

## Notes/Discussion

### Red Flags

### Overall Approach:

- How does the 'PAC' approach deal with the dynamic nature of the landscape and capture places that may be better suited to sustain high quality habitat than the PAC itself?
  - o PAC as sort of an 'interim approach' to make sure we protect key elements while moving towards a more dynamic approach to keep those key elements over the Core Area/Home Range
  - o try to tee-up for the future of habitat across the Core Area, align to the processes
  - o PACs are areas that owls have chosen, there may be important aspects of them that we don't understand, so follow owls cues
  - o ONLY protecting PAC may not be sufficient for owl – some additional retention of dense habitat within Core Area
  - o Transition important – how do we transition from present to desired future conditions
    - e.g. Core Area – really try to align the dense conditions in locations where they are sustainable (this will need mechanical treatment, fire is too unpredictable to force this congruence, but role of fire important too)
  - o We should not be managing a PAC as a 300 acre homogeneous block – key elements of large, older trees, cool microclimates, steeper slope, higher canopy cover – tricky to find where those things are and how to manage them
- Territory Scale is where the questions lie (seems large agreement of science in terms of PAC and home range/landscape scale)
  - o Core Area – concentration of nesting, roosting, foraging activity
- What does NRV look like at the medium (stand? 10 – 100 ac) scale? we have info for small scale and landscape scale, but the rubber hits the road at that medium scale
  - o will need to find a balance between prescriptive and general
- Fire does answer all the questions – most places on the landscape need some mechanical before fire can be put back in there
  - o If you are going to push the use of fire, must acknowledge that there will be much more variation than this approach would suggest
  - o need a larger range of desired (or acceptable) conditions if using fire, accept the variation
  - o help overcome fear of certain burning
- How do we define resiliency and work with that to move forward
  - o when disturbance effects are within (or close to within) NRV – take advantage of that
  - o scale is of paramount importance – the scale of processes is the key to resiliency (e.g. very hard to get tree regeneration in these overly large, intense disturbance patches)
- What is appropriate in a PAC (fire and/or mechanical) – treatment

- worth trying to burn in PACs (spring burns, loosen LOPs in certain areas) to decrease fuel loads, even if some minimal structural impacts
- no evidence that low intensity fire has any (negative) impact
- burning evidence from Yosemite
- Variable density thinning looks a lot more like owl habitat than thinning from below (depending on the prescription)
- risk is not mechanical treatment itself, risk is the changing of habitat to lose key characteristics (Assessment goes with light treatment recommendation)
- revisit studies on differences between nest and non-nest stands to look at where difference starts to blur to add guidance in treatment allowances in PACs
- What proportions of the landscape is in PACs, what proportion of PACs are severely out of whack?
  - Central Sierra = 12-15% of landscape in PACs
- In Core Area outside PAC
  - manage for NRV and assume this will be good for owls
  - at Core Area, if you have less than some threshold of high quality nest/roost then protect some more of it even if not in NRV locations
- Need to work back in East-West gradients and North-South gradients into Recommendations
- SDI:
  - at what scale do you calculate it? avoid calculating at a 'clump' scale
  - get some language about managing for it at a larger scale (want some clump/gap spatial heterogeneity)
  - some language about what makes up the SDI as well – lots of small trees, or a few big trees – can have same SDI, but very different characteristics
- Snag clumpiness – some more guidance
  - in SSPM only 1/3 of landscape contributes to snag (Scott has some papers)
  - mean is an anomaly
- Metapopulation dynamics and importance of PACs
  - unoccupied PACs can be important for metapopulation survival, winking in and out

## To Do Items:

- Rearrange and clarify (see Jamie's suggestions)
  - o Sarah or Jamie to tackle immediately
- Sarah ask Matt to send doodle for next 2 in-person
  - o Jan 25, Feb 1, Feb 8 (two day meeting)
  - o Any week in March (except the last week)
- All/Each
  - o Each tackle Jamie's comments specific to text that are easy to tackle
  - o Specific questions for scientists
- Silviculturalists:
  - o Scales
    - SDI
    - middle scale in general
  - o Gradients (emphasize ends of ranges appropriate in different ecoregions)
- Wildlife Biologists:
  - o PACs
    - PAC establishment and retirement guidance
      - landscape scale prioritization
    - PAC treatment
    - Core Area/HRCA – Jamie Comments and clarifications only, hold off on other stuff
- Fire/Fuels Folks
  - o Post-Disturbance as own principle/recommendation
- Core Area (on hold til after analysis)
  - o circle vs. HRCA (on hold)
  - o more explicit about extra retention/promotion of high quality habitat
  - o Anything like lower limit of high canopy habitat that leads to non NRV extra retention
-