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|  |
| --- |
| **What are common themes among points within each unit?** |
| **Theme** | **Number of observations** |
| **Unit 1 – Lodgepole pine treatment (mechanical, Phase 1) \*only observations within Unit 1**  |
| Evidence of wildlife (beer, moose, elk) | >10 |
| Rock outcroppings | 4 |
| Evidence of very dense trees | 1 |
| Large or old growth trees in units | 3 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 4 |
| Area of observed high winds | 1 |
| Evidence of downfall or fallen trees | 5 |
| Orchids present | 10 |
| Spring present | 1 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (mixed conifer) | 2 |
| Beautiful view area | 1 |
| Gully or drainage area  | >10 |
| **Unit 2 – Lodgepole pine treatment (mechanical, Phase 1)**  |
| Gully present | 1 |
| Discouraged to cut areas (logistic concerns or social value areas) | 1 |
| Large or old growth trees in units | 5 |
| Area of observed high winds | 2 |
| Beautiful view area | 1 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 8 |
| Evidence of wildlife (moose, elk) | 4 |
| Spring present (outside of, but possibly downhill from treatment unit) | 1 |
| Evidence of very dense trees | 3 |
| Evidence of downfall or fallen trees | 2 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (limber pine, ponderosa) | 10 |
| **Units 3 & 4 – Lodgepole pine treatment units (mechanical)** |
| Large or old growth trees in units | 10 |
| Input discourages cutting at spatial point (logistic concerns/social value) | 8 |
| Input recommends cutting/thinning at spatial point | 4 |
| Past treatment evidence and/or issues | 4 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 1 |
| Gulley or streams present  | 2 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (limber pine) | 7 |
| Aspen stands and associated considerations | 3 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | >10 |
| **Unit 24 -- Lodgepole pine treatment unit (mechanical)** |
| Input discourages cutting at spatial point (logistic concerns/social value) | 1 |
| Input recommends cutting/thinning at spatial point | 3 |
| Evidence of very dense trees | 2 |
| **Unit 39 – Douglas fir/mixed conifer treatment (mechanical)** |
| Large or old growth trees in units | >10 |
| Rock outcroppings, some with lichens | 3 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 5 |
| Evidence of wildlife (deer, fox, moose, elk, bird nests) | 6 |
| Aspen stands and associated considerations | 9 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (RM juniper, limber pine, blue spruce) | 6 |
| Questions/observations about tape or other markings | 5 |
| Evidence of recreation | 1 |
| Gully, stream, or possible spring present | 7 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | >10 |
| **Units 42, 75 & 76 – Lodgepole pine treatment units (mechanical)** |
| Large or old growth trees in units | 4 |
| Past treatment evidence and/or issues | 2 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (limber pine, blue spruce, aspen) | 6 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | 9 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 4 |
| Evidence of wildlife (elk) | 1 |
| Evidence of downfall or fallen trees | 1 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | 5 |
| Observations of cryptogrammic soil | 1 |
| Evidence of dense trees | 1 |
| Evidence of downfall or fallen trees | 1 |
| **Units 43 & 68 -- Douglas fir/mixed conifer treatment (mechanical)** |
| Input discourages cutting at spatial point (logistic concerns/social value) | 1 |
| Input recommends cutting/thinning at spatial point | 1 |
| Large or old growth trees in units | 7 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 5 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (Englemann Spruce) | 3 |
| Aspen stands and associated considerations | 3 |
| Open area or meadow | 1 |
| Rocky outcroppings (with views) | 1 |
| Evidence of dense trees | 1 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | >10 |
| **Units 45 & 48 – Douglas fir/mixed conifer and Ponderosa pine mixed conifer (mechanical)** |
| Input discourages cutting at spatial point (logistic concerns/social value) | 2 |
| Input recommends cutting/thinning at spatial point | 4 |
| Large or old growth trees in units | 2 |
| Evidence of social or wildlife trail | 1 |
| Evidence of wildlife (elk, moose, turkey, song birds, lion kill) | 7 |
| Unique or tree species of concern (RM juniper) | 2 |
| Stream or drainage in unit | 5 |
| Aspen stands and considerations | 8 |
| Rocky knoll or rocky outcrop | 9 |
| Open area or meadow | 1 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | >10 |
| **Units 49 & 73** |
| Input recommends cutting/thinning at spatial point | 1 |
| Stream or drainage in unit | 1 |
| Aspen stands and considerations | 2 |
| Rocky knoll or rocky outcrop | 3 |
| Evidence of wildlife (flickers, red tail hawks) | 1 |
| Observations about trees or forest structure | 8 |

|  |
| --- |
| **What are common themes among or between Phase 2 units?** |
| Large, old growth, or tree species of concern within units |
| Evidence of wildlife or concern for wildlife habitat within or near units (moose, elk, deer, fox, mountain lion, turkey, flammulated owl nests, song birds, flickers, red tailed hawk) |
| Evidence of wildlife or social trails within units |
| Rocky knolls (some with views) and rock outcrops (some with lichens) within units |
| Perennial streams, springs, gullies, or other drainage within or near units |
| Areas of social value; input discouraged cutting at spatial point |
| Areas that are appropriate for cutting |
| Aspen stands and considerations |
| Unique or tree species of concern (limber pine, RM juniper, blue spruce, Englemann Spruce) |

**Do we need to make any changes for the future?**

**Avenza data:**

* Points need to be named differently – For example: Placemark 1 should be renamed “Chambers\_1” or the input description (i.e. “Large rocky knoll”)
* Only one final file sent per individual or group if possible
* Put comments in more context for MMG & USFS. Ensure relevance of input – marking large/old growth trees is great, making observations about landscape may or may not be useful.