

LINCOLN RESTORATION COMMITTEE
NOVEMBER 12, 2009 MEETING NOTES

These notes are approximate--BK.

Amber indicated that the mining claim mentioned in the letter to for Forest Service for restoration will not be considered as part of the project as the claimant is proceeding with a new plan of operations and working the claim, beginning in the summer, 2010.

The November 2 draft “umbrella statement” and “zone of agreement” Mixed Severity Fire Regimes documents of the MSFR Working Group were discussed.

Bill wanted to be sure MSFR was defined – it is in the original MFRC Principles document.

Concern was expressed over the sensitivity of large-scale prescribed fire.

Brent felt that the paragraph re “Consider Distance From Development” was not clearly written, and implied projects needed to be close to / in the WUI.

Brian indicated that was not the intention of the MSFR WG, as he experienced the discussion, and the final sentence of the para was intended to make that clear.

Jim felt the document was very acceptable.

The sense of the group was support for the draft’s central concept of using a large landscape analytical approach.

The group indicated a willingness to *consider* developing/implementing a pilot project, in the event the MFRC adopts Mixed Severity guidelines/principles/zone of agreement.

A field trip to the Beaver and Park Creek potential project sites proposed by TWS was held. The group assessed the sites, focusing on the Ponderosa pine restoration potential, including in some cases the potential of restoring large Doug fir.

As the group began to suffer from hypothermia, Jim provided life-saving donuts.

All members present gave thumbs up to these project sites (blue and green on the Forest Service map). The western/green area includes more Lodgepole pine, similar to some of the Lincoln Gulch sites. Its proposed treatment is the same as site A in the group’s Lincoln Gulch project—

“Site A: Habitat types vary widely throughout Site A with the drier sites on west and southern aspects supporting or historically supporting Ponderosa pine and in some cases, open park-like structures and grassy openings. The more moist sites are habitat types where Douglas-fir and Lodgepole pine are dominant with a treatment goal of fuels reduction. During treatment design and development of silvicultural prescriptions, site-specific habitat typing would

determine where fuels reduction would be done and where restoration would be applied. Both would include the reintroduction of fire through prescribed fire. Together this integration of goals and treatments would be applied as an approach to treat the landscape; restore the natural condition; and place the ecosystem on a more natural trajectory by developing a diverse mix of vegetative composition, structure, form and function..”

Absent members will be informed of the group’s thinking and asked for their “thumb” direction. Paul will inform Amber of the group’s decision.

11/21 note from Brian: It was not clear to me whether or not the “green” portion was part of the TWS recommended area that the field trip was designed to visit. Forest Service staff did not seem sure, as the map was in possession of Travis from TWS. So I have left a message with Scott asking for clarification. As soon as I receive it I will communicate it so we can complete the vote.

Meeting adjourned at noon.