

Richard Gienger
[REDACTED] Whitethorn
California 95589
[REDACTED] mobile
[REDACTED] office
27 October 2015

Russell Henly
Assistant Secretary of Forest Resources Management
California Natural Resources Agency
1416 Ninth Street Suite 1311
Sacramento, CA 95814
AB1492Program.Comments@Resources.ca.gov

Comments ADDENDUM from Richard Gienger, and on the Behalf of Forests Forever,
RE: 10.14.15 Public Meeting & the Draft Concept Paper for Planning Watershed Pilot Projects,
and Related Matters

Dear Russ:

I hope this ADDENDUM is timely, and judging from the new time estimates in your email today, it should be. (*"We are working toward having a revised draft of the concept paper done in mid-to late-November; with a follow-up workshop in December."*) I think I recall that a mid-November workshop was anticipated at the October 14th Workshop.

Towards a working narrative for the first pilot project:

** Gather electronically all the THPs for the Planning Watershed. All information aside from that found in the THPs shall be separately organized.

** Seeing how the starting point for evaluation and planning is the description of conditions, the graphic/mapped conditions in each THP shall be overlaid on the Planning Watershed. To avoid confusion and 'too much information', categorization shall take place eg: roads, watercourses/aquatic habitat, terrestrial/avian wildlife habitat, geology, ownerships, forest type stratification etc. These conditions also have a time dimension that needs to be part of this categorization. (See Pacific Watershed Associates Bear Creek Report done for PL/Maxxam and other examples.)

** Assemble an aerial photo record of the Planning Watershed for the longest period available with incremental time frames.

** Present this information to the multistakeholder/multidisciplinary Pilot Project Team (as well as making it available to the public) and have the team evaluate what's in front of them from each of the members perspectives. From this initial evaluation which would include, I imagine, quite complex sets of concerns and perspectives – from general observations to specific responses to stakeholders' needs and responsibilities – there would be a team interaction to set a prioritized course of action to meet concerns addressing essential elements for conditions descriptions in light of the intent language in the TRFR.

** Through this and during the continuing process it is important that general or specific consensus

agreement amongst the stakeholders be recorded. This could be, for instance, agreement on the scale, format, and symbols for geologic information; or what order of topics and associated formats information should be organized for clarity in Planning Watersheds.

** A main context for the above steps is a unified collection of information for the Planning Watershed which would form the basis for evaluation and response to cumulative impacts. What is learned about achieving this should be capable of being implemented in other Planning Watersheds. The goal is to have one comprehensive set of information and procedures as a basis to deal with cumulative impacts for each Planning Watershed. This would enable tiering of THPs, other logging plans, and other land use plans to a single unified cumulative impact element, which would only change when impacts significantly affect the Planning Watershed, or when a project itself presents significant impacts, or potential significant impacts.

** Ideally the above steps that focus on descriptions of conditions would take a year capped by the public hearing/workshop scheduled during the actual Pilot Project process. At this time there should be a fair set of draft findings and recommendations, and hopefully a pretty good consensus about how to use the balance of the time of the initial Pilot Project to prioritize tasks that address the intents of the TRFR Program.

** Incorporated into this initial Pilot Project is the watershed information available that was developed outside of, or not included in, THPs/NTMPs etc. Depending on the Planning Watershed first selected, this information may be extensive or less so. Various types of this information can be evaluated for consideration for inclusion in the normal timber harvest planning and operations process. This is good, but the initial focus should be on what the 'THP' process has developed, and make findings and recommendations that directly address its past, present, and future – and its utility for all the stakeholders and compliance with the precepts of ecological, economic, and social stewardship. If this is taken seriously, this is quite in-line with TRFR Program intents.

By way of additional comment:

- When is the Leadership Working Group going to have its charter?
- When is the Sacramento State Center for Collaborative Policy going to make its report, and when will the related public hearing/meeting/workshop take place?
- When and how will the public be enabled by funding and selection of representatives to actually participate, and participate effectively, in the formation of the TRFR Program and its implementation?
- The existing 'working groups' in the flow charts need to have a range of public ombudsman as part of their membership – when will this happen?

I guess that's enough for today's ADDENDUM. Thanks for your consideration and response. The general content of AB 1492, the specific intents and requirements of the TRFR Program, and the 'footing-of-the-bill' by assessments/taxes paid by the public on retail timber/lumber products present a NEW DAY and a NEW PERSPECTIVE.

Sincerely,

Richard Gienger and on behalf of Forests Forever