

TO AERIAL IS TO DIVINE



April 1991 – USGS Image AR1VFNW00010094

People see all these trees and probably think it's Natural.
'The trees have always been there; this has always been a forest.'
People are, by "Nature," delusional.

WILDERGARTEN 6.2

Wildergarten, ©2014 by Mark Edward Vande Pol & Wildergarten Press, All rights reserved. All photos and illustrations except as noted are by Mark Edward Vande Pol.

You are permitted to download this book without charge for your personal education. You may not edit, or otherwise alter its content in any way. Fair use quoting is considered one page of text and must include reference to the source URL. Content may not be copied, reposted, republished, or transmitted without written permission. This is a dynamic work that will be updated over time. I have no intention of defending conditions that no longer exist or explanations that have since been relieved of unintentional ambiguity or error. Please, use a link.

This book was originally produced under the name *The Responsible Party* for which there were two revisions, [1.0](#) & [2.0](#). Major revisions are for complete rewrites. Decimal revisions are for revised chapters or navigational changes and are not archived. Back revs are viewable by the numbered links below.

Revision History [1.0](#) [2.0](#) [3.0](#) [3.1](#) [3.2](#) [3.3](#) [3.4](#) [3.5](#) [4.0](#) [4.1](#) [4.6](#) [4.7](#) [5.2](#) [5.3](#) [5.4](#) [5.6](#) [5.8](#) [6.2](#)

Vande Pol, Mark Edward, 1954 –

Other writings by Mark Edward Vande Pol:

[Natural Process: That Environmental Laws May Serve the Laws of Nature](#), ©Wildergarten Press, 2001, 454pp, ISBN: 0-9711793-0-1, LOC Control #2001092201.

[Shemitta: For the Land is Mine](#): ©Wildergarten Press, 2009. Contains: 217pp text, 980pp overall, 14 picture books, 2 tables, 963 photographs, 9 maps, 2 drawings, 2 charts, 145 footnotes, 358 citations, and 216 other source references, not including external Internet links. ISBN 978-0-9711793-1-8

[Articles at Wildergarten Press](#): collected writings on Constitutional history and regulatory racketeering by tax-exempt “charitable” foundations

Wildergarten Press
P.O. Box 98
Redwood Estates, CA 95044-0098
www.wildergarten.com





April 1991 – USGS Image AR1VFNW00010094


In viewing these aerial photos, note that the shadows in this image are short and point toward the east, particularly among the conifers. This indicates that the photo was taken just after noon and that the surrounding canopy is not far below the tops of the conifers. Note also how even is the gray-scale of the “texture” within the **enclosed area** and how the majority of the crowns are about the same size and much less than the 50-foot scale marker across their tops. These observations indicate two things: **These are young hardwoods about the same age.**




September 2020 Google Earth Screen Capture

Google


After 30 years of cutting see how much broader the individual hardwood trees have become *within* the property line, while outside of it the tree crowns still form a more uniform “texture.” Similarly, trees in **conifer stands that have been thinned** are broader than trees in **stands that have not been thinned**. Note also that the previous image was taken in April, while this image was at about 10:00AM in September, so the shadows would be longer, but that isn’t all of it. These shadows are as long as they are because most extend over grasslands at lower height. Thus the amount of shadow in these later images visually understates the amount of open area.



Starting with initial conditions, we began with ten acres of impacted mixed hardwood forests full of French broom (shaded area), which dominated all other exotics present except trees. Some of the broom had already been cut (dashed line) and therefore were converted to grasslands, the latter of which were all I could handle between 2002 and 2012. During that 10 years, forestry was confined to thinning patches for fire control, fuel wood, and aesthetics within available time limits. Once the grasslands were under control, I went back to forestry in 2012 and opened up significant area to the residual weed bank for purposes of establishing forbs and brush in the forest understory and between trees.



People get a sense of security by projecting stability onto what they see, a pretended familiarity that inhibits noticing the actual rate of change. Repeat photos, maps, and successive aerials impart reality to change over longer periods, lest wistful memory (or denial) substitute for accuracy. In earlier editions of this book, I confined this chapter to aerial photos taken since we began. More recently, as the [site history](#) chapter developed, I started recognizing what were likely aboriginal vegetative patterns culminating with the realization of an almost incomprehensible degree of change (to most people) resulting from fire suppression, [early road construction](#), and the consequences of [road drainage](#), changes of vastly greater magnitude than what I had previously envisioned. As that history chapter grew, I chose to integrate a graphical representation of each land use into this chapter, befitting the long-term perspective characteristic of forestry. Yet this change in temporal scope placed very difficult demands on this presentation because of a paradox resulting from that same subconscious preference for stability: [We visualize the past in terms of how the land appears to us now](#). When the magnitude of change dwarfs what we can reasonably envision, it makes communicating that degree of difference just a bit challenging.



To recap our history so far, by the time the Spanish built the road in 1791, European diseases had already taken an enormous toll on the Sayante tribe. Only two years later, the tribe was virtually extinct and the consequences had already begun to exert their influence on the land. Weeds came in immediately with the herds driven over the road. The burn ban came two years later. As will be explained in [the chapter on succession](#): as long as there is seed within the immediate area, **vegetation here can progress from bare sand to an impacted forest in only 30 years**. This process took longer than that because even native plants had to invade an area where they had never been in millennia. Between the ban on Indian burning and the arrival of the first American settler, it had been 70 years. By the time Ed Fenn got here, it had been 130 years. Yet even then, this property was still not yet heavily forested. Succession had been retarded by the distance from seed sources, slash fires, and grazing. **When the Indians had it, there were very few trees here.**

Sayante Tribal Land Use - 1750

Bulbs & Herbs
 X = Death Camas
 B = Edible Bulbs
 L = Soap Lily
 S = Skullcap
 W = Mule's Ears
 G = Goldenrod

Shrubs
 R = Canyon Gooseberry
 E = Elderberry
 C = Ceanothus
 M = Manzanita
 H = Hazelnut


Water Seeps
 Sand Hill
 Grasslands
 Brush
 Broadleaf forest
 Redwood
 bare sandstone
 proto-agricultural

Inferred Redwoods:
 Buried or other evidences;
 NOT Stumps

Map Labels:
 Ridge
 Spur
 Cliff Edge
 Camp Site
 1,200'
 1,000'
 W
 N
 50 feet
 C & M
 R & E
 B & H
 Buckeye & H
 Black Oak & Valley Oak
 Hunting Fire Kill Zone


This is my studied guess at Sayante tribal land use in about 1750. Estimated contours are 25 feet, about 200' from the bottom of the property to the top. Seasonal drainages and seeps are in blue. Background colors depict my estimate of what the cover would have been among the categories here today (boxes). These estimates were derived from compiled observations of patterns of returning plants, geology, drainage, burning, and shading by hills along with estimates of physical resource requirements to sustain travelers along the trail (food moisture and fuel) coupled with my experience of what would do well in a particular spot ("If I were an Indian, what would I grow there?") based upon Spanish observations, horticultural experiments, and ethnographic and archaeological readings. The reason there are more detailed evidences on the south (left) end of the property is that the changes imposed by orchard development and exotic tree introductions in the northeast corner (lower right) were so profound as to obliterate most signs of aboriginal land uses.

Colonial Land Use - 1850




By the end of colonial control, signs of Indian land use were gone other than stands of fuel woods *Ceanothus* and manzanita. Indian conscripts had sloped the Spanish road traversing the ridge to get around the end of a **harder rock cliff** on the south end. As discussed in the chapter on **roads**, the discharge from the road's drainage ditch made a gully that grew to **a soil loss of an estimated 30-40,000 cubic yards**. Each slide resulted in rather substantial **colluvial deposits** below. With the ban on Indian burning, woody plants spread, each in its own way. Redwood invaded the north-facing slopes, particularly bare soils in which they germinate more readily: slash burning, fresh landslides, or alluvium. Animals spread live oak acorns, with more bay and maple on shaded slopes, but no fir yet. There was not a single fir tree, nor is there yet proof of the age of the "inferred redwoods" above. At this point in time, the vegetative composition of the northern part of the property is less discernible because of later grazing, grading, and forestry (right side, next slide).

American Land Use - 1930



Then came the Americans, starting with Charlie McKiernan's Road along the ridge in 1851. Charlie Martin added his road from Glenwood about 1860, bypassing the original north drainage on a gentler slope. Around 1890 the redwoods were cut and the slash was burned, which probably also wiped out the brush for a few years. **Three stands of redwood forest** had started in bare soil on steep north-facing slopes near where the few trees had been before. They were 30-60 feet tall by 1930. Ed Fenn terraced gentler north-facing slopes for apple orchards, adding more roads and buildings inside what is now our property. Grading instigated new drainage channels resulting in terrible erosion problems. Ed dumped old equipment, pipes, tanks, engine blocks, a car, *anything* he could get into the drainages to slow the channel incision. For the most part, it worked too. If you are getting the sense that it is much harder to infer the contours of the land prior to deposition than losses due to grading, incision, and sliding, you would be correct.

American Land Use – 1910-30




By 1930, the deciduous oaks at the bottom were old, but not shaded out yet (the few of those left died soon after we got here in 1990, as did the last of the apples). Live oak continued to invade the brush areas. Ed's terraces delayed the woodland invasion that otherwise would have happened sooner on the north end of the property. The sand hill species were disappearing but for the tractor due to invasive grasses and other weeds. Ed planted *eucalyptus* for erosion control and *acacia* next to structures for fuel wood use. By the time we got here, there was a third stand of acacia, but my suspicion is that its location was incidental to seed moved by road maintenance. You will note that **there was no virtually black oak or valley oak invasion**; they had originally been planted by Indians. It was at about this time that I suspect Douglas fir started to invade the property. In 1793, the nearest fir had to be a half mile or more away. Without fire, Douglas fir effectively acts as an invasive species. Watch what happened.

Live Oak & Madrone


Rudy

Live Oak & Madrone


American Land Use - 1980



Note how fast fir spread once on the property and that they clustered around the pioneer tree. That they invade so rapidly and widely without having done so long before indicates how little seed there was in the area and how far away the nearest tree must once have been. Burning for 10,000 years would likely do that to such a resinous and flammable tree species, but I wasn't ready to recognize it until I had mapped it out. That's what research can do to you. Just after 1930, "Old Man Rudy" settled the land across the now County road and built a house. He dumped his two acres of runoff onto the County road, just like most people do today, which then ran down the road to Spanish Gulch. Somewhere around 1970 the County road was graded to reverse road drainage away from the gulch, forcing that flow into the "natural" drainage. To a degree, it worked. It stopped incision of the gulch but it also washed out the upper draw and built an alluvium below. I started laying out the contour changes due to Martin's road and gave up (it's really complicated).




This is a map of forests from the prior slide superimposed over the 1991 aerial photo, with adjustments for angle, position, species, and scaling. Anything unmarked is oak/madrone. Fir stands are in **shaded green**, redwood **red**. When we started, the area in **dashed red** was totally forested; this photo was taken and after I had cleared for house construction, primarily to reduce the fire hazard. As to the remaining area that appears to be open, as noted in the **site history**, the seller to us had done considerable clearing of French broom (**blue line**), most of it (**dotted line**) had been scraped off 8-10 years prior by a bulldozer clearing broom and other brush. Other than three impacted patches of decadent *Ceanothus* (one with tree cover, two with broken cover), there was no other native brush left, as most brush under forest cover was ether broom or was dead from tree shade. There were no grasslands, anywhere. Yes, there were clearings, but that was a pavement of cut French broom and broom seedlings.



This graphic represents my sketchy recollection of where and when I logged **up to 2012-13**, when I returned to forestry in a more serious and impactful way. The graphic includes both hardwood and conifer forestry. Unless indicated otherwise (see key), these are primarily oak-madrone woodland, usually to include bay (not much maple here). There is no color code per se but heavier lines indicate exotic trees. It does not show how much was removed. It does not suggest what **Phase** was achieved (although most often I went from Phase 0 to Phase 2). Overlaid harvests usually indicate achieving Phase 3 on the later date. There is no accounting for growth-induced reversion from (for example) Phase 2 back to Phase 1 (it happened). The one excursion outside the property line in 2003 was by permission of the landowner to construct a shaded fuel break in a spot so rugged and remote that no material was removed (I just chopped it up where it fell). Yep, I logged just about everywhere. Looks like I hit it hard, doesn't it?



This was scanned from an image by a custom aerial photography company taken in the spring of 1995 (I contracted for a photograph for explicit purposes of mapping and management; they thought I wanted pictures of my house). It wasn't terribly useful, as it views down the hill in the afternoon, so I had to rotate, crop, and stretch the image to fit the property boundaries. Note how much the oaks had broadened in the thinned areas in only four years.



2003 – Screen shot of a 2003 Graphical Information System (GIS) image

By 2003, note how much broader the heads of the trees are in the area that had been **thinned most aggressively early on** compared to the example areas **not yet thinned**. Note also the difference between the redwood I had thinned by 25% (1-**red**) versus the other half of the same stand that went untouched (2-**blue**, a difference that becomes more evident in coming slides as satellite photography improved considerably over the ensuing 15 years). Similarly, stump cluster 3 (**red**) is the one with the vertical shots in the **conifer forestry chapter**, versus stump cluster 4 (**blue**) which I hope to thin soon to make siding and trim for the house, also in order to make more room to grow some monster trees.



End of May 2007 – A severe drought year

This is a Google Earth™ screen shot from 5/31/2007. Note that total canopy had increased to beyond what it was when I started in 1991, despite that I was still removing trees for firewood and thinning smaller, dead, and dying trees in various patches. This image was taken amid that long quiescent period during which I was more focused upon grasslands, much of which appears as shadows in this image or was under partial tree cover. One of the big problems with this kind of photography is that one does not have a choice of lighting conditions or filtering.



June 2010 – A wet spring

This is another Google Earth™ screen capture of an image taken 6-5-2010. This was taken near the end of that long period during which the focus was upon grasslands. This date, being closer to the summer solstice and obviously almost noon, shows more of the groundcover between the trees (much more representative) yet those areas are still shrinking. This perspective and timing help communicate the relationship between hardwood and groundcovers. Unfortunately, it also flattens the conifers to the point of being unrecognizable. Keep that tradeoff with shadows in mind as we move into views to come, because I am about to begin some serious thinning of the hardwood, starting at the northeast (lower right) and working my way counterclockwise across the top of the property.



April 2013 Google Earth Screen Capture


April, 2013. Again, the **light green line** was seller brush-clearing in 1987-89 and the **red line** is tree removals I did prior to construction. This image was taken just as I was thinning the area in the **dark green** patch at the top left. I had also thinned the **light blue area** in 2012. Within these two areas you can see that I am accelerating Phase 3 thinning. When viewed from above, Phases 1 and 2 are not really that distinguishable from the totally untouched forest that surrounds the property except as 'point count density,' or trees-per-area (next image) because the trees had broadened until the canopy had closed. Note also the difference in point count density between **logged** and **unlogged** redwood. The **tan lines** enclose my neighbors' eucalyptus, with acacia in **yellow**.



April 1991 – USGS Image AR1VFNW00010094

Back to 1991 with the outlines of recent work. It is hard to distinguish individual trees in forest stands in this image, but the high stem count is unmistakable. The gray-circled areas are Phase 3 projects to be completed in but three years (“planned” areas are in dashed lines). This reflects the change in priorities discussed in the forestry overview re accelerating thinning both because of (1) our control over grasslands and (2) because of the approaching decline of my physical working lifespan. The red arrow indicates a small opening within the stand where the blue dicks first came up. Somehow, the forest had never closed in that spot, nor had brush invaded it.

Note also the spacing between trees in the center area in gold.




February 2014 Google Earth Screen Capture
Power line rights of way are in **red**. Now you can really see the Acacia because it is in bloom.


You can see how much the canopy in the **gold** area has closed since 1991. The rate at which I have been thinning recently is less obvious because of the shadows of February sun despite that it is nearly noon. In a way, it is frustrating seeing it from an aerial perspective. I cut a bunch of trees, worried that I might have hit it too hard, then when I see it here, it looks like I had not done much. Yet as we saw in the chapter on **understory**, the change on the ground is profound when the grasses and forbs take off. The one area that is “iffy” is the eucalyptus at the bottom edge (tan). Those trees are so big that the owner is unlikely to participate in their removal (it’s expensive). Existing power distribution line paths are in **red**. The **fat red** lines represent the old right-of-way that was finally changed to where **the dashed red line** was installed in 2020. The power line corridor described in the phased forestry chapter is in **blue**.



In but eight years, 90% of the broadleaf forest had been treated. The rate limitation has been the material to be dragged, piled, and burned, logs split and converted to **charcoal for grasslands**. I have only so much space to accumulate and process material and only so much time. I left shade screens (pink dots) on the upper left to reduce sun scald on the remaining trees after thinning in 2013-14 (severe drought years). On the right, some of the work encroached my neighbor's land, with his agreement. I will finally be dealing with some of the eucalyptus overhanging our property and clearing out some of the dead and dying material along Fenn's road. My neighbor says he plans to remove the eucalyptus (which requires heavy equipment) and he will then reforest it with redwood seedlings. Too bad he can't harvest it later to cover the cost of conversion. It's all about time, money, limited equipment, and my advancing age. I will be able to do this kind of thing for only so much longer.



So, what remains? Once I have all of the hardwood to Phase 3, the future of removals will be individuals (X), as opposed to treating whole areas at a time. There were but **two areas that had not yet been thinned** on the property at the opposite western corners. What is striking to me is that it has taken some six to seven years to “finish” what had already been begun when I shifted to grasslands in 2004, even to what I regard as an interim level of Phase 3. Dealing with my neighbor’s Acacia and Eucalyptus monocultures is not something I relish, as there will be weed problems and fire hazards that result until that situation comes under control, perhaps by planting redwood. Some were left to shade certain areas until the groundcover and shrubs had recovered from the shock of thinning, others are retarding groundcover as more valuable trees grow. The good news is that in places young trees are starting to take shape to replace the “lollypops” overstocking produced. It does take time, but in a way it is surprising how fast the response can be, then necessitating tough decisions over spacing when so many older trees are so spindly as a result of how they developed.




Yet there is one other major reason this forest has grown so fast: **Atmospheric carbon dioxide enrichment** (as can be proven by laboratory experiment, unlike “climate change” as a cause of fires). In 2020, the **North Draw Project** removed 15 large trees to make a new power line right of way. I will now be growing and selecting from trees in the old right of way to shape them for balance and cover, to remove what was left during that cut to shade the ground and slow things down later on. Hence, the work planned for 2019-20 didn't happen because PG&E proposed to install new poles. Marked trees in the prior slide that have since been removed have been converted to dotted lines while others have been added because plans change. Three eucalyptus were removed by PG&E on my neighbor's property to make more room for the power line right-of-way. The biggest constraint on forestry since 2017 has been that my old truck died. So I'm building a new one. The demands of weeding only give me a few months per year for that.




April 2016 Google Earth Screen Capture

What's left? Conifers. As of 2015, we have a new law that allows me to thin my redwood within 300 feet of the house and sell the logs. When I built my house in 1991, we just did not have the money for good siding and trim, despite that I had all this beautiful overstocked redwood with which to make it. So now that the kids are done with graduate school, we can thin stands R2,3,&4 inside the **red curve** and our redwoods will attain a sane stand density. One goal will be to inhibit sprouting from the root crowns without harming the remaining standing trees so that I can then encourage some biodiversity, both by burning and transplants. The fir trees at the end of the **arrows** have bark beetles, probably due to redwoods shading them increasing the stress due to drought. I'll see if I can entice some acorn woodpeckers to make a home of one. The rest will have to go. The **orange arrow** indicates a junky curved and leaning "trap tree" I felled in fall 2015 to keep it from tearing out a hunk of the hillside and to help slow the beetle kill.



The first step for the job was to create more room to fell, move, mill and load trees as well as dry lumber. First, there were several **large bays**. For reasons mentioned elsewhere, I also coppiced **two large bay wads** to stabilize slopes, remove a severe fire hazard, and give me slots into which the fellers could drop redwood without tangling them in the bay. I also started taking out **dead and dying fir being shaded out by redwood**, as well as young **fir invading a hardwood stand** in which I am reversing succession to keep it as broadleaf forest. If all of this looks slow to you, just remember: It's only one old guy doing all of it, armed only with a chainsaw and a pickup truck. Conifers make big logs that require heavy equipment to move. Patches R2 and R3 will be done when we will mill lumber for the house with the assistance of a feller with equipment. Only once that job is done will I take on R4 under permit with an LTO.

Sayante Tribal Land Use - 1750




I thought I'd close with a "before and after" set of maps to encapsulate what "restoration" means here. This slide is the first "before." Again, I want to emphasize: **I am not trying to "restore" to these original conditions.** First, with current technology it is humanly and financially impossible: grasslands require so much labor, there is so much deeply buried seed, and the seed barrage from outside the property is so constant, there is just no way to do that. Nor do we have the elk, antelope, and people to eat much of what those grasslands would produce nor grizzly bears to eat them. Such fantasy goals are functionally insane, nor do I think them ideal for today. I am doing what I can to produce a landscape at all stages of succession that fully expresses the botanical, fungal, and insect variety long habituated to this area while configured for efficient labor demand. I want it to produce food for us and for wildlife, materials to support our continuance here including redwood and hardwoods for construction, heating fuel, herbs, flowers, and other pleasantries.

Live Oak & Madrone

Rudy


Live Oak & Madrone

American Land Use - 1980




This is the second "before." In an odd sense, Mr. Fenn's goals were similar to the Sayante's and mine, in that he wanted the land to produce something. Failing that economically, abandoning his orchard business allowed a choking mess to ensue, to the point that there was virtually no groundcover, native or exotic. Eighty percent of the property was dominated by exotic plants and the rest was a redwood monoculture (still is). Eighty percent of the original native plant species were either dormant, extinct, or relegated to a very few individuals. Everything was either conifer forest, exotic forest of eucalyptus (some of them huge), and acacia, choking oak/madrone woodland, or broom (some of it dead in massive piles made by a bulldozer) with virtually no groundcover. Much of the oak woodland was going decadent with conifers (particularly Douglas fir) invading and shading out the hardwood, with poison oak and honeysuckle vines climbing into the canopy and girdling the trunks. Some madrones were standing dead. It was a fuel bomb.

Wildergarten - 2017



So, from a macroscopic perspective, first came broom and clearing for a house, then exotic trees and conifers on the main ridge. I thinned the oak woodland for fire. Then I got the grasslands under control and made an area for sand hill plants. I thinned about half the main redwood stand. Then I went back to whacking oak woodland into a savannah that could express forage plants and sustain a varietal and mostly perennial groundcover. Then came a **fuel break** below the house and the conifers. Beyond making forestry here less laborious but still successionaly diverse and aesthetically pleasant, the goal is to fund and construct the first research laboratory of its kind in the world to integrate forestry with early-successional native plant systems to learn how they work and how they might be managed at reduced cost (see [Project Orientation](#) for details). It may seem an obvious thing to do, but nobody else has the native test environment that allows researchers to instigate and investigate the kind of disturbance that has once again become frequent here.

Wildergarten - 2025



After replacing the house siding and trim comes logging the conifer stands with the goal of an eventual and varietal understory, meaning I'm going to deal with redwood sprouts. Other science projects will continue, especially toward processes dedicated to cleansing the weed seed bank, stabilizing steep slopes with low fuel-value plants, using fire to manage succession, charcoal soil amendment to improve mineral and water retention and increase forage productivity, possibly reintroduce grazing, characterize novel nitrogen cycles, study fungal and insect relationships including a few introduced as native biocontrols, learn to regulate predation, and continue to reduce the labor input necessary to maintain that forest and grassland cover while making it ever more beautiful with minimal requirements for harvesting (not as easy as one might think). Research and development have always been part of this job; else we never would have got this far, as you will learn in [the coming chapters on grasslands](#). Enjoy!

FORESTRY OVERVIEW

If the **conifer forestry** chapter seemed limited in scope, that is because I have not done much of it (see timeline on the next page), certainly not nearly as much as is needed. The reasons are very simple:

1. I'm busy weeding.
2. It's expensive; heavy equipment costs a lot just to get it up here and the job is too small to fully defray those costs.
3. Until 2015, the State of California and the County of Santa Cruz made it illegal sell logs to offset the cost of thinning, deeming it "commercial logging" (even if it is done exclusively as an improvement at a net loss or with all proceeds going back into the land). Hence, if we want to improve our forest, the money *must* come from our pockets and it's not cheap. Effectively, only big timber landowners are allowed to sell logs while forests grow too dense to be healthy.

If I don't cut the trees, they'll eventually fall or burn (if they make it to the ground without tangling up in their relatives). If they fall, they will *definitely* make a substantial hole in the side of the hill. Unfortunately, timber operations are expensive, not so much in the cost of cutting trees but in getting the logs out, particularly in a benign manner. The better a job I want to do, the more unaffordable it becomes. For example, I would love to grind out the stumps to make more room for the groundcovers and shrubs characteristic of a primeval forest. It might also reduce the regeneration of so blasted many trees. I have experiments in mind there too. We do have potential uses for wood I cannot afford that would benefit the land and advance the science of native landscape management. For example, if I wanted to do experiments grazing grasses or browsing brush while weeding what comes up after them, I would need a small barn, and a corral to protect my goats or sheep from the government's overpopulated predators. We have many more trees that need removal to give room for the others to grow into the monster redwoods everybody loves (including me). Thinning the trees could fund that construction.

So, the trees sit there, too thick for their own good and definitely bad for the forest understory species I would like to reestablish. According to US Forest Service measurements, this county is growing five times, by volume, what is being harvested; it is unsustainably "sustainable." Worse, succession is starting to threaten even oak madrone woodland, as Douglas fir precedes redwood into colonizing what only 90 years ago were grasslands and forbs 120 years before that. Meanwhile, the regulatory process disinvests land ownership, eventually forcing the owner to sell, usually to a developer or to subsidize urban infill, an economic process discussed at length in **Natural Process**.

These laws are exemplary of an insanity advocates of regulatory government have sold as beneficent. The system benefits large corporations, developers, and their dependent cadres of bureaucrats, activists, academics, and consultants. Please, help make it stop. If nothing else and as a temporary measure (until risk management markets can displace the regulatory juggernaut), there should be a minimum size of harvest for job to require a permit. That way, enough more people could afford to do projects such that we might all actually learn more than we do now by observing their results.



FORESTRY OVERVIEW

The arrangement of our place today in no way represents what it once was at any time since the last ice age. There is obviously a major disparity between the preponderance of grasslands under aboriginal management versus the amount I can weed plus the amount of forest cover I maintain here today. So this project is a “native plant restoration,” not a “habitat restoration” per se.

One reason for this choice is that grasslands require four to ten times more weeding labor per acre than forests. I simply cannot manage that much grassland at the necessary level of detail to accomplish nativity. It is not physically possible with current technology. Because of historic erosion, many of our slopes have become too steep for a grassland here anyway; gophers would just tear it up and induce continuing subsequent landslides. Nor do we have a way to manager herbivory.

We are not using the land the way the Indians did. We don't eat acorns. We don't dig blue dicks as a starch or for safe water. We don't use sedge roots for baskets. We do use redwood. We do need roads for wheeled vehicles. We don't harvest grasses, small seeds, or hazelnuts. We leave those for wildlife, which is finally starting to appreciate the condition of things here. I don't hunt much. I just don't have the time and patience for it.


In terms of time and effort and despite their relative scale, grasslands and sand hills have absorbed WAY more emphasis than forests here since about 2003. Yet the reality when we started was that the place was either totally forested (both native and exotic) or covered with broom. Only once broom was removed and overstocking was under control were even exotic grasslands possible (which is what we got). So, removing that woody brush and big weeds came first, which is why it was first in these forestry chapters. In effect, the need for functional infrastructure and a place for grassland systems to express is why forestry as a topic was covered before the chapters on grasslands to come. I was just lucky that there weren't many tree stumps in the brush-lands that were covered with broom, although I sure am making more of those now.

So, what then is the goal? There are many (see the [Project Overview chapter](#) at the end of Part I). Bottom line: we are learning how to maintain and observe relationships among all the constituents of the successional system, its symbiotes and dependants as living and reproducing, if only to keep them from going extinct. In order to learn how to keep these **systems** alive, we must first clean them up and learn how they work and then learn how to do that in a cost-effective manner. That way, others can repeat the work and increase its effective scale. I suspect there are a series of 'critical masses' with which to sustain the animals that depend upon these systems in adequate numbers to prevent them from going extinct too but I don't think anybody knows what those scales might be for each and every animal species. Bugs are particularly in trouble. One thing at a time.

So if you are still with me in this monster of a “book,” it's on to grasslands and all they bring. This is where things get technical, and not just aesthetic, although their beauty is virtually unfamiliar to all, which is why that is where we will start.



FORESTRY OVERVIEW



This image presumes you have read the [Project Overview](#) chapter



OTHER BOOKS BY MARK EDWARD VANDE POL

Quick Read Picture Books

Range Management

Zion National Park

Canyonlands National Park

Deseret Ranch

Fuels Management, Succession Run Amok

The Cone Fire (the benefits of active forestry)

The Warm Fire (what happens without it)

Fire Aftermath: Mesa Verde National Park (weeds)

The Croy and Summit Fires (the wildland urban interface)

Socio-Ecological Paradigms

Environmental Consequences

Meadow Encroachment in Yosemite Valley

Why we can't accept how the original forest as it once was got that way

Living Sheepishly

Why we need a culture of animal husbandry

Sustained Development

Cities are becoming prisons

Katrina: What Did You Expect?

Environmental bureaucracy can be deadly

Natural Process: That Environmental Laws May Serve the Laws of Nature, ©Wildergarten Press, 2001, 454pp, ISBN: 0-9711793-0-1, LOC Control #2001092201. <http://www.naturalprocess.net>

Shemitta: For the Land is Mine: ©Wildergarten Press, 2009. Contains: 217pp text, 980pp overall, 14 picture books, 2 tables, 963 photographs, 9 maps, 2 drawings, 2 charts, 145 footnotes, 358 citations, and 216 other source references, not including external Internet links. ISBN 978-0-9711793-1-8. <http://www.shemitta.com>

Articles at Wildergarten Press: collected writings on Constitutional history and regulatory racketeering by tax-exempt "charitable" foundations. http://www.wildergarten.com/wp_pages/articles.html

TABLE OF CONTENT

Each line in the TOC is a link that opens that chapter in a new file

Part I - Introduction

1. This is Wildergarten
2. A Site History Like No Other
3. When Environmental Protection = Mass Extinction
4. What Is "Native," Really?
5. Repeat Photography, Before & After
6. Proof: Pure Germination of Native Annuals
7. Project Overview

Part II – Forestry

1. Making WOW! - Restoration of Forest Understory
2. Phased Thinning of Broadleaf Forest
3. Conifer Forestry – Thinking Really Big
4. Drainage – When Hill Goes Downhill
5. Roads – From Curse to Blessing
6. Vegetative Maps & Aerial Photography

Part III - Grasslands

1. Grassland Variety in Meadows & Forests
2. "The Onion": Weed Management by Species
3. Sand Hills: A Model Post-Disturbance Habitat
4. Colonization Behavior of Native Annual Forbs
5. Grassland Restoration and Soils Rehab
6. Comprehensive Weed Management
7. Vegetative Identification & Weeding Technique
8. Pre-Emergence Selection for Native Germination
9. Drought Tolerance in a Pure Native Grassland

Part IV - Miscellaneous

1. The Vegetable Garden as a Research Tool
2. Pollinators and Native Forbs
3. Fungi
4. Specialized Tool Development

Part V – Project Context

1. Periodic Disturbance and Feed-Forward Stability
2. Weeds: A Tragedy of the Commons
3. Control Boundaries: Fragmentation Is Your Friend
4. Central Planning
5. Our "Ownerless" Backyard



Next



Each line in the TOC is a link that opens the corresponding chapter in a new file

These are LARGE files; they do take time to load

Please offer suggestions and comments [HERE](#)

References are [HERE](#)

More [Picture Books](#)

Other [Writings](#)

Wildergarten [HOME](#)

