

Hi Scott,

Thank you for your hard work and individual attention to our situation. I think I can clarify a little more what my overall concern is and why I come at this project the way I do, in case you wonder. I believe I understand your intent throughout the document, and if put in the kindest hands I would have no worries. In our case, however, this will not be passed off to a dedicated owner or unified group. History on this and other issues has shown me that this document will be in the hands of varying interests at various times-sometimes sincere differences of opinion, but sometimes negligent indifference and even callous manipulation. The future will hold all that. I feel part of my job in reviewing your document has been to identify those areas open to misinterpretation and try to fill the holes. I consider this, and the review of Barry Schrieber's report, to be the most important things I've done in the last two years. At the same time I'm aware that little will prevent a determined city government from having their way, especially not a perfect document. So there I am.

I also wanted you to know that I think your straightforward addressing of issues from the 1999 harvest helps validate and perhaps soothes some of the community pain that some of us feel from having our concerns ignored at that time.

These are my additional suggestions for changes in the 90% draft.

Critical Recharge Area

I would like to see the critical recharge area called out and addressed in terms of maintenance, harvesting, chemicals, and other activities. For example, we had an informal understanding within the board in the spring of this past year, when we were discussing control of competing vegetation, that the northernmost upper "bowl" in the upper clearcut would remain free of chemicals. It was later determined that controls, chemical or not, were not necessary at that time. The critical recharge area appears to include a majority of the upper clearcut; this should be more clearly defined with Dennis Nelson's final report. An interesting issue is the idea that if the critical recharge area is able to accommodate chemical treatments with no adverse affect on the water supply, then it can handle some degree of human activity as well. (This is part of the public access discussion.) But if the critical recharge area is so fragile, or our desire to protect it so strong, that we wish to limit human activity in this area, then we should also eliminate chemical use from the area. This issue pointed out that individuals seem to favor one or the other (public access or chemicals), but not both, but that both or neither was the appropriate response to be consistent with any policy in the critical recharge area. We never reached consensus. (And all this was before Sept. 11.) The goal here is protection of the actual ground/surface /soil/canopy/ecosystem (which was damaged in the clearcut) to improve, maintain and even maximize penetration of clean water into the groundwater system, as opposed to the protection of water facilities and structures.

Please my comments for page 31 on public access.

Woody Debris

Down woody debris is very important in a watershed. I think we should have a goal of maximum down woody debris in the critical recharge area, instead of the 20-ton/acre minimum. I do believe I understand your concerns for phasing this: that if biological processes are mostly in the same stage (in this case, the breaking down of debris), then balance is upset possibly causing over or under abundance of micro-organisms and a resulting chain reaction. But I would like to think of how phasing happens differently. Instead of thinking of phasing as applying to the cut trees by removing some and leaving some on the ground, I suggest that phasing be applied to the planning of the thinning process so that all trees thinned are scheduled to be left on the ground in a phased process. Please note, this is a concern for the critical recharge area only. If the critical recharge area were held in reserve, thinning and other activities important to ecological health could still happen, yet assure that all nutrients (in the form of woody debris) remain for the health of the forest and groundwater. Please see my comments for page 13.

There are several items we discussed at the meeting which I didn't see in the draft:

20 tons/acre of down logs

the reduction of big leaf maples to 1/acre in the plantations.

public input before harvest decisions

You have my opinion on woody debris in the critical recharge area, above.

For wildlife's sake, and the sake of diversity in the meantime, I'd like to see the maple reduction phased in. The reductions at later dates would also contribute to larger woody debris. I'd also like some of Barry Schrieber's concerns regarding location of retained maples addressed. Please see comments for page 35.

See my comment on page 7 about public input.

Page 5

1st paragraph, 1st line: Suggest leaving out the term "cut-over". It sounds like a bias right away without an explanation, and you do cover the history a few pages later. But maybe it makes sense with the first chapter (which we don't yet have) leading into it.

Second paragraph, second line: Between words "supply," and "citizens" insert "and as a result of political controversy over secondary use in 1999," or something that refers to the events which were the catalyst for our seeking of this new vision.

Third paragraph: Change 1st sentence to read "Water quality, forest health, wildlife habitat enhancement, and tree harvest can go hand in hand with conservation-based management practices." This changes the emphasis from harvest happening to possibly happening. It's not as hard hitting and it's still true.

Third paragraph: After "diversity" add "of flora and fauna". It just read funny to me; not a big deal.

Fourth paragraph: love it!

Page 6

I didn't understand the "Planning process" section: six major steps refers us to Figure 1 which shows 4 boxes. Three things (resource assessment, policy development, recommended actions) were considered within three general resource areas: $3 \times 3 = 9$. Some things match to the boxes and some don't.

Page 7

Top of page: planning team members also include "members of the public" or "interested members of the public" or something like that.

Paragraph under "Planning and administration": Add to the end of the last sentence "following public input." or advisory input, etc. If advisory input is meant to be given before a council decision, there should be a reference here to that point in the last chapter. I'd like to have the city attorney look at this to ensure a vote can't be taken without an opportunity to comment.

Page 10

Andy Bryant, with his chainsaw, found evidence of damage in older oak stumps from 150 years ago, consistent with fire, which is what he was looking for.

Last paragraph: I don't know if a crisis was declared in 2001, but restrictions have happened fairly often-at least a few times. It would be interesting to have them noted, at least the first time it happened.

Page 11

1st full paragraph: I didn't know there was a well already on line in Dayton Prairie.

After 1st paragraph of "Timber Harvest History": In the last 1960s, clearcutting was considered and rejected by the city council. Source: then-councilor and former mayor, Jimmy Schmauder.

1st line of last paragraph of "Timber Harvest History": replace "a forestry consulting firm" with "several forestry consultants". Background: Dean O'Reilly and Andy Bryant both prepared plans which were much more modest in scope. I don't believe they were offered for public review; I first heard of them after the board was up and running.

2nd paragraph of "Socio-Economic Situation": omit "and prohibits recreation". This is redundant and is of no

benefit that I can see, and will cause trouble if someone reads far enough to find it.

Last paragraph of "Socio-Economic Situation": End paragraph after the word "administrator". There has been no election of new members to the city council yet.

Page 12

Third paragraph: Will the referenced map identify the neighboring Winter and Trappist Abbey properties? Are the mentioned long-term stewardship plans of these properties available for review?

Third paragraph, second line: between "area" and "stretching" insert " beginning in the northern end of the watershed and".

Third paragraph, sixth line: insert "as well as ____ acres of the watershed's clearcut area" after the word "vineyard" to end the sentence.

Fourth and fifth paragraphs: Kathi can tell you if CH2MHill's upcoming report will address these issues.

Page 13

1st paragraph under "Wildlife", 6th line: omit sentence "No wetland habitat is associated with Henry Creek." Although there are no marshy types of environments, there are emergent wetlands associated with springs, and forested wetlands on the slopes above the creek. There may be other types. Though these are not as readily observed as ponds and marshes they are still important wetland environments.

4th paragraph: Insert new sentence after 1st sentence: "Woody debris also protects groundwater by insulating soil from heat; reducing runoff, erosion, and evaporation; and providing a source of water (as a sponge-like reservoir) and nutrients (the long-term release of nitrogen)."

Fifth paragraph: Great!

Page 14: second paragraph, line 3: what does "80-to-120 sq. ft./acre" mean? Diameter? Canopy?

Page 15, 1st paragraph: is there any difference between the "cherry" and the "non-native flowering cherry"?

Page 16, 1st line: re: "drier, upper end of the large clearcut." My impression is that that end is not as dry because it is north-facing. I could certainly be wrong.

Page 17

Line imm. above "Soils, Roads & Slope Stability" section: add "and leaning trees of the 'allee' which were preserved, but left exposed, from the lower clearcut" to finish the sentence after the word "clearcut." I'm not sure of the spelling of that apparently French word.

Last sentence before "Fire Management" section: Omit sentence? I am uneasy about tying an identifiable household to an allegation of trespass.

Page 18

Top of page: Should practices to reduce fire risk also address understory (shrub) control, limbing, grasses in clearcuts?

First full paragraph, second line: this is very important-please change "man" to "humans".

First full paragraph: how do we minimize slash without burning? By piling? Is it explained further?

Second-to-last paragraph: insert ", water system facilities' loss," between "loss" & "and".

Page 20: Consider listing Critical Recharge Area under Reserve Areas.

Page 28

1st objective: "Reserve sensitive areas from management." Omit sentence? Insert "non-reserve" between "manage" and "forest" in previous sentence? I feel that we're running into a semantical problem in what management means. Here it means management for timber. However, we discussed different goals (logs going out of the forest for revenue vs. staying on the ground to serve the ecosystem) which involve some of the same management activities. Sensitive areas will be managed for ecosystem health, and perhaps even for harvest. How about I look more closely at this in the final draft?

Page 30

#7 at top of page: We've had some concern on the board about horses and manure in the critical recharge area. And while we're at it, also concern about too much heavy equipment in the critical recharge area. The continuous nature of agricultural activity is what ultimately killed consideration of agricultural use when we (I) looked into the potential of other uses for the clearcut areas.

What does #12 above "Reforestation" mean? Is it about the piling of slash? To reduce fire hazard?

#3 under "Reforestation": From talks with Brent O'Nion, it is my understanding that, as well as the trees you describe for planting, the FPA allows anything that was pre-existing (or better, commercially speaking) to be planted or regenerated after harvest. My concern is your use of the term "commercial tree species." I know that a lot of the clearcut forest really wasn't very commercial. I don't know if the ability to get away from the commercial replanting requirement, as I described, is an improvement of your standard or not, but it increases the options. One of my ongoing concerns has been that the replanted forest is not the of the same makeup as the cut forest had been, and what will be the effects of that on wildlife, and especially the ability of the critical recharge area to function as before in receiving surface water into the groundwater supply if the forest type changes. I can find no resolute answer-there are so many factors; we'll have to wait and see. So anyway, I just wondered if you're limiting the replanting options or if your standard is stronger as written.

#6 under "Reforestation, 1st line: replace "are" at end of line with "have been shown to be".

Page 31

Please see the attached document, some form of which I believe will be accepted by the Board from the Public Access subcommittee sometime in January. Perhaps it would be pieced into your "Access" section. I really don't know how Kathi envisions it. If not, I suggest a reference to the document in this section stating that until such time as action is taken by the city in accordance with the document, the following Standards and Guidelines (as you have listed) will be in effect. Or any suggestion you have for our subcommittee would be welcome.

Page 33

New bullet under "Opportunities": There is potential for improvement of deep root structure as an aid in surface-to-groundwater percolation. Oak regeneration can be encouraged and saplings protected in critical recharge areas." See attached letters of support.

1st paragraph under "Key Considerations", line 3: add "as well as the city watershed" after "winery" to finish the sentence.

1st paragraph under "Key Considerations", line 5: "Gladhurst" is "Gladhart", I believe.

New Recommended Action: "1.5 Tag spouting oaks; develop plan to ensure survival."

Page 35

2.4: omit " in conjunction with future harvest operations." I don't think the creation of snags and down logs needs to be in conjunction with future timber harvests (although it *could*). The worth of this management action stands on its own. The need for snags is now, from what I hear; and the need for down woody debris in the critical recharge area/upper clearcut is great enough that phased thinnings, at the appropriate times,

should serve that purpose exclusively.

"Opportunities" section: add bullet something like "Plantation tree species diversity can be improved by protecting sprouting hardwoods and minor conifer from activities (etc.), and ensuring that a significant stock of BLM are retained on southern or other edges or other locations with adequate sun exposure for long-term survival, and ???"

Page 36: Paragraph above "Plantation Maintenance": I don't understand the use of the word "secondarily"

Page 37: Above "Roads and Access" section: add bullet on Scot's broom

Page 38: Under "Recommended Actions" section: add Scot's broom

Quick, little things:

page 5

1st paragraph

add hyphen between "122" and "acre" (By the way, various acreage amounts have been used. I don't know which is correct.)

make "Citizens" lower case "c"

page 6

1st paragraph

make "Staff" lower case "s"

line above bullets

make "Plan" lower case "p"

Page 9

1st paragraph

add hyphen between "122" and "acre"

reconcile "Henry Creek...flows south" w/ "Henry Creek's east-to-west flowing..."

add hyphen between "west" and "facing"

I think the watershed is between ½ and ¾ miles from the city boundary.

2nd paragraph

remove apostrophe from "1900's"

second-to-last line: add "are" between "areas" and "valuable"

4th paragraph

add commas between "hot" & "dry", "brief" & "cold" & "storm"

change "melting warm rains" to "warm, melting rains"

Page 10

1st line: omit comma after "berries"

last line: change "crises" to "crisis"

Page 11

1st line of "Timber Harvest History": remove apostrophe from "1940's"

Last paragraph of "Timber Harvest History":

add hyphen between "36" and "acre" (Various acreage amounts have been used here, too.)

add hyphen between "9" and "acre"

1st line of "Socio-Economic Situation": add hyphen between "high" and "quality"

last paragraph of "Socio-Economic Situation": change "2001" to "2000"

Page 12

2nd paragraph

change second word to "have"

Second line is past tense; should it be present tense? Or is this assuming Dennis Nelson's report will be done before this one is?

Second-to-last line: replace ". Because it can no longer move downward, it" with ", then"

Fifth paragraph, fourth line: insert "to" between "contributing" and "the"

Page 13

1st line under "Wildlife" section: insert hyphen after "fair" and between "good" and "quality"

Second paragraph, 1st line under "Wildlife" section: add "dia." after tree sizes

Third paragraph, 5th line under "Wildlife" section: insert hyphen between "cavity" and "dependent", replace "or" with "of"

Page 14, second-to-last line: insert "had" between "crew" and "hoed"

Page 15

second paragraph, third-to-last line: add hyphen between "prism" and "point"

last paragraph, first line: insert "a" between "only" and "few"

Page 16, last paragraph under "Plantations": add to end of last sentence "and Scot's broom"

Page 17, "Soils, Roads & Slope Stability" section, line 3: "River Flows" lower case?

Page 23

5th line under "Policies": insert end-quote after "conifer".

3rd bullet under "Objectives": reverse order of quote and comma to , following the word "legacies," (I prefer your method; it's more clear and I'm using it here, but they say it's not correct in this country.)

Page 26, 3rd line under policies: insert "of" between "mix" and "indigenous"

Page 27:

#3: add hyphen between "low" and "risk" and between "large" and "scale"

#5: add hyphen between "on" and "site"

Page 28, #7: omit "a" between "and" & "brief"

Page 29

#4 under "Silviculture": add "to" at beginning of bottom line

#5 under "Silviculture": omit "and" between "developing" and "mixed"

#6 under "Timber harvesting": add hyphen between "road" and "building"

Page 33

1st paragraph under "Key Considerations", line 5: add hyphen between "conservation" and "minded"

2nd paragraph under "Key Considerations", line 2: add hyphen between "1/2" and "acre"

2nd paragraph under "Key Considerations", line 3: insert "of" after "establishment"

Page 34

3rd bullet: insert "of" after "loss"

3rd bullet: add hyphen between "Mixed" and "building"

Page 35

1st line: add hyphen between "short" and "term"

Page 36

top bullet, 1st line: replace "11-20 year" with 11- to 20-year"

Page 38

second-to-last paragraph under "Vegetation and Botanical Resources"" change "blackberries" to "blackberry is"

Page 41: 1st paragraph under "Methods," last line: add hyphen between "on" and "site"

Paragraph at "Inventory": Check second sentence.

Page 42

junction of "Conditions Requiring Action" and Timber Management...": change "andy" to "and" or "any"