

COPWRR Project-Level Ecosystem Monitoring Report Form

Project: Katalo	
Date: October 30, 2006	
Interdisciplinary Team Members Participating: Bill Peterson, Jim Schlaich Wildlife Biology Staff (TBD)	
Other Participants in Field Evaluation: Glen Ardt, Phil Chang, Cindy Glick, Loren Kellogg, Tim Lillebo, Kate Ramsayer, Robin Vora	
Unit #: 3 (SV-3)	Acres in Unit: 325
Other Units from Project Being Monitored: 9 (D-6), 13 (G-2), 18 (G-7), 23 (E-2)	

Background

<p>Purpose and Need for Treatment of Unit:</p> <p>To maintain and restore a healthy forest ecosystem which provides a range of habitat conditions for plants and animals while producing commercial wood products and providing for improved public safety. Five specific purpose areas are listed in the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Fuels Management/Public Safety: To reduce fuel bed depths and stand density to improve public safety, reduce risk of uncharacteristically severe wildfire, and improve resistance to insect infestation.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat: To provide for various wildlife species habitat needs, including elk, deer and raptors.</p> <p>Soil Productivity: To improve soil productivity by addressing the impacts of past management activities, primarily soil compaction.</p> <p>Forest Health: To establish a condition where all possible combinations of size, structure and species composition are represented in a balanced distribution across the landscape so that insect, disease, and other disturbance agents, such as fire, are operating within the historic range of variability while meeting current and future human needs.</p> <p>Fiber Harvest: To produce fiber harvest as an output of vegetation management to provide economic benefits, employment, and returns to local and federal governments.</p>
--

Management Objectives for Unit:

Unit 3 lies within a Scenic Views emphasis area: A specific objective within this area is to provide visitors with scenic views that represent the natural character of Central Oregon while providing for forest health. Also, to promote a mosaic of size classes with healthy crowns.

Treatment Summary for Unit:

260 acres of commercial thinning and pre-commercial treatments using “designation by geometry” prescriptions. Target of treatment was 80 sq. feet of residual basal area per acre. Treatment of this unit was initially delayed to survey for sensitive plant species.

Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures, and BMPs to Evaluate:

1. Retain snags, down logs and live replacement trees at the levels specified in the Interim Management Guidelines (Appendix C.)
4. Provide for protection of any raptor nests or PETS found after the sale is awarded (Appendix C.) Prior to harvest activities or prescribed burning, determine if existing historical and current raptor nests are active.
6. Harvest commercial thinning in EA units in a manner which would restore 80% of the area in an acceptable condition of soil productivity. Recommended methods which would meet this objective are 1) sufficient snow and/or frozen ground followed by subsoiling of major skid roads; 2) other methods such as using existing and pre-designated skidroads, handfelling, pulling line and subsoiling of major skid roads to meet the standard and guide. Subsoiling would be done on road obliterations and existing areas detrimentally compacted within the project area.
11. Green-tinged paintbrush populations would be protected from ground disturbing activity.
13. Use standard contract provisions to reduce the likelihood of noxious weed spread.
16. To maintain biodiversity and assure that some forage would be left within the EA units, leave approximately 10% of the EA units in an unburned condition. To assure re-sprouting in mow units, protect the root crown on bitterbrush in deer habitat and the key elk area. Mow the area in such a manner as to maintain a mosaic condition.

Alternative 4 MM 1. Retain a minimum of 10% of the acres in general forest and 30% of the acres in deer habitat and in key elk habitat associated with each commercial thinning EA unit for cover and biodiversity. Cover areas in general forest would typically be a minimum of 2 acres; in the key elk area a minimum of 6 acres and a maximum of 30 acres; and in deer habitat a minimum of 2 acres. Scenic View units would be 20% cover and a minimum of 2 acres. Incorporate historic raptor locations within cover areas.

Unit Evaluation

Were the treatments implemented as described in the decision document or Record of Decision? Were the treatments implemented in accordance with the Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures and BMPs identified above? If not, please explain why.

Thinning treatments were implemented as described in the Decision Notice for the Katalo project. The Bend- Ft. Rock RD found the “designation by geometry” methods to work effectively for a thin from below project. They have continued to use and fine tune designation by geometry since the time this unit was implemented. After this project they determined that wider spacing between trees could be beneficial on future projects to reduce residual basal area, control the growth of bitterbrush, and for other purposes. This is an observation that may be worth passing on to other Natural Resources Teams on other Districts. Attendees of the field visit suggested that a more “clumpy, patchy, gappy” spacing of trees that were left would result in forest stands that better mimicked historical stands than the uniform spacing that resulted from this project. The Bend-Ft. Rock District has already begun to implement such non-uniform spacing in more recent projects and was glad to have external feedback that encouraged that change.

Mitigation Measures from the EA were followed in implementation on this unit:

- All snags and down logs were retained on the site
- Two Coopers Hawk nests were identified and were protected during operations
- Subsoiling was implemented and operations occurred over snow to meet targets for soil productivity
- Noxious weeds were not observed on the unit
- The unit was neither burned nor mowed
- 20% cover area was maintained

For each Management Objective for this Unit please evaluate whether the objective has been achieved. If the objective has not been achieved, please comment on barriers, constraints, limitations, etc and what might be needed for future projects to achieve the objective.

The treatment is moving the area towards a structural condition that represents “the natural character of Central Oregon while providing for forest health” – a more open stand with some big trees. As noted above, field visit attendees expressed a preference for a less uniform, more “clumpy, patchy, gappy” spacing of trees and the Bend-Ft. Rock is incorporating that preference into more recent projects. Using the designation by geometry prescription allowed the District not to mark trees with paint and this is a significant aesthetic benefit. As mentioned above, the Forest Service has learned the value of wider spacing when using designation by geometry.

The concern was raised that while subsoiling reverses the impacts of soil compaction it also can impact the visual appearance of a project area and may impact remaining trees by damaging root systems.

The Bend-Ft. Rock District would have liked to have burned this unit but was constrained by the proximity to Bend and smoke considerations. Still, the work that was completed on the project site has significantly improved the ability of the Forest Service to control future fires in the project area.

One attendee asked the question “how do we get snags in this unit?” The Bend-Ft. Rock District appreciated this concern and acknowledged that there will be much more snag creation in the units where burning is possible. Hopefully this will help to balance out the relative scarcity of snags in units that do not get burned.

Project Evaluation

Were the results of this project what was anticipated and intended? Have treatments addressed the Purposes and Needs for this Unit? If not, why not?

The results of the project were as anticipated and intended and the Bend-Ft. Rock District was happy with the results.

The field visit participants agreed that the project has advanced the purposes identified for this project: Fuels Management/Public Safety, Wildlife Habitat, Soil Productivity, Forest Health, Fiber Harvest.

Please share any observations or comments about the project planning, implementation, or results that are important to understanding management of this unit or important for improving future management in similar projects.

COPWRR Project-Level Ecosystem Monitoring Report Form

Project: Katalo	
Date: October 30, 2006	
Interdisciplinary Team Members Participating: Bill Peterson, Jim Schlaich Wildlife Biology Staff (TBD)	
Other Participants in Field Evaluation: Glen Ardt, Phil Chang, Cindy Glick, Loren Kellogg, Tim Lillebo, Kate Ramsayer, Robin Vora	
Unit #: 9 (D-6)	Acres in Unit: 395
Other Units from Project Being Monitored: 3 (SV-3), 13 (G-2), 18 (G-7), 23 (E-2)	

Background

<p>Purpose and Need for Treatment of Unit:</p> <p>To maintain and restore a healthy forest ecosystem which provides a range of habitat conditions for plants and animals while producing commercial wood products and providing for improved public safety. Five specific purpose areas are listed in the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Fuels Management/Public Safety: To reduce fuel bed depths and stand density to improve public safety, reduce risk of uncharacteristically severe wildfire, and improve resistance to insect infestation.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat: To provide for various wildlife species habitat needs, including elk, deer and raptors.</p> <p>Soil Productivity: To improve soil productivity by addressing the impacts of past management activities, primarily soil compaction.</p> <p>Forest Health: To establish a condition where all possible combinations of size, structure and species composition are represented in a balanced distribution across the landscape so that insect, disease, and other disturbance agents, such as fire, are operating within the historic range of variability while meeting current and future human needs.</p> <p>Fiber Harvest: To produce fiber harvest as an output of vegetation management to provide economic benefits, employment, and returns to local and federal governments.</p>
--

Management Objectives for Unit:

Unit 9 lies within Deer Habitat and Scenic Views emphasis areas with the following specific objectives:

Within Deer Habitat: To provide optimum habitat conditions on deer winter range while providing for wood products, visual quality and recreation. To protect stands from stand replacing wildfire, reduce road density to provide more effective habitat, maintain suitable growth rates and density, protect stands from beetle attack, and provide for more palatable forage.

Within Scenic Views: To provide visitors with scenic views that represent the natural character of Central Oregon while providing for forest health. To promote a mosaic of size classes with healthy crowns.

Treatment Summary for Unit:

277 acres of thinning and mowing treatments. Target for residual basal area is 80 square feet per acre.

Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures, and BMPs to Evaluate:

1. Retain snags, down logs and live replacement trees at the levels specified in the Interim Management Guidelines (Appendix C.)
4. Provide for protection of any raptor nests or PETS found after the sale is awarded (Appendix C.) Prior to harvest activities or prescribed burning, determine if existing historical and current raptor nests are active.
6. Harvest commercial thinning in EA units in a manner which would restore 80% of the area in an acceptable condition of soil productivity. Recommended methods which would meet this objective are 1) sufficient snow and/or frozen ground followed by subsoiling of major skid roads; 2) other methods such as using existing and pre-designated skidroads, handfelling, pulling line and subsoiling of major skid roads to meet the standard and guide. Subsoiling would be done on road obliterations and existing areas detrimentally compacted within the project area.
13. Use standard contract provisions to reduce the likelihood of noxious weed spread.
16. To maintain biodiversity and assure that some forage would be left within the EA units, leave approximately 10% of the EA units in an unburned condition. To assure re-sprouting in mow units, protect the root crown on bitterbrush in deer habitat and the key elk area. Mow the area in such a manner as to maintain a mosaic condition.

Alternative 4 MM 1. Retain a minimum of 10% of the acres in general forest and 30% of the acres in deer habitat and in key elk habitat associated with each commercial thinning EA unit for cover and biodiversity. Cover areas in general forest would typically be a minimum of 2 acres; in the key elk area a minimum of 6 acres and a maximum of 30 acres; and in deer habitat a minimum of 2 acres. Scenic View units would be 20% cover and a minimum of 2 acres. Incorporate historic raptor locations within cover areas.

Unit Evaluation

Were the treatments implemented as described in the decision document or Record of Decision? Were the treatments implemented in accordance with the Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures and BMPs identified above? If not, please explain why.

Thinning treatments successfully reduced basal area from an average of 140 to an average of 79. The stand density index was reduced from 250 to 150 by the treatment. The mowing treatment is scheduled to occur this fall. This unit started with a very low number of snags/acre. Snags were created as part of the treatment to increase the number from 1 per 20 acres to 1 per 10 acres. Road obliteration was completed as planned. Landing piles on this project were used for hog fuel.

Mitigation Measures from the EA were followed in implementation on this unit:

- All snags and down logs were retained on the site
- One Coopers Hawk nest was identified and was protected during operations
- Subsoiling was implemented and operations occurred over snow to meet targets for soil productivity
- Noxious weeds were not observed on the unit
- When the unit is mowed 25% of the shrub area will be retained
- 30% cover area was maintained

For each Management Objective for this Unit please evaluate whether the objective has been achieved. If the objective has not been achieved, please comment on barriers, constraints, limitations, etc and what might be needed for future projects to achieve the objective.

Thinning treatments were implemented to retain 30% cover area for deer and mowing will be implemented to retain 25% area for winter range. Mowed areas will provide good quality forage in the future. Road segments were obliterated to provide more effective habitat.

The treatment is moving the area towards a structural condition that represents “the natural character of Central Oregon while providing for forest health” – a more open stand with some big trees.

Field visit participants brought up two considerations for future management:

- 1) What number of large trees do we think there were in old-growth stands in the past? To the extent we want to mimic pre-European conditions this is important to know. This also has implications for our basal area targets. We can treat a stand to 80 sq. feet per acre today but we will have to come up with a new basal area objective for that stand in the future as the residual trees get larger.
- 2) The Deschutes Basin Land Trust is doing variable density thinnings on some of its properties. What are the advantages and disadvantages of variable density thinnings?

Project Evaluation

Were the results of this project what was anticipated and intended? Have treatments addressed the Purposes and Needs for this Unit? If not, why not?
--

The results of the project were as anticipated and intended and the Bend-Ft. Rock District was happy with the results.

The field visit participants agreed that the project has advanced the purposes identified for this project: Fuels Management/Public Safety, Wildlife Habitat, Soil Productivity, Forest Health, Fiber Harvest.

Please share any observations or comments about the project planning, implementation, or results that are important to understanding management of this unit or important for improving future management in similar projects.
--

COPWRR Project-Level Ecosystem Monitoring Report Form

Project: Katalo	
Date: October 30, 2006	
Interdisciplinary Team Members Participating: Bill Peterson, Jim Schlaich Wildlife Biology Staff (TBD)	
Other Participants in Field Evaluation: Glen Ardt, Phil Chang, Cindy Glick, Loren Kellogg, Tim Lillebo, Kate Ramsayer, Robin Vora	
Unit #: 13 (G-2)	Acres in Unit: 50
Other Units from Project Being Monitored: 3 (SV-3), 9 (D-6), 18 (G-7), 23 (E-2)	

Background

<p>Purpose and Need for Treatment of Unit:</p> <p>To maintain and restore a healthy forest ecosystem which provides a range of habitat conditions for plants and animals while producing commercial wood products and providing for improved public safety. Five specific purpose areas are listed in the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Fuels Management/Public Safety: To reduce fuel bed depths and stand density to improve public safety, reduce risk of uncharacteristically severe wildfire, and improve resistance to insect infestation.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat: To provide for various wildlife species habitat needs, including elk, deer and raptors.</p> <p>Soil Productivity: To improve soil productivity by addressing the impacts of past management activities, primarily soil compaction.</p> <p>Forest Health: To establish a condition where all possible combinations of size, structure and species composition are represented in a balanced distribution across the landscape so that insect, disease, and other disturbance agents, such as fire, are operating within the historic range of variability while meeting current and future human needs.</p> <p>Fiber Harvest: To produce fiber harvest as an output of vegetation management to provide economic benefits, employment, and returns to local and federal governments.</p>
--

Management Objectives for Unit:

Unit 13 lies within the General Forest area. The objectives within this area are 1) to provide for timber production consistent with resource protection standards and guidelines and 2) to maintain satisfactory growth rates and protect stands from fire, insects, and disease while recovering commercial timber value.

Treatment Summary for Unit:

45 acres of thinning and mowing treatments within a unit that is adjacent to an area with riparian values and aspen stands. Target for residual basal area in thinned areas is 90 sq. feet per acre.

Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures, and BMPs to Evaluate:

1. Retain snags, down logs and live replacement trees at the levels specified in the Interim Management Guidelines (Appendix C.)
2. Maintain no harvest buffer on the intermittent, non-fish bearing streams adjacent to EA unit G-2 as specified in the Regional Foresters Forest Plan Amendment.
4. Provide for protection of any raptor nests or PETS found after the sale is awarded (Appendix C.) Prior to harvest activities or prescribed burning, determine if existing historical and current raptor nests are active.
6. Harvest commercial thinning in EA units in a manner which would restore 80% of the area in an acceptable condition of soil productivity. Recommended methods which would meet this objective are 1) sufficient snow and/or frozen ground followed by subsoiling of major skid roads; 2) other methods such as using existing and pre-designated skidroads, handfelling, pulling line and subsoiling of major skid roads to meet the standard and guide. Subsoiling would be done on road obliterations and existing areas detrimentally compacted within the project area.
13. Use standard contract provisions to reduce the likelihood of noxious weed spread.
16. To maintain biodiversity and assure that some forage would be left within the EA units, leave approximately 10% of the EA units in an unburned condition. To assure re-sprouting in mow units, protect the root crown on bitterbrush in deer habitat and the key elk area. Mow the area in such a manner as to maintain a mosaic condition.

Alternative 4 MM 1. Retain a minimum of 10% of the acres in general forest and 30% of the acres in deer habitat and in key elk habitat associated with each commercial thinning EA unit for cover and biodiversity. Cover areas in general forest would typically be a minimum of 2 acres; in the key elk area a minimum of 6 acres and a maximum of 30 acres; and in deer habitat a minimum of 2 acres. Scenic View units would be 20% cover and a minimum of 2 acres. Incorporate historic raptor locations within cover areas.

Unit Evaluation

Were the treatments implemented as described in the decision document or Record of Decision? Were the treatments implemented in accordance with the Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures and BMPs identified above? If not, please explain why.

Thinning and mowing treatments were implemented as described. Management Measures were followed.

The main reason that the Monitoring Committee wanted to visit this unit was to take a look at the small aspen stand and riparian area on the edge of the unit. No treatments were implemented within or around the riparian area at the time of treatment based on the idea that the health of this sensitive riparian area would be better served by leaving it alone than by attempting management in it. The field visit participants wanted to evaluate whether a “hands off” approach was truly the best strategy for stewarding this aspen stand and riparian area.

For each Management Objective for this Unit please evaluate whether the objective has been achieved. If the objective has not been achieved, please comment on barriers, constraints, limitations, etc and what might be needed for future projects to achieve the objective.

The objectives for the non-riparian areas in the unit are being served by the treatments.

It appears that a “hands off approach” is not fully serving the long term health of the aspen stand/riparian area. Numerous conifers are encroaching upon the aspen stand and the density of conifers in the buffer area around the aspen stand is also high. Field visit participants expressed the concern that the aspen stand would shrink and might be replaced by conifers if current trends continued.

To maintain the health and extent of areas like this aspen stand we may need to be willing to enter and actively manage riparian areas. This will require specific, highly sensitive restoration prescriptions. The historical extent of this aspen stand might be determined by sampling the soil in the area to look for remains of aspen leaf litter. We might try to mimic disturbance across this historical area to regenerate a larger aspen stand. We might try to protect individual conifer trees from rare and highly valued species in the riparian zone, such as spruce, while aggressively removing others, such as true firs. The value of the aspen stand to wildlife would need to be recognized, but it might be necessary to fence parts of the restoration area for a time to allow sprouts a chance to establish. It might be beneficial to thin the uplands surrounding a riparian area/spring like this to try to increase base flows.

The Bend-Ft. Rock has done some work to restore aspen stands on the Cardinal project near Sunriver and on the Tumbull project in recent years.

Project Evaluation

Were the results of this project what was anticipated and intended? Have treatments addressed the Purposes and Needs for this Unit? If not, why not?

In the non-riparian areas the results of the project were as anticipated and intended and the Purposes and Needs of the project are being addressed.

In the riparian area/aspen stand that was intentionally left out of the unit and buffered from treatment the Purposes and Needs of the project are not being met. As suggested above, concerns about the sensitivity of riparian areas has discouraged implementing treatments in those areas. But the visit to this unit suggests that not treating these areas can result in negative environmental consequences as well.

Please share any observations or comments about the project planning, implementation, or results that are important to understanding management of this unit or important for improving future management in similar projects.

We need to think more about when and how to enter and treat riparian areas.

COPWRR Project-Level Ecosystem Monitoring Report Form

Project: Katalo	
Date: October 30, 2006	
Interdisciplinary Team Members Participating: Bill Peterson, Jim Schlaich Wildlife Biology Staff (TBD)	
Other Participants in Field Evaluation: Glen Ardt, Phil Chang, Cindy Glick, Loren Kellogg, Tim Lillebo, Kate Ramsayer, Robin Vora	
Unit #: 23 (E-2)	Acres in Unit: 365
Other Units from Project Being Monitored: 3 (SV-3), 9 (D-6), 13 (G-2), 18 (G-7)	

Background

<p>Purpose and Need for Treatment of Unit:</p> <p>To maintain and restore a healthy forest ecosystem which provides a range of habitat conditions for plants and animals while producing commercial wood products and providing for improved public safety. Five specific purpose areas are listed in the Environmental Assessment:</p> <p>Fuels Management/Public Safety: To reduce fuel bed depths and stand density to improve public safety, reduce risk of uncharacteristically severe wildfire, and improve resistance to insect infestation.</p> <p>Wildlife Habitat: To provide for various wildlife species habitat needs, including elk, deer and raptors.</p> <p>Soil Productivity: To improve soil productivity by addressing the impacts of past management activities, primarily soil compaction.</p> <p>Forest Health: To establish a condition where all possible combinations of size, structure and species composition are represented in a balanced distribution across the landscape so that insect, disease, and other disturbance agents, such as fire, are operating within the historic range of variability while meeting current and future human needs.</p> <p>Fiber Harvest: To produce fiber harvest as an output of vegetation management to provide economic benefits, employment, and returns to local and federal governments.</p>
--

Management Objectives for Unit:

Unit 9 lies within the Ryan's Ranch Key Elk Area. Special consideration will be given to thermal and hiding cover, forage, and road densities.

The Unit also lies within General Forest and Scenic Views emphasis areas with the following specific objectives:

Within General Forest: 1) To provide for timber production consistent with resource protection standards and guidelines and 2) to maintain satisfactory growth rates and protect stands from fire, insects, and disease while recovering commercial timber value.

Within Scenic Views: To provide visitors with scenic views that represent the natural character of Central Oregon while providing for forest health. To promote a mosaic of size classes with healthy crowns.

Treatment Summary for Unit:

256 acres of thinning and burning treatments. Target for residual basal area is 80 sq. feet per acre.

Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures, and BMPs to Evaluate:

1. Retain snags, down logs and live replacement trees at the levels specified in the Interim Management Guidelines (Appendix C.)
4. Provide for protection of any raptor nests or PETS found after the sale is awarded (Appendix C.) Prior to harvest activities or prescribed burning, determine if existing historical and current raptor nests are active.
6. Harvest commercial thinning in EA units in a manner which would restore 80% of the area in an acceptable condition of soil productivity. Recommended methods which would meet this objective are 1) sufficient snow and/or frozen ground followed by subsoiling of major skid roads; 2) other methods such as using existing and pre-designated skidroads, handfelling, pulling line and subsoiling of major skid roads to meet the standard and guide. Subsoiling would be done on road obliterations and existing areas detrimentally compacted within the project area.
13. Use standard contract provisions to reduce the likelihood of noxious weed spread.
16. To maintain biodiversity and assure that some forage would be left within the EA units, leave approximately 10% of the EA units in an unburned condition. To assure re-sprouting in mow units, protect the root crown on bitterbrush in deer habitat and the key elk area. Mow the area in such a manner as to maintain a mosaic condition.

Alternative 4 MM 1. Retain a minimum of 10% of the acres in general forest and 30% of the acres in deer habitat and in key elk habitat associated with each commercial thinning EA unit for cover and biodiversity. Cover areas in general forest would typically be a minimum of 2 acres; in the key elk area a minimum of 6 acres and a maximum of 30 acres; and in deer habitat a minimum of 2 acres. Scenic View units would be 20% cover and a minimum of 2 acres. Incorporate historic raptor locations within cover areas.

Unit Evaluation

Were the treatments implemented as described in the decision document or Record of Decision? Were the treatments implemented in accordance with the Selected Implementation Guidelines, Management Measures and BMPs identified above? If not, please explain why.

Thinning was implemented as described in the Decision Notice. The burn was a little hotter than planned, resulting in higher tree mortality than anticipated. (Was 10% or more of the unit retained in an unburned condition?) One of the main reasons that the burn was hotter than planned was that the burn window each year is very narrow and there are not enough days with ideal conditions during this window for all of the burns to be exactly the way that planners want them. Road obliteration will be implemented this fall or spring.

Mitigation Measures from the EA were followed in implementation on this unit:

- All snags and down logs were retained on the site
- No nest sites were identified within this unit.
- Soil protection and restoration measures were followed
- Noxious weeds were not observed on the unit
- The burn crew tried to retain 10% of the unit area in an unburned condition
- 30% cover area was maintained in pieces 6 acres in size or greater which were GPSed

For each Management Objective for this Unit please evaluate whether the objective has been achieved. If the objective has not been achieved, please comment on barriers, constraints, limitations, etc and what might be needed for future projects to achieve the objective.

The thinning treatments were implemented to retain 30% cover area for elk and burning was implemented to increase the native grass production for elk forage. It was too early to tell whether the burning has been effective in increasing native grass recruitment. Road segments will be obliterated to provide more effective habitat. Based on field observations, bitterbrush will recover well in this site from burning, with significant resprouting already occurring.

The treatment provided for current and future timber production. The treatment produced a significant volume of fiber now and has created the conditions for tree growth and tree health for coming decades.

Depending on the aesthetics of the beholder, scenic views may have been negatively impacted by slightly higher than expected tree mortality because of a hot burn. But overall, the treatment is moving the area towards a structural condition that represents “the natural character of Central Oregon while providing for forest health” – a more open stand with some big trees.

While the Bend-Ft. Rock did everything that they said they would do to improve and protect habitat for elk one field trip participant wondered whether our wildlife/management science is good enough that we really know what the elk need. Do we know how large forest openings should be? Do we know where to place the cover leave patches on the landscape to provide the most benefit to elk and other wildlife?

Project Evaluation

Were the results of this project what was anticipated and intended? Have treatments addressed the Purposes and Needs for this Unit? If not, why not?

Besides a bit more tree mortality than planned for, the results of the project were as anticipated and intended.

The field visit participants agreed that the project has advanced the purposes identified for this project: Fuels Management/Public Safety, Wildlife Habitat, Soil Productivity, Forest Health, and Fiber Harvest.

Please share any observations or comments about the project planning, implementation, or results that are important to understanding management of this unit or important for improving future management in similar projects.

Narrow burn window is a challenge for all projects that include prescribed burning.