From:	Matt Greene
Sent:	Thursday, November 06, 2014 10:01 AM
To:	Henly, Russ@CNRA
Subject:	Redding Review Team Report

Russ,

I had a few minutes today to briefly go over your report of the Redding Review Team Pilot Project for THP reviews. One thing in particular caught my mind. The idea of a centralized database has to happen, but it has to be open to the public as well, not just for the agencies. I have been harping on this at Board of Forestry meetings and at Water Board meetings for years.

As an RPF who works for small landowners that don't have big tracks of land and access to entire watershed, I find it particularly difficult to write a cumulative impact analysis for 99% of my clients that is worth the paper it is written on. Most of the time, when I ask a neighbor about going on their lands to look at the watercourses or roads, I get the are you stupid look. So all I have to go on for a cumulative impact analysis is what I can see on my landowners property and what is published. I don't work in a lot of watersheds with industrial ownerships, so this is particularly difficult and in fact probably a waste of times since all agency staff have told me they don't read them anyway.

For the last 12 years or so, we have been collecting data and giving it to WQ in the form of waivers and GWDRs. This information is not being used to its full potential. We are supplying them with the following kinds of information: roads upgraded, roads rocked, stream crossings updated to 100 year storms, the location and number of crossings, the locations, fixes and monitoring of mitigation points, and many other items. This information is similarly submitted within a THP, so Cal Fire has this information as well. I don't have the ability to go back through all of the THPs and NTMPs that have been submitted, but all of these things could be entered into a central database for all to see and utilize.

One other thing that has crossed my mind on this topic of increased efficiency and review is the idea of a new form. With the improvements in computers and software of the last 10 years, we should be able to create a drop down THP form. That THP form would have all the rules listed under each drop down and then RPFs won't have to spend a significant amount of time regurgitating rules and Staff won't have to read each rule within a plan to make sure that the RPF recited the rule properly. In addition, things like individual mitigations could be incoporated into the form. I know that Cal Fire tried to put together a new THP form about 4 or 5 years ago and they got comments from over 100 people about how bad it was, but I think it might be time to do something different. Just a thought anyway.

In addition, one thing is still eating at me from one of the previous reports. I believe the average time for review of THPs was around 160 days, but the average review for NTMP was over 400 days. This is really hard to stomach. They plans aren't much different than a THP, in-fact the only real difference is the Growth and Yield Analysis and that can't take an additional 240 days to accomplish. I don't know what the difference in review times was about as I don't practice in the Redding area, but that was shocking to me.

Anyway, I am open to any questions you may have and CLFA will be meeting on Saturday for it's monthly meeting, so I am sure we will try and submit comments for you as well. Thanks for trying to simplify things and harmonize all. We are starting to see some level of cooperation amongst the agencies.