re-formatted

Jere Melo -- Hardwoods

TO: Jackson Demonstration State Forest Advisory Group

c/o Russ Henley, Deputy Director, CALFIRE

FROM: Jere Melo, JAG Member

SUBJECT: Rationale, “Strong Disagreement” Vote

Hardwood Dominated Stand Retention

DATE: November 2, 2010

I am the single JAG member who voted in “Strong Disagreement” to the proposal from the Landscape Committee for retention of some specific hardwood stands. The background for the Landscape Committee proposal is:

- Six (6) stands were shown on a very small scale map of JDSF as the ones for retention, three (3) on the west side and three (3) on the east side.
- A one-page report was provided. The report indicated that the stand sizes ranged from 17 to 106 acres, and that the Management Plan classified them as Mixed Hardwood Conifer.

The report contains the following statements:

- *“I (the author) have not visited each site, so do not know the accuracy of the map relative to either the dominance of hardwoods or the tree sizes.”*
- *“Management guidelines for these would be to conduct no timber operations or conduct hardwood control in them until after conifer basal area exceeds 2/3 of the stands total basal area. An option for retention would be to allow conifer harvest that does not decrease the Hardwood:Conifer ratio.”*
- *“Also as an aside, the area and distribution of hardwood-dominated stands will likely decline without some even-aged management coupled with fire and minimal hardwood control efforts.”*

My “Strong Disagreement” vote is based on the following:

1st Bullet: The stands are not “Hardwood Dominated”; they are Mixed Hardwood Conifer. Because the stands are not defined on the ground, nor has hardwood dominance been determined, staff will not be sure of compliance if the proposal is adopted by BOF and CALFIRE. No information was provided as to how these small areas related to JAG proposals to revise the allocation of forest structure conditions.

2d Bullet: This is an attempt for a prescriptive set of rules, very complex rules, and a choice with conflicts. There is no reconciliation between the standards, “..”no timber operations” .., and “...allow conifer harvest...”. There is no firm standard for staff to follow. I object to the attempt by JAG to set prescriptive rules that contain conflicts.

3d Bullet: I happen to agree with this statement. However, the call for even-aged management to maintain hardwoods seems out of character with the theme of the Management Plan as adopted by BOF. Further, my experience as a forester is that there always have been various mixtures of hardwood and conifers on JDSF and other ownerships on the west side of Mendocino County. I should also state that I am no fan of the thick tanoak areas that are largely not productive. Give me Redwood or Douglas-fir, anytime.

Aug 27 Item 4: Mike Anderson's compromise to Landscape:

Mike Liquori

My vote is registered as Qualified Disagreement:

I generally feel that the Landscape Committee did not provide a compelling case for the benefits of these additional allocations relative to other values for these areas (e.g., research, demonstration, monitoring, revenue, operational accessibility, leveraging work done to date by staff, etc). I also have concerns that the cumulative extent of additional allocations may challenge the ability for the forest to satisfy its sustainable harvest obligations, and without information on the cost impacts, I feel it is irresponsible to approve these lower priority areas.

Linwood Gill

I voted Qualified Disagreement for this section. I based my vote on my opinion that the Brandon Gulch headwaters and the Volcano THP area should be left as Matrix area. This would give the unique opportunity to contrast and compare the effects of LSD, OFDA and Matrix management within the confines of a single watershed.