

**Colville Plan Revision
Meeting with the Northeast WA Forestry Coalition
May 25, 2016**

Subject: Request for meeting to discuss the draft forest plan

Participants:

Maurice Williamson, NEWFC

Jon Day, Forest Silviculturist and Forest Plan Revision Vegetation Lead, and Marcy Rumelhart (notes).

Meeting start time: 9:00 am, Williamson Consulting Office, Colville, WA.

This meeting was requested by Maurice Williamson to discuss elements of the draft plan, specifically the 1982 planning rule and how the plant association classifications were developed.

Jon gave Maurice copies of the 1982 planning rule and his vegetation specialist report.

Discussion of the 1982 Planning Rule

Maurice had asked Jon for a specific citing of the 1982 Planning Rule which specifies that the Allowable Sale Quantity numbers must be based on non-declining even flow vs. a 'cutting budget' which varies over time depending on more immediate silvicultural and forest health needs.

Jon – the Multiple Use Sustained Yield Act (MUSYA) is law and defines what sustained yield is. The way the 1982 Rule interprets it is the Allowable Sale Quantity is an average over a decade. If the draft plan is proposing 62 mmbf, that's what it is annually, averaged over a 10 year period.

Maurice asked if Jon was aware the American Forest Resource Council is in litigation over the 2012 planning rule. He expressed concern that there are at least two places in the Colville DEIS or the draft plan where it states compliance with the 2012 rule.

Jon – the 2012 planning rule only directs us to use a small portion of it. He asked Maurice to follow up with Amy on this, but thinks it is the monitoring component that applies to those forests still planning under the 1982 rule.

Jon shared a copy of the regional guidance with Maurice. That is the policy developed from the planning rule and the MUSY Act.

Plant Association classification discussion

Maurice shared a document with Jon about ecology and management of mixed conifer forests in Oregon and Washington¹.

¹ The ecology and management of moist mixed-conifer forests in eastern Oregon and Washington: a synthesis of the relevant biophysical science and implications for future land management. 2014. Stine, Peter; Hessburg, Paul; Spies, Thomas; Kramer, Marc; Fettig, Christopher J.; Hansen, Andrew; Lehmkuhl, John; O'Hara, Kevin; Polivka, Karl; Singleton, Peter; Charnley, Susan; Merschel, Andrew; White, Rachel.; Gen. Tech. Rep. PNW-GTR-897

Jon explained that publication came about from issues in managing grand fir stands in the Blue Mtn forests (Blues). What is called moist forest in the Blues is defined as anything within the grand fir plant association. It is not an issue here on the Colville NF. There have been many discussions about what is defined as moist forest and that is why he used the term Northern Rocky Mtn Mixed Conifer. The grand fir/moist vegetation type is not in our draft plan because it is not a vegetation type here.

Jon discussed how he looked at the different vegetation types and based his analysis on the plant associations that occur on the Colville. The Forest was liberal in defining the Douglas-fir dry type. Anywhere Douglas-fir is the climax species is considered the Douglas-fir dry type. There are some vegetation types classed as moist in the Blues that are classed as dry here.

We consider the Northern Rocky Mtn mixed conifer to be a drier type. We also have a cedar/hemlock type, but what we consider as moist is the wet, true cedar areas and we have very little of that on the Colville NF. Most of it is in Pend Oreille County. Don't like the term moist, is too subjective.

Jon discussed the tables in the vegetation section of the DEIS that display how many acres are in each vegetation type. Almost 70% of the forest is in the two dry types, and the cedar/hemlock types are only about 9% of the total. The Colville doesn't really have any true grand fir plant association types, because everywhere grand fir is found there is also cedar, hemlock, or subalpine fir. The Colville NF plant association guide states that grand fir is a minor component on the forest and suggests using the Douglas-fir type. The Blues document doesn't really apply to the Colville, even though it was written for Oregon and Washington.

Discussed Historical Range of Variability, structure classes, and how the modelling was done. Used pretty liberal definitions. Not using age as a measure, using size of tree and canopy closure. The models were run thousands of times to get a range of variability. It is a rough estimate. Keep in mind most of the ground we manage is in the Douglas-fir dry type. The models were developed by the Nature Conservancy about 10 years ago, as part of the Landfire program. They developed a base and the regional office adjusted it to make it relevant to the Colville.

Maurice thanked Jon for his time and stated he has a better understanding of how he came up with the plant associations.

Meeting ended at about 10:00.

Follow-up

- Maurice asked Jon to email him a shapefile of the vegetation types and summary of the acreage.
- He also asked for the page number in the draft plan that discusses the nondeclining even flow.

A list of acronyms used in the meeting discussion can be found on the Colville Forest Plan Revision web page:

<http://www.fs.usda.gov/detail/colville/landmanagement/planning/?cid=stelprd3824594>