



for the greatest good



BLUE MOUNTAINS
FOREST PLAN REVISION - 2015
Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman
National Forests

Meeting Notes

Public Meeting on Pace and Scale of Restoration and the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision

Hosted by Grant County, High Desert Partnership, and the Malheur National Forest

John Day, Oregon | Dec. 11, 2015

These notes reflect the best efforts of the notetaker to capture the discussion of meeting participants, but in no way are these notes a word-for-word transcript as the notetaker may have unintentionally missed some statements or dialogue. Also, the notes do not attempt to correct or clarify any statements made by participants.

Participants (as listed on the sign-in sheet): Boyd Britton, Chris Labhart, Larry Blasing, Gary Ringering, Cheryl Ringering, Jim Boethin, Louis Provencher, Elaine Eisenbraun, Marty Eisenbraun, Billie Jo George, Frances Preston, Harold Preston, Jim Sproul, Guy Sproul, Irene Jerome, Angel Carpenter, Mark Webb, Dave Traylor, Tad Houpt, Jack Southworth (facilitator)

U.S. Forest Service (USFS) participants: Steve Beverlin, Sabrina Stadler, Gunnar Carnwath, Amy Unthank, Ryan Falk, Gerald Dixon, Teresa Dixon, Amanda Lindsay, Don Hann, Matt Rathbone, Peter Fargo (notetaker)

Organizations represented: Grant County, John Day City Council, American Forest Resource Council, Ecotrust Forest Management, Corporate Wetlands Restoration Partnership, Blue Mountain Eagle, High Desert Partnership, and USFS

Introductory Remarks

Jack Southworth, Facilitator with High Desert Partnership: Welcome everyone; please take a seat around the circle and we will get started. We are here to talk about the pace and scale of forest restoration as it is addressed in the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision. Everyone will have an opportunity to voice their concerns and solutions. Please be respectful of others views, please focus on the issues not the person, and keep in mind that we need to leave time for others to speak. We will go around the circle a few times, so everyone will have ample time to make their points, listen to others, and ask questions as we go around.

Who are you, where are you from, and what is your relationship to the Malheur National Forest?

- Fifth generation resident; the Malheur is important to my family and way of life; I want to pass it on to future generations.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- Live in John Day; Grant County Community Wildfire Program; the forest is the heart/soul of our county. The Malheur National Forest has been doing a great job in recent years, and I wonder, can we sustain the pace and scale of restoration on this forest?
- Grant County; what happens on public lands controls a lot of economic opportunities in the County.
- Retired; my concern is the USFS really failed us; the timber sale program went down to next-to nothing; we have recently been able to make some positive changes, but policies still are not adequate; we are not getting products off the National Forest that should be available, but the growth is there.
- Forester and silviculturist on the Blue Mountains Forest Plan Revision Team.
- Billy Jo George; concerned about access issues on the Forests; concerned about timber and lack of logging on the forest.
- Forest Supervisor; interested in ecological sustainability and also community economic sustainability.
- Francis Preston; born in Prairie City; father was a logger; mother was a homemaker; concerned about the Malheur, Umatilla, and neighboring forests; want us to have access: all people, all cultures, and all ages. Concerned about Article 21; that people in DC will try to burn us out and send us to the corridor.
- Forest archeologist for the Malheur National Forest
- Ecologist with the USFS; looking for the best-available science to inform decision-making and thought process in the Forest Plan.
- Worried sick about the forests and how they've been managed over the past 10 years; worried about the wildlife; this County is going to crash if we don't make a change.
- Came here the year that the 1990 Forest Plan was put in place; my family homesteaded in the Blue Mountains; loggers in the family; dad became a scientist, and I followed that path into the USFS.
- Gerald Dickson; with the Malheur National Forest; looking for opportunities for forest products
- Recent land owner adjacent to the USFS; want to be sure the USFS is a responsible neighbor.
- Natural Resources Staff Officer on the Malheur National Forest
- Journalist with the Blue Mountain Eagle
- Lived in Alaska; now in Prairie City; interested in how Mt. Vernon will deal with wood chips.
- Recently celebrated my 20th year in John Day; where we are is light years ahead of 10 years ago, and I am grateful to the Malheur National Forest for stepping up.
- Facilitator; rancher in Bear Valley; use the forests for grazing, firewood, hunting, etc.
- Retired after 30 years with the USFS in grants and agreements; in-laws all tied to the ranching community; on the John Day City Council; need to promote economic development and USFS can play an important role.
- Manage timber lands; concern is competing with the sudden glut of fire salvage logs coming off the forest.
- Malheur National Forest is in every direction from my property; I'm on the North Fork John Day Watershed Council and do a lot of work related to the National Forest.
- Retired school teacher and County Commissioner.
- Malheur National Forest is the lifeblood of Grant County.

Opening Remarks

Boyd Britton, Grant County Commissioner: I'm pleased with where we are at and how far we've come. We still have a mill here in Grant County, and that continues to benefit the community. However, I don't think you're getting enough budget to maintain the pace & scale we currently have. Let's keep it up; I would like to see it increased.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Chris Labhart, Grant County Commissioner: What we have today is better than what we had a decade ago, but now we need to ensure a sustainable social and economic situation.

Steve Beverlin, Malheur National Forest Supervisor: I got here three years ago. Two weeks into the job we had the Parish-Cabin Fire; two weeks later the mill announced it was going to close. The community, Forest Collaboratives, individuals, County Court, and USFS got together to see what we could do. We put a proposal together, and the Regional Forester said, "Go ahead." We hired 48 more employees to analyze lands/projects faster; we made three times the number of decisions in half the time. Our timber target went from 25 million board feet (MMBF) to 75 MMBF. We have the largest grazing program in Region 6. This year was the first in a long while that over 600 students enrolled in school in the County, which is one of interrelated benefits of the work we are doing together.

Gunnar Carnwath, USFS Ecologist (The following is a limited sampling of the discussion. For details, please see the attached briefing paper, beginning on page 8, "Timber Topics: Frequently Asked Questions.")

- I'd like to provide a brief overview of the Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ) about timber in the briefing paper.
- Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ) is an equation; to change what is on the right side of the equal sign, we must change what is on the left side of the equal sign. What is on the left side? Desired Conditions, Existing Conditions, Acres Suitable for Timber Production (the biggest driver of ASQ), Yield Tables, Harvest of Large Trees, Assumption of Non-Declining Flow (equal or greater availability of timber in future years than in the present year).
- There are ecological arguments to make in favor of a Declining Flow. However, if we have a Declining Flow of harvestable timber volume, there are economic implications. How high do we want to go in the near term to address the ecological needs? Conversely, how low do we want to go in the future to reach a sustainable harvest level?
- We are taking another look at yield tables using new models/data, and comparing the results of modeling to results on the ground.
- Harvest of large trees: We need more land in Late/Old Single Story structure. To get there, we decided in the past not to cut large trees. Now we are revisiting this, because there are sometimes ecological reasons to harvest large trees. We are asking how many large trees are out there and could be harvested for ecological reasons, and how much additional volume they would represent?
- The Eastside Screens, especially the 21" screen, currently constrain the harvest of large trees. We are looking at a range of options to move past the 21" screens.

Questions and input around the circle

- How is the environmental community handling the possible loss of the 21" screen?
 - USFS: Short answer; they generally want to retain the 21" screen; they are vocally nervous about giving local USFS staff more discretion on the harvest of large trees. We are looking to move the discretion down to the Districts. That is going to be a contentious issue. We are going to help by giving local staff a list of possible exceptions that would allow the harvest of large trees.
- Aspen projects, for example. Will you cut and burn them or sell on a commercial sale?
 - USFS: That would be up to the Districts.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- One concern is that USFS is using timber to barter against access (i.e., closing roads as part of the environmental assessment for an area intended primarily for timber harvest). I'm not against logging but don't want it to affect access. I have never seen an open road block a project.
- USFS forester: Still getting up to speed; recently arrived from Colorado, where we didn't have a diameter cap. The diameter cap looks like an area where we could revise the Plan.
- The Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act does not say we can have HRV as a Desired Condition; it says we should manage the general forest for a variety of purposes, including timber. The National Forest Management Act changed that; said we would fundamentally change the stands, and that was okay. Since the USFS passed the Eastside Screens, they have made many of the same changes but have not solved the problem. We can't defend the Plan that the USFS put out originally. Don't regurgitate what you did before. My recommendation is to begin with a clean slate.
- Why not treat salvage in the same way you treat trees over 21"? I still have a problem with the current ASQ. My solution would be for you all to model based on the new parameters you described, including non-declining flow.
- Using this Desired Condition with Historic Range of Variation over all lands is a flaw. Applying it to the General Forest is causing a bottleneck. I don't see a way to do this unless you generate a new alternative; modify the Desired Condition to maximize timber products. Also, many uses go well together: timber and grazing.
- The system we have now borders on insanity; 16 percent unemployment in Grant County is unacceptable. How much growth is on the forest now, 100 or 150 MMBF? The 55 MMBF in the ASQ isn't enough; we need to increase the allowable cut, or it will burn. Same thing with grazing; if we're going to cut the trees, be sure to graze it, or it will burn. We must get back to multiple use and what's happening on the ground. I fear for the way of life in this County. Solution: Coordination with the County, where local plans have equal footing with federal plans. Local people ought to be writing this plan.
- Biomass is a concern of mine; we are looking at a possible biomass plant in Grant County that would process 80,000 green tons of biomass per year. I want it to be built here. It's a significant opportunity as Portland Gas & Electric transitions to greener fuels, and it looks like an 80/20 probability on the plus side it will be built here.
- Thank you to all of the USFS people who are working really hard; you have been willing to sit here and listen to different opinions. If we have declining flow, we may reduce jobs, we may reduce USFS staff (fewer people in our community and fewer with children in schools). I would recommend we avoid a declining-flow scenario. Let's think about future generations.
- Also concerned about declining flow. We will run out of easy ground; then we will need to do "cable logging" on steep slopes, which is more expensive. We would need access to larger trees to make that economically viable. My solution is to do away with the 21" limit, instead of pursuing declining flow, so we can maintain economically viable logging where it makes sense.
- I understand how important the timber industry is to do the work we do. Southern California doesn't have a timber industry anymore, and it shows.
- 4% growth per year on the forest; 55 MMBF would only be the "interest" of growth on 80,000 acres. The only way to deal with the fuels is to harvest at least what is growing each year. We need to cut more than is growing each year, instead of these Desired Conditions. Solutions: We need to know how much volume we have, how much it is growing each year, and we need to set the cut accordingly. Desired Conditions need to be what the forest needs, not what some scientist thinks.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- We used to have small fires; mostly loggers protecting their livelihoods; they put the fires out. Conditions have declined. We are collaborating with special interest groups, because they would sue us otherwise. We depend on the forests, but they are burning up. I am fearful of the firefighting industry; big business needs big fires. Incident commanders are getting experience at our cost. We must demand that our firefighters are immediate and relentless until the fires are out. We can't afford to sit and watch. We never had meetings like this years ago; people were doing their jobs and meeting needs of the County.
- Facilitator: Can you reconcile the 75 MMBF commitment from the Regional Office with the 55 MMBF we have now in the ASQ of the Preferred Alternative of the draft Plan?
 - USFS: Used different processes to reach these numbers. We are now updating our models and looking at a range of alternatives for ASQ in the Forest Plan Revision.
- I don't think the big Forest Plan will ever work. Take smaller chunks at a time. The Malheur National Forest has done well enough under the current Forest Plan. Why change it?
- Can't they get rid of the Eastside screens as easily as we got them?
 - USFS: Malheur National Forest is looking at an amendment that will allow us to cut over 21" trees. However, Forest Plan Amendments are a losing proposition. The Wallowa-Whitman National Forest spent years and a lot of money on an amendment related to the Snow Basin Project, but the project fell through, because the amendment fell through.
- How have recent fires informed the Forest Plan?
 - USFS: We had large fires, and we will continue to have large fires. The most acres ever burned across the west this year. It's climate change and a drying of the forest; we need to take that into account in our management and have more flexibility for salvage. We are doing salvage here on the Malheur, and hopefully the Forest Plan gives us the flexibility to manage as needed locally.
 - We are trying hard to address some of these issues. Salvage is a big issue, and based on feedback, we are looking closely at the standards and guidelines related to post-fire harvest.
- I'm encouraged to hear the knowledge in Grant County. People really care.
- This is our community; it is up to us to make it strong. We want the resources here for the next generation. I'm excited and appreciate the comments.
- Fires across the nation are on land managed by the same people; we need to manage the land differently.
- USFS, Malheur National Forest: Want to revisit the 75 MMBF. Make sure you get the information that we developed to justify 75 MMBF, especially from our local forester who is about to retire.
 - USFS, Forest Plan Revision: We have been in contact; there are differences in assumptions.
- USFS: Salvage; related to desired habitat across the landscape? Can we look at the range of variability of snags in post-fire habitat?
- In the 1980s the residents of this County were trying to slow the USFS down, because of the clear-cutting that was happening. Now we have a flip-flop. The environmentalists need to see what they have done. They made forest fires into a big business. The environmentalists are wrong. Harvest what is necessary; we need buffers. Make it a balance. Forest management we have now is only meant to do one thing, and that is burn. The Malheur National Forest in the 1970s was self-sufficient; now it is far from self-sufficient. I'm sick of the woodpecker shrines. Let's find a new form of management. My solution is let's get together to convince the environmentalists to work with us.
- USFS Ecologist: Historic Range of Variability (HRV) is well-established science, and it's important that we use it. However, HRV doesn't stand alone in the Desired Conditions. We are adapting it to reflect current social expectations—e.g., although large fires were more frequent in the past, large fires are not socially acceptable and therefore not a Desired Condition.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- USFS: Concerned about climate change and our ability to be nimble and responsive as changes come.
- USFS: Does HRV take into account the Future Range of Variability (esp. climate change).
 - USFS Ecologist: In a sense, yes. HRV reflects greater resilience to fire and provides for species viability. HRV is a big step forward to help us be more resilient to climate change, but we will need to look at vulnerable systems to see where adaptation needs more support.
- From what landscape designation does the USFS expect to get the most timber products?
 - USFS: General Forest. The Malheur has the largest General Forest areas of the three Blue Mtns. National Forests. 60-65% is saw log and the rest is biomass. 80% is a small business share, but 20% we put out to big business.
- Solution: 1990 Plan with no Designation of Routes. We have in this room 4-5 people who can step forward and take charge of this Forest Plan. Ryan and Steve, I challenge you to coordinate government-to-government with Chris and Boyd. I challenge you to bring a new Forest Plan to this area through coordination.
- USFS: Social/economic sustainability are important to me. Need agile industry across different sectors of the economy, and we need to be opportunistic when possible.
- Ecosystem services include timber, correct? USFS: Correct.
- What is the challenge for going higher on ASQ? Identify how many acres need to be treated, the volume across those acres, and the ASQ needed to treat those acres.

Summary of what was heard: Steve Beverlin, Malheur National Forest Supervisor

- I heard “not enough” and “too much.” Not enough timber, grazing, jobs, etc. Too much fire, dead trees, grass, unemployment, empty businesses.
- I also heard balance, expressed differently for each person.
- I appreciate the acknowledgment of the progress we have made on the Malheur National Forest. Nobody else is doing what we’re doing in the nation in terms of the pace and scale of restoration. We are doing the best we can with the resources we have been allocated, and those resources are limited across the Pacific-Northwest Region of the Forest Service. We would need more investment and more money to do more.
- In addition to the Ecological Desired Conditions (DCs) in the plan, we need Social and Economic DCs in the plan. We heard you there; we are trying to get that balance better and hopefully support our communities better.
- We’re looking at the appropriateness of taking “Designated Routes” out of the Plan and instead considering a statement about compliance with the national Travel Management Rule of 2005 (36 CFR 212).
- We are considering “Road Densities” only in wildlife corridors and elk winter range.
- Keep in mind, however, this is the Regional Forester’s decision ultimately.

Final thoughts around the circle

- How many people submitted formal comments on the draft Forest Plan in 2014? You have standing in the objection process.
- Old Growth Management Areas: Still in the plan? [USFS: Not in the Preferred Alternative.] Were other areas re-looked at? [USFS: Wildlife Emphasis Areas also removed.] I’m worried about wildlife over-emphasis.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

- The Malheur National Forest has done a great job, but they have received special treatment in their budget. That likely won't increase. There is only one bucket, so other National Forests have had to go with less.
- 500 MMBF of growth per year; even if we cut 150 MMBF per year, we won't have to worry about non-declining flow.
- USFS: Great to see people showing up, connected with the National Forest, and educated about the issues.
- Good meeting.
- Is there a way to create a model for Existing Conditions based on outside / local experts? [USFS: If it's the best-available data on the Existing Condition.]
- Would like to see more USFS people show up.
- Where is the younger generation? This is really all about them.
- You're not going to get the young people when you have double-digit employment; they are looking to get out.
- Thank you to Steve for trying. You're doing the best you can, and I appreciate that. I hope you stick around long enough to continue making a difference.
- USFS: Been here for 25 years. Eastside Screens were only supposed to be here for a matter of months, but they have been here since 1994. We need a new Forest Plan to get us up to speed, and I'm looking forward to having that new Plan to work with.
- USFS: Interdisciplinary teams are not just on the landscape scale; keep in mind the great interdisciplinary work being done on the Forest and District levels.
- Glad to be here.
- Good discussion; glad to be here.
- Very instructive.
- Steve found a way to make something happen rather than not happen. What he said is true about the laws/policies. If the USFS tries to make something happen, it can happen. We as the community need to be tenacious. Winston Churchill said, "Never never never never never give in."
- We need to look at the whole picture on this Forest, not just piece by piece. In Grant County, nearly 600 MMBF of growth per year. We never had fires like this before. Pine forests don't historically burn like this. If we don't have the forests, we don't have the benefits the forest provides such as clean water, game, etc.
- I appreciate how patient you have been with us. We are spending a lot of time discussing this input and doing the very best we can to address it.
- Recognize that USFS employees are a big part of Grant County (e.g., volunteers, kids in schools). About laws and regulations, the USFS can only go so far; we need to write our representatives in Congress, etc.
- Where will the additional material go? What is the market if we increase harvest dramatically? Will the prices drop, then cause us to harvest less?
- Support the USFS.
- Admire the passion of the USFS employees. Keep the team together if you can. The presence of federal employees in our County provides significant economic and social benefits.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Timber Topics: Frequently Asked Questions

What is the Allowable Sale Quantity (ASQ)?

- ASQ is the maximum amount of volume **potentially available** as part of regularly scheduled timber harvest from **lands suitable** for timber production **per decade**.
- Although it is expressed as an annual figure, it is actually a 10-year cap, within which annual variation is allowed.
- ASQ is primarily influenced by:
 - *Desired Conditions*
 - *Existing Conditions*
 - The number of acres considered suitable for timber production
 - An assumption of “non-declining flow” (not required)
- ASQ is not the same as the total harvested volume. It is not a promise or a goal.
- It is not based on budget; larger budget assumptions do not result in higher ASQ.

What is the Total Sale Program Quantity (TSPQ)?

- Total amount of volume estimated to be harvested under each Alternative. TSPQ is not a promise of, or a limit to, what may be done in the future.
- TSPQ volumes come from:
 - lands *Suitable* for timber production (ASQ)
 - lands *Unsuitable* for timber production but available for timber harvest to meet the Desired Conditions for a particular area (e.g., Riparian Management Areas, Old Forest)
 - Salvage, firewood, post and poles
- TSPQ is influenced by estimated budget.

What is the Historic Range of Variation (HRV) and why has it been used to develop Desired Conditions for the Forest Plan Revision?

- Range of Variation is defined as the variation of ecological characteristics and processes over scales of space and time that are appropriate for a given management application. The fundamental assumption underlying the use of HRV is if historical ranges in stand structures by forest type are maintained on current and future landscapes, then much of the habitat for native flora and fauna should be recreated and maintained. Thus, most species and ecosystem elements should remain viable. (Wiens et al, 2012; Agee, 2003).
- Use of HRV as reference point for Desired Conditions is not an attempt to turn managed landscapes in to wilderness or return to a specific time in the past. Rather, HRV is a lens that helps managers achieve multiple-use objectives.
- There is broad agreement among managers and scientists that HRV provides essential insights for decision-making. Managing toward HRV has the following benefits:
 - protecting biodiversity and ensuring species viability,
 - recognizing the roles of disturbance,
 - widening the options for management, and
 - maintaining resilience and ecological integrity.

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

How many acres are considered suitable for timber harvest in the Alternatives of the draft Environmental Impact Statement?

(See the chart in the Addendum for acreage: “Timber Suitability Classification for Alternatives C, D, and E”)

- **Alternative C** has the fewest suitable acreage for timber production because of a greater number of acres of Preliminary Administratively Recommended Wilderness Area (PARWA), Old Forest, and wider Riparian Management Areas. Alt. C contains additional areas in wildlife corridor management areas that were identified as unsuitable.
- **Alternative D** has the most suitable acreage for timber production, because Riparian Management Areas are narrower and Old Forest is classified as suitable. The effect of this classification would be to increase the ASQ, which is based on the suitable acres.
- **Alternatives B, E, and F** have the same suitable acreage, because they all have the same *Standards, Guidelines*, and similar *Management Areas* that influence Suitability for timber production. Old Forest and Riparian Management Areas are classified as Unsuitable for timber production.

What is the approach to Old Forest management in the 1990 (current) Forest Plans for the Malheur, Umatilla, and Wallowa-Whitman National Forests?

Eastside Screens:

- In 1994, the Forest Service Pacific Northwest Region regional forester issued “Interim Direction Establishing Riparian, Ecosystem, and Wildlife Standards for Timber Sales on Eastside Forests” (USDA Forest Service 1995c), commonly referred to as the Eastside Screens. It amended the 1990 Forest Plans by establishing riparian, ecosystem, and wildlife standards for timber sales.
- The Eastside Screens amendment emphasizes:
 - retaining and developing late old forest structures and patch sizes within the Historic Range of Variability;
 - maintaining or developing linkages between old forests;
 - meeting requirements for snags, downed logs, and green tree replacements; and
 - retaining most trees greater than 21 inches in diameter.

Old Growth Management Areas:

- All three 1990 Forest Plans designate Management Areas for old growth.
- Old Growth Management Areas are Unsuitable for timber production, but some Old Growth areas may be harvested for other purposes.
- In the 1990 Forest Plans, many Old Growth Management Areas were designated in areas that did not actually contain old forest characteristics. In addition, some areas have been affected by fire, insects, and disease, resulting in changes to species composition and forest structure. As a result, only between 20-40% of designated Old Growth Management Areas actually contain old forest structural characteristics.

Proposed Management of Old Forest and Large/Old Trees

In general, unlike the 1990 plans, the Revised Forest Plan recognizes that Old Forest characteristics are dynamic in space and time and should be managed accordingly.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | Alt. B | Alt. C | Alt. D | Alt. E | Alt. F |
|--|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|-----|---|---|
| Desired Conditions Direct Old Forest Management? | YES | YES | YES | YES | YES |
| Designated Old Forest Mgmt. Area? | No | YES | No | No | No |
| Standard or Guidelines on Harvesting > 21" DBH? | YES; Guideline: Retain >21" DBH (with exceptions) | YES; Standard: Retain >21" DBH (no exceptions) | NO | NO | NO |
| Standard or Guidelines on Harvesting Old Trees? | NO | NO | NO | YES: Guideline: Retain trees with old characteristics | YES: Guideline to retain trees >150 years old |

How are Snags (standing dead trees) and Down Wood addressed in the draft Plans? What are some Standards and Guidelines that could affect post-fire salvage of snags?

- Section 1.14 (Snags and Down Wood, starting on p. 47) in the Proposed Revised Land Management Plan includes the Background, Existing Condition, and Desired Condition regarding Snags and down wood.
- The Desired Condition for snags and down wood is to maintain ecological characteristics within the historic range of variability.
- Examples of Standards and Guidelines that could affect post-fire salvage of snags:

| Standard or Guideline | Alt B | Alt C | Alt D | Alt E, F |
|--|--------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------|
| Harvest no more than 50% of post-fire source habitat (*) | X | Salvage not permitted | No Standards or Guidelines | X |
| No snag harvesting in areas with fire perimeters less than 100 acres | X | Salvage not permitted | No Standards or Guidelines | X |
| Harvest no snags greater than 21" and 50% of 12-21" (**) | X | Salvage not permitted | No Standards or Guidelines | X |

* Except in the Wildland-Urban Interface

** Except for Danger/Hazard Trees

Contact Information:

- Matt Rathbone, Silviculturist: 541-523-1286
- Peter Fargo, Public Affairs Officer: 541-523-1231
- Website: fs.usda.gov/goto/BlueMountainsPlanRevision

Would you like to be on the Mailing List?

- Email bluemtnPlanrevision@fs.fed.us or call 541-523-1231

MEETING NOTES

(continued)

Addendum: Timber Suitability Classification for Alternatives C, D, and E

The chart below illustrates acres of land that are either Suitable, Unsuitable, or “Available” for timber harvest within the National Forest under different Alternatives in the draft Environmental Impact Statement. The definitions below are helpful for the purposes of this chart:

- Lands *Suitable* for timber production allow for regularly scheduled harvest of trees for industrial or consumer use.
- *Unsuitable* lands are deemed unsuitable for timber production based on criteria established by the National Forest Management Act (Sec. 6k) and the 1982 Planning Rule (Sec. 219.14). In general, this includes land with less than 10% canopy cover, significant regeneration issues/concerns, and lands withdrawn by law or policy (e.g., Wilderness Areas).
- “Available” lands are lands that are Unsuitable for regularly scheduled timber harvest but allow for the harvest of trees to meet Desired Conditions for a particular area (e.g., Riparian Management Areas)

