

# **Report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on the Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Program Assembly Bill 1492**

Fiscal Year

2023-24

In Fulfillment of the Annual Reporting  
Requirement of Public Resources Code  
Section 4629.9



CALIFORNIA  
NATURAL  
RESOURCES  
AGENCY



**CalEPA**  
California Environmental  
Protection Agency



## CONTENTS

BACKGROUND .....	4
Legislative Mandate .....	5
2023-2024 Program Dynamics in Focus .....	7
PROGRAM OVERVIEW .....	8
Timber Harvest Review .....	8
Additional Program Engagement .....	9
Reporting Requirements .....	10
PROGRAM REPORTING FISCAL YEAR 2023-24 .....	11
Fund Status .....	11
Fund Financial Status Summary: Wood Products Assessment, Revenues and Expenditures .....	11
Staffing Levels .....	12
Restoration Grant Funding .....	13
Timber Harvest Document Review, Inspections, Approval, and Enforcement .....	14
Timber Harvest Plans (THPs) .....	14
Nonindustrial Timber Management Plans (NTMPs) .....	16
Emergency Notices and Exemptions .....	18
Timber Operator Licensing .....	21
Enforcement .....	22
Process Improvements, Efficiencies in Environmental Review and Permitting .....	23
OTHER FORESTRY-RELATED ACTIVITIES INVOLVING PROGRAM STAFF .....	26
Monitoring and Evaluation .....	26
Monitoring and Research Related to Emergencies and Exemptions .....	26
Effectiveness Monitoring .....	30
Statewide Forest Ecosystem Monitoring and Assessment .....	31
Wildfire Preparedness and Emergency Response .....	33
Utility Right-of-Way Vegetation Management .....	33
Watershed Emergency Response .....	34



---

Governor’s Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force and Action Plan .....	34
APPENDIX .....	35
Departmental Staffing and Costs .....	35
Natural Resources Agency .....	35
CAL FIRE and Board of Forestry and Fire Protection .....	35
Department of Fish and Wildlife .....	37
State and Regional Water Boards .....	39
Department of Conservation .....	40
Workload Analysis .....	41
Detail on Timber Harvest Activity for FY 2023-24 .....	47
Number and Acreage Extent of Timber Harvesting Documents Processed .....	47
Average Time for Plan Review .....	47
Review of Timber Harvest Permits for Filing .....	48
THP Review Times .....	48
NTMP Review Times .....	50
Number of Field Inspections per CAL FIRE Inspector .....	50
Number of Active Plans and Acres under Active Plans .....	52
Overall Accounting of Program Fund Personnel Activities .....	54
Timber Harvest Numbers: County-by-County .....	55



## BACKGROUND

The Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Fund (Fund), established in 2012 under [Assembly Bill 1492](#) (Chapter 289, Statutes of 2012; AB 1492), places a one percent assessment on lumber and engineered wood products sold at the retail level to pay for agency staffing, permits, oversight, and environmental protection of California's forested ecosystems (Figure 1). In FY 2023-24, the Fund supported nearly 211 agency staff at the California Natural Resources Agency (CNRA), the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF), the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE), the Department of Fish and Wildlife (CDFW), the Department of Conservation's California Geological Survey (CGS); and the California Environmental Protection Agency's State and Regional Water Quality Control Boards (Water Boards).




Figure 1 (left image): Statewide land cover map of California forest ecosystems (approximately 33 million acres) under the purview of the Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Program; (right image): Statewide map of Program offices and department jurisdictions (CAL FIRE, Water Boards, CGS, and CDFW) along with geographic reference to forest areas under Program.



## Legislative Mandate

AB 1492 outlines the Legislature's intended goals (PRC § 4629.2):

- Promote and encourage sustainable forest practices consistent with state environmental laws, including, but not limited to, the Timberland Productivity Act of 1982, CEQA, the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Act, and CESA.
- Ensure continued sustainable funding for the State's forest practice program to protect the state's forest resources.
- Support in-state production of timber within the State's environmental standards and promote and encourage retention of forests and forested landscapes.
- Create a funding source for the restoration of the state's forested lands and promote restoration of fisheries and wildlife habitat and improvement in water quality.
- Promote restoration and management of forested landscapes consistent with the California Global Warming Solutions Act (AB 32).
- Promote transparency in regulatory costs and programs through the creation of performance measures and accountability for the State's forest practice regulatory program and simplify the collection and use of critical data to ensure consistency with other pertinent laws and regulations.
- Identify and implement efficiencies in the regulation of timber harvesting between State agencies.
- Modify current regulatory programs to incorporate, and provide incentives for, best practices and develop standards or strategies, where appropriate, to protect natural resources, including the development of plans that address road management and riparian function on an ownership-wide, watershed-wide, or district-wide scale.

Primary objectives of AB 1492 as they relate to the review team agencies are:

- 1) Administrative accountability, efficiency, and transparency (PRC§ 4629.1 & 4629.2(f-g)),
- 2) Timber Harvest document review, inspections, approval, and enforcement (PRC§ 4629.6(c)),
- 3) Monitoring and reporting (PRC§ 4629.2(f) & 4629.9(a)),
- 4) Establishing and evaluating ecological performance measures ((PRC§ 4629.1, 4629.3(f), 4629.9(a)), and
- 5) Providing forest restoration grants (PRC§ 4629.2 & 4629.6 (d-g)).



The Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Program has been operating for approximately 12 years. The Program's annual operating budget ranges from \$69 million - \$111 million, enabling interagency staff to work closely to build and maintain interagency cohesion, efficiency, and performance in the management of California's forested ecosystems. Extensive collaboration occurs outside the Program's core departments, including work with other state and federal agencies and partner organizations.

Program staff are actively engaged in core duties to conduct timber harvest review; fulfill policy and oversight functions including new regulation development and enforcement; ensure transparency and efficiencies through monitoring and online permit innovations; and support forest and watercourse restoration. Related to these legislatively mandated duties, highlighted duties listed below have emerged since the creation of the Program and absorbed significant staff time during this reporting period. These include, but are not limited to:

1. Emergency response to post-wildfire watershed hazard identification and community recovery, flood and winter storm events.
2. Oversight of Emergency Notice filings (ministerial permits that allow immediate salvage of timber after a loss due to fire, insect or other agent).
3. Oversight of Exemption filings (pre-mitigated, non-discretionary timber harvest permits that allow for operations to commence faster than a normal THP).
4. Implementation of the new California Vegetation Treatment Program (CalVTP) to streamline environmental review of non-commercial vegetation management.
5. Execution of Governor's Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force (Task Force) [Action Plan](#) items pertaining to:
  - a. Vegetation management permit synchronization and streamlining
  - b. Statewide monitoring and evaluation systems including vegetation treatment tracking systems, and CNRA's remote sensing investments.
6. Review of annual utility Wildfire Mitigation Plans in coordination with the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety (Energy Safety).
7. Response to pending endangered species listings (e.g., California Spotted Owl).
8. Response to issues with illegal timberland conversion and other violation types.
9. Support and oversight of State-owned land vegetation management implementation.

Some of the above-listed items are episodic, aligned with disaster declarations, while others are long-term work areas Program staff are continually addressing. In all cases, Program staff have ramped up interagency and stakeholder outreach and coordination efforts in recent years, including extensive collaboration with the U.S. Forest Service.



## 2023-2024 Program Dynamics in Focus

While the 2021 through 2023 wildfire seasons were less severe and extensive when compared to the 2020 season (the largest in California’s recorded history burning nearly 4.3 million acres across the state), significant fire events occurred during the reporting period (for more on annual incidents review CAL FIRE incident archive: [2021](#), [2022](#), [2023](#)). An early heat dome in June 2024 caused unseasonably drying and led to the 429,603-acre Park Fire that burned in northern California by the city of Chico. The balance of the 2024 fire season was primarily in the southern areas of the state, both in forested and non-forested environments.

Consistent with trends observed in recent years, post-fire salvage Emergency Notices trended downwards as fire activity trended downwards in the reporting period. FY 2023/24 had the least amount of submitted emergency notices in the past five years of reporting due to the lowered fire activity from the two years previous. This trend has already started to reverse itself in late 2024 due to salvage activity of the 2024 Park Fire, a fire that burned thousands of acres of commercial private timberlands. The number of Emergency Notices submitted in the past five years has been consistent with the fire activity for the season as displayed in Table 6. Other than forest damaging agents besides fire, such as bark beetles and drought, the trends of emergency notice submittals almost always follow the previous year’s fire activity. A fire season with a lot of activity will typically be followed up with a year of increased emergency notice submittals.

Program staff are aware of the effects of climate change and wildfire on the timberlands and broader forested ecosystems. Considering these challenges staff:

- Shifted focus to post-fire salvage operations that have been submitted as emergency notices by private timberland owners, while maintaining consistent THP permitting timelines,
- Made notable contributions to Key Actions outlined in the Governor’s Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force Action Plan,
- Contributed to technological advances in statewide forest ecosystem assessment and monitoring,
- Met statutory obligations related to Emergency Notice and Exemption monitoring and reporting, and
- Followed through on grant-supported contracts issued for restoration projects in previous years.



## PROGRAM OVERVIEW

Implementation of the Program began in January 2013, bringing various State natural resource management agencies together under the Program to efficiently and effectively regulate and permit timber harvesting activities occurring on state/local and private lands, while ensuring the protection of the state's natural resources and broader forested ecosystems. Agencies directly involved in the Program include CNRA, BOF, CAL FIRE, CDFW, CGS, and Water Boards.

Retail revenues generated under the Fund create a consistent source of revenue to support costs of the agencies charged with the review, inspection, and issuance of permits to conduct timber operations. Funds are also used to protect forest resources; restore the state's forested lands, including fisheries, wildlife habitat, and water quality; and support core staff work on subjects including permitting efficiencies, ecological oversight and monitoring, and forest ecosystem restoration through grant programs [PRC§ 4629.6(d)-(g)].

AB 1492 requires that monies be expended for purposes relating to:

- 1) The regulatory activities of responsible state and local agencies involved in the management of forested landscapes.
- 2) The costs of managing forest resource programs in the state.
- 3) Grants for restoration in forested ecosystems.
- 4) Certain grants for fire protection and suppression.

### Timber Harvest Review

A major component of the Program is to provide consistent interagency oversight for commercial timber harvest on California's non-federal timberland. Commercial timber operations on non-federal forestlands in California are regulated under the [Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act](#) (Act) and implemented under the [California Forest Practice Rules](#) (Rules). The Act establishes the goal of ensuring a thriving and sustainable forest products industry that also supports California's ecological objectives, protection of soil, water quality, and conservation of wildlife habitat.

The Rules provide explicit instructions for permissible and prohibited actions that govern the conduct of timber operations in the field. The Rules cover major categories including silvicultural systems and regeneration methods; harvesting practices and erosion control; site preparation; watercourse protection; sensitive watershed designation; functional wildlife habitat and late successional forest protection; fire protection; hazard reduction and more. The Rules define the contents of a variety of permitting and related procedural mechanisms for the conduct of timber harvesting activities, including the



Timber Harvest Plan, which is a formal environmental review document that must be prepared by a Registered Professional Forester. The BOF is the rule-making authority, and CAL FIRE is the lead agency for approving timber plans and enforcement of the Forest Practice Rules. The Act and Rules and the interagency process used to review and approve THPs under them constitute a Certified Regulatory Program under the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA).

The multi-agency “review team” is defined in the Act and Rules and includes CAL FIRE (lead agency), the Water Boards, CDFW, and CGS. The Act and Rules establish a coordinated process for multi-agency, interdisciplinary review of timber harvesting projects including THPs, Nonindustrial Timber Management Plans (NTMPs), Sustained Yield Plans (SYPs), Program Timberland Environmental Impact Reports (PTEIRs), Working Forest Management Plans (WFMPs), and Emergency and Exemption Notices. In 1976, the Natural Resources Secretary certified that the plan review process under the Rules was the “functional equivalent” of an environmental impact report (EIR) under CEQA based on the number of provisions that require evaluation and protection of soil, water, plant, fish, cultural and wildlife resources.

Beyond participating in the review team process, CDFW also serves as a CEQA Responsible Agency for plans with the issuance of appropriate Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements (1600 Agreements) and Incidental Take Permits (ITPs) for species listed under the California Endangered Species Act (CESA). The Water Boards also have a statutory obligation to regulate all nonpoint source water pollution activities on both non-federal and federal lands under Federal and State clean water laws. Coordination among these agencies and departments is critical to meet each agency’s respective mandates and reduce duplicative efforts.

The Program has enabled a transition towards more transparent, coordinated review and permitting related to timber harvesting activities. With a foundation of collaboration, the multi-agency review team provides early and consistent oversight to efficiently process timber harvesting proposals, with no permitting fees. Further, the Program has expanded measures to deliver program accountability and enhance stakeholder accessibility.

### **Additional Program Engagement**

Beyond oversight of timber harvesting activities, Program staff engage in broader forest health and timber harvest initiatives integral to the Program’s scope and operations.

These initiatives include:

- **Wildfire mitigation, public safety, science, and innovation:**
  - Collaboration between Program staff and partner agencies and stakeholders to address drought, tree mortality, and wildfire issues, workforce development needs, utility right-of-way mitigation work, wood



product utilization, restoration, and reforestation initiatives, and the like. These efforts include work associated with the Governor's Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force.

- Review team staff collaborate with partner agencies to ensure complementary and consistent work. Partner agencies include the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety (Energy Safety), California Office of Emergency Services, CalRecycle, Public Utilities Commission, Caltrans, Department of Water Resources, Coastal Commission, Office of Planning and Research, Air Resources Board, U.S. Forest Service, and Bureau of Land Management.
- CNRA is leading the development of an integrated statewide forest ecosystem monitoring effort to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of management (harvest, fuel reduction activities, other land uses) on forest ecosystem conditions, including water quality and supply, carbon, biodiversity, and related natural resource assets. This includes statewide coordinated acquisitions of remote sensing data to enhance and complement the data and assessments being conducted by partner organizations.

## Reporting Requirements

AB 1492 established a requirement for CNRA, in consultation with CalEPA, to submit an annual report to the Legislature on the activities of all State departments, agencies, and boards relating to forest and timberland regulation (PRC§ 4629.9). Per the statute, that report shall, at minimum, include all the following:

- 1) A listing, by organization, of the proposed total costs associated with the review, approval, and inspection of timber harvest plans and associated permits.
- 2) The number of THPs and acreage covered by the plans, reviewed that year.
- 3) To the extent feasible, a listing of activities, personnel, and funding, by department, for the forest practice program for the most recent fiscal year and preceding 10 fiscal years.
- 4) The number of staff in each organization dedicated fully or partially to, a) review of THPs, and b) other forestry-related activities, by geographical location in the state.
- 5) The costs of other forestry-related activities undertaken.
- 6) A summary of any process improvements identified by the Administration as part of ongoing review of the timber harvest process, including data and technology improvement needs.
- 7) Workload analysis for the forest practice program in each organization.



- 8) To assess efficiencies in the program and the effectiveness of spending, a set of measures for, and a plan for collection of data on, the program, including but not limited to:
- a. The number of THPs reviewed,
  - b. Average time for plan review,
  - c. Number of field inspections per inspector,
  - d. Number of acres under active plans,
  - e. Number of violations,
  - f. Evaluation of ecological performance.

A discussion of each is included in the following section.

## **PROGRAM REPORTING FISCAL YEAR 2023-24**

### **Fund Status**

The following provides information on the Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Program operations covering Fiscal Years 2023-24 including budget condition, staffing information, and reporting on available and applicable Program activities and trends involving forest management and timber harvesting.

#### Fund Financial Status Summary: Wood Products Assessment, Revenues and Expenditures

In fiscal year 2023-24 the Program supported nearly 211 agency staff at CNRA, CAL FIRE, CDFW, Water Boards, BOF, and the CGS largely in technical and administrative capacities responsible for: conducting timber harvest project review; fulfilling policy and oversight functions including regulation development and enforcement; ensuring transparency and efficiencies through monitoring and online permit innovations; and supporting forest and watercourse restoration.

In fiscal year 2023-24, the Fund had \$217.9 million in available resources, of which approximately \$54.9 million came from annual forest product sales assessment revenues. At the end of fiscal year 2023-24, the Fund showed an ending balance of \$175 million (Table 1). Overall, the fund is in good condition, including that there are regular past year increased adjustments to revenues. The adjustments happen because of the timing of receiving the funds from the large retailers which are sometimes delayed and impact reporting.



**Table 1. Fund Balance (millions of dollars), Fiscal Years 2016-17 to 2023-24.**

	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Total Resources	\$71.4	\$75.8	\$78.3	\$69.6	\$77.4	\$90.2	\$95.7	\$217.9
Expenditures	\$68.3	\$48.2	\$54.6	\$46.3	\$43.6	\$40.5	\$42.5	\$42.9
Ending Balance	\$30.7	\$27.6	\$23.7	\$23.3	\$33.7	\$49.7	\$156.8	\$175

**Table 1.** Trends in Fund condition. Total Resources represent the prior year fund balance carry-over plus forest product sales assessment revenue collected for a given Fiscal Year. Ending Balance is the total amount of available resources remaining at the end of the Fiscal Year. The difference between the Total Resources and Ending Balance represents the total spending in the given Fiscal Year. The difference between a given year’s total resources and the prior year’s ending balance is the given Fiscal Year’s lumber and forest product sales assessment revenue.

Staffing Levels

Since 2013, the Fund has provided consistent staffing levels for Program review team agencies to engage in timber harvest review functions and related forest health objectives (refer also to Appendix). Review team agencies regularly evaluate the adequacy of staffing levels supported by the Fund to ensure timely plan review and permitting, responsiveness to new legislative mandates, and to meet broader Program requirements such as monitoring, oversight, and restoration.

Given the scope and scale of forest and timberland management need across the state, including response to emerging climate change impacts and increasing wildfire risk, new positions have been incrementally added since Program inception (Table 2). Nearly 211 staff positions (PY: person years) were authorized under the Program in FY 2023-24.



**Table 2. Staffing Levels, Fiscal Years 2015-16 to 2023-24.**

Department	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
CNRA	2	2	3	3	3	3	3	3	3
BOF	1	1	2	4	4	4	4	4	4.25
CAL FIRE	114	114	123	123	123	123	123	123	123
CDFW <sup>1</sup>	41	40	41	34.5	42.7	43.6	43.7	43.7	44.0
Water Boards <sup>2</sup>	34.9	34.9	34.9	35.2	35.2	17.5	17.2	17.5	17.7
CGS	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19
<b>Total</b>	<b>212</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>223</b>	<b>219</b>	<b>227</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>210</b>	<b>211</b>

**Table 2.** Interagency staff numbers as measured by PY (person years) between FY 2015-16 and 2023-24. Notes: 1) 4.5 of CDFW’s PYs are funded through the General Fund; 2) In past years, the Water Boards reported all positions assigned to Forest Activities Program work, beginning in FY 2020-21, the positions reported have been revised to reflect those specifically supported through the Program Fund.

Given rising costs and growth of Program operations and responsibilities in recent years, it is anticipated that Fund appropriations across Program departments may need to be revisited to ensure appropriate resources are in place for consistent delivery of core Program services across the State.

Restoration Grant Funding

The State of California is a major purveyor of contract and grant funding to support research, innovation, and on-the-ground management action. As Fund condition allows, the Program, through its various departments and boards, administers restoration grant funding to enable reforestation, water quality improvement and forest management in high-risk forested areas of the State.

When Program funding is available for restoration work, funds are appropriated by the State budget process to: promote forest restoration; mitigate past damage from wildland fire and legacy forest management practices; improve fish habitat and remove fish migration barriers; improve sediment control measures to prevent water quality impairment; and more.

As with recent fiscal years, no new grant funding appropriations were allocated toward the issuance of new grants under the Program. However, given consistent and strong revenues in the reporting period, in coming fiscal years, the Program may be prepared to provide new grant funding as laid out in PRC 4629.6 (d-i), upon appropriation by the Legislature.



## Timber Harvest Document Review, Inspections, Approval, and Enforcement

To reference up-to-date maps of timber harvest activity across California discussed in this document, please refer to [CAL FIRE's Timber Harvest Viewer](#) (click on the “layer list” in the top right hand corner of the webpage to enable viewing of harvest types of interest).

### Timber Harvest Plans (THPs)

In FY 2023-24, there were 198 new THPs approved covering roughly 73,000 acres. THPs are valid for five to seven years, with harvest occurring during any given fiscal year in the covered period. Of these new THP acreages, approximately 34 percent of timber harvesting was proposed as uneven-aged management, also known as selection silviculture. Several large landowners employ even-aged management, including clearcut silviculture which averaged approximately 31 percent of approved THPs in the past reporting year. The remainder constituted special prescription and other management such as fuel reduction work, restoration, or the like.



In addition to THP usage, the timber industry is increasingly employing ministerial permitting mechanisms such as Exemption and Emergency Notices. These ministerial permits do not receive multi-agency review that occurs for THPs or NTMPs prior to approval, however, unlike THPs, NTMPs and WFMPs, non-discretionary permits like exemptions have pre-determined operational parameters, and no allowance for landowner discretion is allowed in determining operational standards to follow. These “pre-mitigated” exemptions have been determined by the legislature to be de minimis in their potential for environmental impacts. The rise in the use of these ministerial permits is due to the significant number of acres and volumes of timber experiencing mortality from drought, insects, and wildfire, and the expansion of Exemption types that are now available to treat pre-fire conditions (e.g., reducing hazardous fuel loads).

Despite the complexity involved in THP review and the increased use of Exemption and Emergency Notices, the average number of days for approval of a THP has remained relatively consistent over the past several years (Table 3). Accounting for agency review time, pre-harvest inspection (PHI) coordination, and time for project proponent response to questions, review days in the past ten fiscal years have averaged 116 days from submittal to approval. It is important to note that THPs and the review team process constitute a functional equivalent to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR), which typically requires significant time and can take several years to complete. The causes for delays in harvest plan review times, include, but are not limited to: endangered



species concerns; snow levels preventing PHIs; wildfire conditions; and plan submitter preparedness and responsiveness.

To reduce unnecessary permitting delays, in September 2023, consistent with Assembly Bill 2889 [Caballero, Ch. 640, Stats. 2018], CAL FIRE developed a “Timber Harvesting Plan Filing Checklist” to assist Registered Professional Foresters (RPFs) in their preparation and submission of a THP as required by the Act. Use of the checklist by RPFs is intended to result in greater first-time plan filing and reduced plan return rates. The checklist includes highlighted emphasis on common errors that can result in a plan not being approved by CAL FIRE.

In addition to the checklist, another resource currently available to assist RPFs in their development of harvesting plans is the online California Timber Regulation and Environmental Evaluation System (CalTREES). RPFs can use CalTREES to view examples of plans that were filed and the reasons for which plans were returned not filed. Through consistent use of CalTREES, RPFs can maintain awareness of the common return issues and make corrections prior to plan submission. Additionally, with the added functionality to submit THPs online through CalTREES, initial return problems are more likely avoided through the automated error checking for key information when submitting online. In addition to online submittal, CAL FIRE revised both the THP and the NTMP forms. These form revisions are also intended to help RPF’s and the regulated public.

**Table 3. Approved THP Review Days, Fiscal Years 2014-15 to 2023-24.**

*Corrections to previous years’ numbers from past reports are from QA/QC of Forest Practice data.*

Fiscal Year	Count	Acres	Minimum Days in Review	Maximum Days in Review	Average Days in Review
2014-15	253	125,444	33	335	112
2015-16	243	81,332	26	347	107
2016-17	215	81,674	37	308	119
2017-18	267	59,847	43	344	118
2018-19	237	83,933	43	308	103
2019-20	224	119,235	40	322	131
2020-21	208	92,742	67	333	118
2021-22	178	60,674	25	330	108
2022-23	171	54,075	32	339	136
2023-24	195	72,163	34	358	106

**Note:** Individual Plans greater than one year in review have been removed to represent more accurate time frames. These outliers are generally due to weather delays with



PHIs, review team awaiting RPF responses to recommendations, and responding to public comments. Substantial Deviations for THPs (in cases where significant changes to existing approved plans are requested) are not included in these figures. Review time spikes during some fiscal years are mostly attributed to controversial Plans with significant public comments which take longer to review.

#### Nonindustrial Timber Management Plans (NTMPs)

NTMPs do not expire like a THP; therefore, once approved active harvesting can be conducted in any fiscal year so long as a permittee files a Notice of Timber Operations (NTO) and the plan is in compliance with any required amendments. Selection silviculture (uneven-aged management) prescriptions make up nearly all the harvesting for these plans. A total of 854 NTMPs have been approved since these permits became available with 848 of them still active. NTMPs represent far less acreage than THPs, accounting for approximately only 5 percent of approved plan acres in the last fiscal year at 1,442. In the past ten fiscal years NTMPs have averaged 142 review days from submittal to approval, roughly 20 percent more than the average THP review time.

Due to the complexity in demonstrating long-term sustained growth and yield across the often-large size of NTMPs (maximum acreage of 2,500), the average review times tend to be more variable than for THPs. Similar dynamics associated with THP review times apply to the NTMP review team process as it is a functional equivalent to an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The number of NTMPs and associated harvest acreage have varied over recent years due to timber industry changes, wildfires, and widespread tree mortality due to droughts and pest infestations. Tables in the Appendix of this report provide further information about NTMP review times. A summary of approved NTMPs, associated acreage, and review days is included in Table 4.




**Table 4. Approved NTMP Acreage and Review Days, Fiscal Years 2014-15 to 2023-24.**

*Corrections to previous years' numbers from past reports are from QA/QC of Forest Practice data*

Fiscal Year	Count	Acres	Minimum Days in Review	Maximum Days in Review	Average Days in Review
2014-15	11	3,207	69	166	107
2015-16	11	5,410	72	291	159
2016-17	13	5,109	73	205	155
2017-18	13	3,869	77	193	121
2018-19	14	2,410	82	268	171
2019-20	13	4,172	67	189	122
2020-21	7	1,017	67	255	116
2021-22	8	2,389	54	343	204
2022-23	6	1,889	76	205	165
2023-24	6	964	58	172	103

**Note:** Individual Plans greater than one year in review have been removed to represent more accurate time frames. These outliers are generally due to weather delays with PHIs, review team awaiting RPF responses to recommendations, and responding to public comments. Substantial Deviations for NTMPs are not included in these figures.

As shown in Figure 2, the majority of approved THPs and NTMPs over the past five years were in the Coast Range, followed by the Cascade Range.



*Figure 2 Total approved discretionary THP and NTMP numbers. Bar colors indicate each year the CAL FIRE Forest Practice Area where accepted.*



### Emergency Notices and Exemptions

In certain situations, Notices of Emergency (Emergencies) and Notices of Exemption from Timber Harvesting Plan Requirements (Exemptions) allow landowners to utilize a *ministerial* harvest document to harvest timber rather than preparing a discretionary document such as a THP, NTMP, MTHP, or WFMP. Ministerial documents receive a rapid administrative review only for accuracy of the submittal prior to acceptance or return. Emergencies and Exemptions require compliance with the Forest Practice Rules and other agency regulations governing timber harvest, road construction, residual timber stocking standards, and protections for fish and wildlife species, and water quality. Emergency notices allow landowners to capture loss to their timberlands from fire, wind, insects or disease, whereas Exemption notices are “pre-mitigated” harvest documents that have strict parameters on use that must be adhered to when operating. Unlike THP’s, NTMP’s or WFMP’s, Emergency notices and exemptions cannot have alternative methods proposed as no discretionary review is performed to analyze alternative proposals.



*Figure 3 The Dixie Fire ignited on July 13, 2021. Photo of post fire salvage logging.*

The number of acres harvested under ministerial Exemptions and Emergencies fluctuate based on statewide fire activity, fuels reduction projects, drought, and tree mortality from insects and disease (Figure 3). Exemptions have greatly outnumbered Emergencies in the last five years. However, yearly Exemption totals have been trending downward since 2019, while Emergencies saw a spike in 2021, before decreasing in 2023 to below levels seen in 2019.




Figure 4 Total accepted Exemption and Emergency Notices by year (inclusive of all types). Bar colors indicate each year the CAL FIRE Forest Practice Area where accepted. For reference, the black dashed line in panel shows the average number of approved THPs per year, 2019 to 2023.

A summary of the Exemption and Emergency Notice types and their quantities over the past 5 years are provided in Table 5.

Given the expedited ministerial permitting process for Exemptions and Emergencies (timber operations may commence within five to 15 days depending upon the ministerial document type), CAL FIRE (on occasion with other Review Team agencies) conducts field review, inspection, and monitoring for a sampling of these timber operations to evaluate compliance and effectiveness of Forest Practice Rules implementation (in partial fulfillment of SB 901 reporting requirements). Results of ongoing monitoring activities are described in more detail later in this report.

With a changing climate, California is experiencing long-term trends of higher temperatures and low precipitation. Climate projections coalesce around these trends continuing, exacerbating the incidence and severity of drought, insects and disease, tree mortality, and wildfire. Therefore, it is expected that the use of Exemptions and Emergencies will remain high or increase in the coming years. If usage of these ministerial permits grows, to help ensure compliance with State regulations, additional resources to ensure Review Team agency oversight may be needed in the future.



**Table 5. Exemption and Emergency Notice types and their quantities over the past five years (note: data not reported in FYs).**

	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	Total
<b>EXEMPTIONS</b>						
Structure Protection 0-150 Feet	553	438	339	242	262	1834
10% DDD-Fuelwood-Woody Debris	471	377	353	288	257	1746
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	188	206	263	187	128	972
Right of Way	374	291	127	115	57	964
Butte Post-Fire Recovery	536	0	0	0	0	536
Drought Mortality/Unmerchantable Sawlog	73	32	115	114	91	425
Post Fire Recovery	2	239	76	53	21	391
Forest Fire Prevention	44	62	52	70	57	285
Structure Protection 150-300 Feet	41	50	49	55	39	234
Christmas Tree	31	33	27	19	25	135
Oak Woodland Management	6	7	11	16	32	72
Small Timberland Owner	7	6	2	2	2	19
<b>EMERGENCY</b>						
Emergency Notice - Post-Fire	201	220	451	270	117	1259
Emergency Notice - Other	9	17	15	13	39	93
Emergency - Fuel Hazard Reduction	11	23	7	10	10	61

*Emergency Notices*

In general, changes in the number of Emergency Notices (Emergencies) accepted and acres harvested in any given fiscal year are correlated to the number of acres of timberland impacted by wildfire. In FY 2023-2024, the number of Emergencies was proportional to the fire activity taking place during the season, or seasons just before (Table 6). Emergencies were dominated by post-fire salvage projects, with numbers peaking in 2021, in response to the 2020 and 2021 wildfire seasons.

**Table 6. Emergency Notices Accepted in Fiscal Years 2019-20 through 2023-24.**

FY	Count	Acres
2019-20	106	12,124
2020-21	446	85,321
2021-22	376	106,653
2022-23	229	65,646
2023-24	98	16,965

The “Emergency Notice” count and acreages are directly related to the fire activity during the previous calendar year(s). Fiscal years with little fire activity in the previous years will have less count and acreages than previous years with heavier fire activity. The 2024 Park Fire, which largely burned in federal and private timberlands, has caused an uptick of submitted emergency notices in late 2024 and will continue into 2025 until the salvage recovery is complete.



*Exemptions*

The general pattern of Exemptions is variable from year to year (Table 7). The Structure Protection 0-150 Feet (§1038(c)(1)) and the 10 percent Dead, Dying, Diseased, Fuelwood, and Woody Debris (§1038(b)) Exemptions represent the majority of Exemptions accepted, accounting for over 50% of submitted Exemptions Landscape conditions and the status of the timber industry over the past several years have affected the type and volume of Exemptions, averaging nearly 2.4 million acres of the state’s timberlands in the past five fiscal years. Reported acres for Exemptions, however, can be highly misleading when including the 14 CCR 1038(b) “10 percent Dead, Dying, Diseased Exemption”, as this exemption frequently covers many thousands of acres, or even “ownership-wide” areas, even though many of these areas will not actually see any harvest activity. This can skew the data giving an impression of more activity on the landscape than is actually occurring.

**Table 7. Exemptions Accepted in Fiscal Years 2019-20 to 2023-24.**

FY	Acres	Count
2019-20	1,703	2,520,030
2020-21	1,591	2,908,915
2021-22	1,191	3,487,500
2022-23	964	1,545,177
2023-24	982	1,440,901

Timber Operator Licensing

Licensed Timber Operators (LTOs) are individuals who have been licensed under the Forest Practice Act law and are authorized to conduct forest tree cutting and removal operations. LTOs must understand and comply with all laws relating to such tree cutting or removal. As with licensing of Professional Foresters, though CAL FIRE’s Timber Operator Licensing Program is not supported by the Fund, it is an integral component of timber harvesting in the state. The program is staffed with one program coordinator responsible for day-to-day program operations, a program manager and administrative help from other programs. The program continues to see a high demand for meeting the training class requirement for new applicants.

- Shasta Community College in Redding has been helping the Department meet this demand by providing approximately eight classes a year when there are enough students to make a 45-person class. The college has recently hired a retired industry RPF to help lead their resource department and this is expected to continue to improve the venue for training.



- The Department has historically scheduled two to four classes a year using unit staff foresters as instructors when staff is available.
- These combined classes allow 400 to 500 students annually to attend LTO training classes.

It is estimated that 30 percent to 40 percent of the students enrolled in the class also apply for a Timber Operator license, equating to approximately 112 new licenses issued per year. The program has processed approximately 600 to 1,000 renewals and new license applications each year for the last several years.

### Enforcement

Unpermitted timberland conversion (activity unrelated to harvest plans) continues to dominate CAL FIRE's enforcement activities. Table 8 presents the number of violation records produced annually by harvest document type for the past ten years. The main enforcement actions taken by the Department are administrative action (NOV), administrative civil penalties (monetary penalty/mitigation) and criminal action (misdemeanor/mitigation). Other enforcement actions include licensing actions against timber operators or submitting RPF complaints.

Enforcement actions are also taken by CDFW and the Water Boards against those landowners, RPFs or LTOs found to be out of compliance with relevant rules and regulations. Such enforcement actions are based on laws that these agencies enforce, such as the Fish and Game Code and the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, and related permit requirements. Note that the number of violations associated with THPs appears to have increased significantly during FY 2023-2024. This increase is largely reflective of staff identifying violations on approximately 44 THPs, 22 violations however were associated with one THP. The decrease in Emergency Notice violations is reflective of the decrease in salvage operations being conducted.



**Table 8. Number of Violations Issued by CAL FIRE, FY 2014-15 to 2022-24.**

Harvest Document Type	FY 14-15	FY 15-16	FY 16-17	FY 17-18	FY 18-19	FY 19-20	FY 20-21	FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 23-24
THPs	45	24	64	73	42	38	57	42	25	90
NTMPs	11	21	28	6	30	16	14	5	17	8
Emergency Notices	7	27	23	3	5	17	15	34	40	8
Exemption Notices	40	109	98	109	116	84	60	46	33	48
Violations Not Tied to a Harvest Document	98	180	259	254	96	154	125	157	104	97
<b>Totals</b>	<b>201</b>	<b>361</b>	<b>472</b>	<b>445</b>	<b>289</b>	<b>309</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>284</b>	<b>220</b>	<b>251</b>

**Note:** A single Plan/Notice may have multiple violations associated with it.

Process Improvements, Efficiencies in Environmental Review and Permitting

A key objective outlined in AB 1492 is to identify and implement efficiencies in the regulation of timber harvesting between state agencies. While Program staff continuously endeavor to improve Program efficiencies, activities included the following:

*California Timber Regulation and Environmental Evaluation System (CalTREES)*



A significant effort funded by the Program over the past several years has been to develop a single online application portal to enable more efficient permit submission, agency review, and to promote transparency associated with the environmental review that may be required for timber harvest permitting by multiple regulatory agencies.

The online timber harvest permitting system, [CalTREES](#), is one of the few online application systems in the state that facilitates a complete CEQA equivalent environmental review process. The goal of CalTREES is to improve efficiency for the submission, review, and administration of timber harvesting permit applications. It will also enhance public access to timber harvesting permit information and support analysis by automating the collection of program performance information, such as time to complete reviews of THPs and NTMPs. The CalTREES database and reports allow for efficient and consistent summarizing, including most of the Forest Practice harvesting statistics in this report.



During FY 2023-24 there were major functionality improvements with CalTREES. The ability to submit Amendments to THPs and NTMPs through the CalTREES website went live at the end of 2023. Additionally, in June of 2024 THPs can now be submitted online through CalTREES. Both functions will improve Review Team efficiencies for submitting Harvesting Plans to the system. The goal was to reduce input errors and potential return issues during filing, along with improved automatic email noticing throughout the review process. Improved system reporting was updated providing a wider array of summarized live data that is available to everyone from the reports page.



Moving forward, in the second half of 2024, CalTREES will deploy similar online submittal functionality with NTMPs. Late 2024 and into 2025, CalTREES will start the transition to the Accela cloud, as the base software will no longer support on premise storage and system functionality. This will improve system security, performance, and the ability to be connected to up-to-date platform versions.

Additionally, the program continues to research the integration of a geospatial component and has posted new updated links in the help section to the CAL FIRE GIS spatial data hub and connections to the new CAL FIRE [Timber Harvest Viewer](#).

### *Permit Synchronization*

As noted, one of the primary goals of AB 1492 is to identify and implement efficiencies in the regulation of timber harvesting across state agencies. Permit synchronization is a term often used to describe this endeavor. In addition to AB 1492, the concept of permit synchronization has been outlined in AB 2889 (Chapter 640, Statutes of 2018) and more recently described in the 2020 Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan (Key Action 1.35) and codified in Senate Bill 456 (Chapter 387, Statutes of 2021).

In FY 2021-22, Program agencies, industry representatives, and stakeholders developed a work plan to align permitting under the Act and FPRs and regulations adopted by the BOF and including relevant permitting and regulatory requirements of the Water Boards and CDFW. The Work Plan proposes a thorough evaluation of permitting workflow and timelines through implementation of Lean 6 Sigma analysis.



Currently CNRA is working to contract with a third-party vendor to facilitate this analysis, which will begin in 2024.

### *Timber Harvest Permitting Guidance Documents*

CAL FIRE has developed and published the “[Timber Harvesting Plan Filing Checklist](#)” to assist RPFs in their preparation and submission of plans as required by the Forest Practice Act, Public Resources Code Section 4592.5. Use of this checklist by RPFs is intended to result in greater first-time plan filing and reduced plan return rates. The checklist includes highlighted emphasis on common errors that can result in a plan not being approved by the Review Team.

### *Response to Related Legislation, Rulemaking, and Permitting Efficiencies*

Periodically, new legislation (e.g., [SB 901](#), Chapter 626, Statutes of 2018), Executive Orders and Emergency Proclamations necessitate significant Program staff time to respond to mandates set forth by the Legislature or Governor, where these impact forests and timberlands of the State.



Over the past several years, in response to SB 901 and Executive Orders, Program staff have maintained ongoing involvement in broader regulatory relief efforts to facilitate forest health, and wildfire fire mitigation and response activities action on the ground.

### [Expanding the Availability and Use of Emergency Notices and Exemptions](#)

As directed by the Legislature, the BOF has greatly expanded the availability of Emergency Notices and Exemptions (e.g., forest fire prevention, drought mortality, post-fire recovery, etc.) for eligible commercial timber harvest activities, precluding more time-intensive preparation of a THP. This is meant to provide landowners with an expeditious pathway to conduct fuel reduction and forest health projects, while observing the operational provisions of the Rules. Review Team agencies continue to work closely with CAL FIRE to ensure natural resource protection through compliance with state and federal laws and regulations and provide permitting and technical assistance where necessary. These permit forms are available on the [CAL FIRE website](#).

Similarly, Review Team staff regularly provide the BOF with coordinated interagency comments on rule revisions or new policy and rule development, particularly concerning resource management issues, community fire hazard matters, and emerging industry



needs. Further, CDFW staff consult on prospective threatened or endangered [species listings](#) that affect forested areas of the State. Review Team staff are continuously involved in complex negotiations with industry, private landowners, federal authorities, and others concerning development of innovative solutions such as species-specific [Safe Harbor Agreements and Habitat Conservation Plans](#) designed to enable forest management while safeguarding species of concern.

## **OTHER FORESTRY-RELATED ACTIVITIES INVOLVING PROGRAM STAFF**

### **Monitoring and Evaluation**

Interagency staff are working to expand the Program's capabilities in field-based and remotely sensed monitoring and spatial analysis for advancing environmental monitoring and natural resources management. AB 1492 directs the Program to develop an ecological performance measures approach as an accountability measure for the multiple State programs that regulate forest and timberland ecosystems. Results of monitoring are used to inform decision makers in their work to adaptively manage forests and timberlands and to track efficacy of State-led forest management regulations, policies, and programs. This includes the evaluation of State and Federal programs to invest in forest health and resilience such as fuel reduction activities.

Program staff actively lead various levels of monitoring associated with management such as timber harvest and fuel reduction projects, including:

- 1) Ongoing work to track regulatory effectiveness of forest management projects on the ground; and
- 2) The establishment of a new monitoring effort to evaluate forested watershed conditions statewide using state-of-the-science remote sensing technologies.

### Monitoring and Research Related to Emergencies and Exemptions

CAL FIRE's Watershed Protection Program, in conjunction with the other Review Team agencies, actively evaluates outcomes of harvesting operations that fall under Emergency and Exemption ministerial harvesting permits. In addition, regular compliance inspections are conducted by CAL FIRE foresters and Review Team agency staff during and after project implementation.

Exemption and Emergency Notice monitoring has been a priority of CAL FIRE since 2018. Prompted by a reporting requirement imposed by the Legislature in consecutive statute changes enacted by Assembly Bill 1958 (Chapter 583, Statutes of 2016) and Assembly Bill 2029 (Chapter 563, Statutes of 2016), Senate Bill 92 (Chapter 26, Statutes of 2017), and Senate Bill 901 (Chapter 626, Statutes of 2018), CAL FIRE, in cooperation with the BOF and the other Review Team agencies initiated a long-term



monitoring and annual reporting program for Exemption and Emergency Notices. Work is being phased over time, with each year focusing on one or more Notice types for rigorous evaluation with additional agency staffing.

To date, CAL FIRE, along with the other Review Team agencies, have monitored or are in the process of monitoring five types of Exemption and Emergency Notices, and recently completed a draft monitoring report on the second round of Emergency Notice monitoring. These include:

*Emergency Notices (14 CCR § 1052) – Completed December 2019*

In 2019, 54 Emergency Notices were randomly selected from 272 submitted in 2018 for tree damage and mortality due to wildfire, insects, or drought. Forty-nine Notices were related to wildfires, and five were related to insect or drought damage. Of these 54 Notices, 13 percent had no activity under the submitted Emergency (e.g., no work started). Of the 49 enacted Emergency Notices, the majority involved ground-based tractor yarding or a combination of tractor yarding and cable yarding. Harvest intensity on Notices generally followed tree damage and mortality patterns and ranged from low impact to extensive clearcut-equivalent timber harvests. Based on California Natural Diversity Database (CNDDDB) queries of the sampled Emergencies, Rare, Threatened, or Endangered species had not been previously reported to CNDDDB within many of the Notice boundaries, but Notices were filed within areas of suitable habitat for these species.

Sixty-two percent of the sampled Notices had “Acceptable” composite performance outcomes related to water quality, while 32 percent had “Acceptable to Unacceptable” mixed performance outcomes, and 6 percent had entirely “Unacceptable” outcomes (Figure 5). Twenty-six percent of the Notices had an “Unacceptable” outcome relative to either watercourse crossings, road hydrologic disconnection, or watercourse protection. Water quality issues were related to watercourse crossings that were not adequately designed or maintained, ground-based tractor yarding, and road drainage onto fire-impacted bare hillslopes near watercourses.



*Figure 5 Review team inspecting drainage and erosion issues proximate to harvest site.*



As a result of this recent Notice monitoring study (released in 2019), the BOF and CAL FIRE, in close collaboration with CDFW and Water Boards, have and continue to issue guidance and outreach materials directly to RPFs, LTOs and landowners to reinforce the critical need to comply with Forest Practice Rules, particularly related to water quality. Due to the report, the BOF made changes to 14 CCR § 1052 to explicitly outline a Registered Professional Forester’s responsibilities during Emergency operations to ensure more favorable outcomes.

CAL FIRE recently completed a draft report on the second round of post-fire salvage Emergency Notice monitoring which will be subject to public review and comment. Meanwhile, field sampling on § 1038(d) Drought Mortality Exemptions is nearing completion, and a draft report is anticipated to be completed in 2024.

*Reduction of Fire Hazard With 150 Feet of Structures (14 CCR § 1038(c)) – Completed July 2021*

CAL FIRE focused on 1038(c) Exemptions (Notices) in 2020, as they are the most numerous Exemption type and allow landowners to offset the costs of implementing the requirements of PRC §§ 4290 and 4291 by permitting the commercialization of timber removed during defensible space-related fire hazard reduction activities (Figure 6). Seventy-five 1038(c) Notices were randomly selected from Notices accepted during the last nine months of 2019. Monitoring objectives were focused on whether Notices achieved the intent of reducing the horizontal and vertical continuity of surface, ladder, and/or crown fuels, especially within the first 10 or 30 feet of the permitted structure as per 1038(c) and Technical Rule Addendum Number 4 (TRA #4).

Overall, findings suggest:

- (1) 1038(c)s are implemented at a cost to the landowners, although 1038(c)s are not a requirement to implement PRC §§ 4291.
- (2) Water quality is protected during the implementation of 1038(c)s.
- (3) Only 31 percent of Notices met the intent of Technical Rule Addendum (TRA) #4, where only single specimen trees are allowed to be within 30 feet of a structure.
- (4) While most Notices did not break up horizontal crown continuity as per requirements, surface and ladder fuels were adequately treated.
- (5) Smaller parcels are less likely to achieve the intent of 1038(c) due to



Figure 6 Fire hazard reduction: before and after treatment (left to right).



the difficulty and cost of removing trees adjacent to multiple structures.

(6) 1038(c)s are potentially being used for purposes other than fire hazard reduction.

Recommendations include developing landowner / LTO guidance for 1038(c) implementation, potential revision to the Forest Practice Rules and TRA #4 to increase clarity, better guidance to landowners and LTOs on use of Exemptions in general, and integrating 1038(c) evaluation with the Office of the State Fire Marshall's Defensible Space inspections. Completed Notices should be rigorously evaluated by Damage Inspection Specialists (DINS) when impacted by wildfire to determine 1038(c) effectiveness.

*Reduction of Fire Hazard Within 300 Feet of Structures (14 CCR § 1038(c)(6)) –  
Completed October 2022*

In 2021, CAL FIRE focused on the §1038(c)(6) Exemption (hereafter “(c)(6) Notice”), which allows for exempt commercial harvesting of timber within 300 feet of legally permitted and habitable structures. The (c)(6) Notice compliments the §1038(c) Notice, by allowing tree removal 150 to 300 feet from these structures. To assess the efficacy of the (c)(6) Notice, CAL FIRE monitored 35 randomly selected (c)(6) Notices statewide to achieve results with a 95 percent confidence level and 8 percent margin of error. Of the landowners who reported financial estimates from operations, a majority reported either breaking even or a financial gain, with a minority reporting that operations and the treatment of their property resulted in a financial loss.

Watercourse protection was adequate on all monitored (c)(6) Notices where watercourses were present, which occurred on 40 percent of the sampled Notices. All sampled (c)(6) Notices met the slash treatment requirements and had an average post-harvest slash depth below 18 inches per the FPRs, however there were often isolated individual instances of deeper slash depths. A minority of the sampled (c)(6) Notices did not meet basal area retention requirements per the FPRs. In general, a minority of the (c)(6) Notices failed to meet the desired intent of the Exemption.

Recommendations include encouraging logging techniques that minimize the accumulation and horizontal continuity of slash, as well as a focus on effectively treating ladder fuels and disrupting the horizontal continuity of crown fuels. A policy focus on providing renewed guidance to landowners, RPFs, and LTOs, as well as alternate regulatory requirements for achieving desired post-treatment fuel conditions was also recommended.



*Forest Fire Prevention Exemption (14 CCR § 1038.3) - In Review*

In 2022, CAL FIRE's monitoring report focused on the Forest Fire Prevention Exemption (FFP) type. Public review of this report concluded in early 2023 and the report is currently undergoing internal review. The FFP Notice serves as a rapid permitting tool for exempt commercial and non-commercial timber harvesting, with the goal of improving forest fire resiliency via "thinning from below," or removing the smallest and most flammable trees, eliminating surface-to-tree crown fuel continuity, and reducing the risk of catastrophic wildfire.

Monitoring was rapid and objective, with quantitative, binned quantitative, and qualitative measurements, across objectively located plots and locations on each FFP Notice, with sampling intensity based on the size of the FFP. Almost all FFP Notices reported harvest and removal of substantial volumes of timber (> 25 thousand board feet). FFP Notices rarely indicated exceptions to remove timber within a watercourse lake protection zone on a Class I or II fish bearing stream (WLPZ). A total of 48 percent of the sample reported being adjacent to a "Community at Risk" or permitted structures (i.e., residences), with 62 percent Non-Industrial FFP Notices being adjacent to these communities and structures, compared to only 28 percent of Industrial FFP Notices. However, only 23 percent of FFP Notices occurred in areas with housing density fitting the requirement of Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and/or Intermix.

Water quality related outcomes on FFP Notices were generally positive for roads, road-watercourse crossings, and watercourse protection. Of the 66 road segments assessed in monitoring, 6 percent had a sediment discharge, found on four sampled FFP Notices. These four notices represent 9 percent of the total sampled notices. Sediment discharges were generally associated with lower standard roads that were poorly maintained, and all roads with a discharge had native surfacing (used underlying soils as the road surface). On non-industrial FFPs, 28 percent of assessed roads also doubled as residential access roads (i.e., driveways) as well. Additionally, temporary road construction or re-construction on FFP Notices was found on only 18 percent of the sample, similar to an internal review of 101 FFP Notices from a 22-month period where 17 percent of all FFP Notices planned temporary road work. None of the sampled temporary roads violated associated construction prohibitions, and none resulted in a sediment discharge.

Effectiveness Monitoring

CNRA and CalEPA see important connections between their AB 1492 responsibilities and the BOF's [Effectiveness Monitoring Committee](#) (EMC). The EMC was formed in 2014 to develop and implement a project-level monitoring program to address both watershed and wildlife concerns and to provide a better feedback loop to policymakers, managers, agencies, and the public. Project-level, short-term effectiveness monitoring is necessary for assessing whether management practices are achieving the various



resource goals and objectives set forth in the California Forest Practice Act and Rules and other natural resource protection codes and regulations.

The EMC updates its [Strategic Plan](#) every three years with the most recent version produced in 2022 and produces an Annual Report and Work Plan in the interim.

In the 2023/24 FY, seventeen project presentations and/or project deliverables (e.g., posters, conference presentations, reports, final project presentations) were provided at four public EMC meetings, and five peer-reviewed journal articles were published and/or submitted. A Field Tour to disseminate and highlight the results of EMC-supported research was conducted at Boggs Mountain Demonstration State Forest in November 2023 to observe monitoring projects (see November 16, 2023 [EMC meeting](#) and [Boggs Mountain Demonstration State Forest Field Tour](#)). The tour was attended by members of the public, governmental and non-governmental agencies, and forestry and industry professionals from across the State.

The EMC added one new Critical Monitoring Question (CMQ) to the Research Themes that guide EMC grant proposals and identified six priority CMQs for the coming 2024/25 FY. The Research Themes and CMQs guide potential EMC grant applicants in developing research proposals to focus on data gaps and priority research needs as they related to effectiveness monitoring of the Forest Practice Rules and related regulations. Finally, the EMC welcomed two new agency representatives, reappointed two members to the Monitoring Community, and appointed a new co-chair from the current membership.

In FY 2023-24, the EMC reviewed four grant proposals and awarded two projects for a total allocation of \$347,080 across three FYs beginning 2023/24, of which \$139,187 was encumbered from FY 2023-24 funds. An additional \$204,476 was allocated from 2023-24 funds to existing EMC projects funded in previous years (see Table 9 for project details). For a list of all EMC projects and research deliverables, see the [EMC website](#).

### Statewide Forest Ecosystem Monitoring and Assessment

Managing California's extensive forests and timberlands requires an enduring monitoring effort to enable the State to adaptively manage and effectively respond to unprecedented pressure and change. This is particularly important given the significant investment State and Federal partners are directing to forest restoration and fuel reduction projects, in addition to ongoing commercial timber harvest. Statewide forest ecosystem monitoring, called for under AB 1492 (see [AB 1492 Ecological Performance Measures White Paper](#)) necessitates regular assessment of forest resource conditions to enable more targeted and sustainable management through time. Monitoring forest resource conditions across California ecoregions can link the outcomes of on-the-ground projects to the efficacy of state funded programs, including those for restoration and regulatory compliance.



The Budget Act of 2021 ([SB 170](#)) provided CNRA critical remote sensing funding to implement targeted monitoring data collection and perform strategic assessments to support broad program administration and oversight. In partnership with federal, state, and tribal agencies, CNRA is undertaking the following cutting edge data collection and state-of-the-science assessment efforts:

- **LiDAR Data Collection & Processing:** In partnership with the US Geological Survey's 3D Elevation Program and other entities, CNRA is collecting over 40 million acres of new LiDAR covering large swaths of Northern California and the Sierra Nevada, and filling data gaps up and down the state. Processed data products will be generated to directly enhance our knowledge of forests and landforms in some of the most rugged and fire-prone portions of the state in support of wildfire incident response, strategic planning, and management efforts to improve natural resource conditions and protect public safety.
- **Wildfire, Ecosystem Resilience & Risk Assessment Initiative (WERK):** To fulfill its legislative mandate to establish and evaluate ecological performance under the Program, CNRA and the California Air Resources Board (CARB) are partnered with NASA Earth Exchange at Ames Research Center to develop remotely-sensed data products and assessments tailored to California's shrubland, grassland, and forest ecosystems which include change detection, high-resolution land cover, and individual tree mapping, [known as the WERK project](#). The WERK project will generate wall-to-wall maps of change detection and attribution, land cover classification, individual tree detection, and built structures. As a part of this project, assessments will be performed within and between the data products to support programmatic evaluation of management effectiveness, including management associated with the State's multi-billion-dollar investments in fuel reduction and forest health treatments. These updatable monitoring data products will provide timely and essential information to help state and federal agencies decrease the negative impacts of catastrophic wildfire and changing climate conditions to protect public health and forested ecosystems.

Leveraging an entire new science section, CARB plays a lead role in managing science development and data refresh moving forward on behalf of CNRA. These publicly available data and assessments will be maintained by CARB's [Nature-Based Strategies section](#) to transform the WERK project into an enduring monitoring program and provide new and improved means for monitoring and assessing the progress of California's multi-billion-dollar wildfire and climate resilience programs. This data will become available starting in 2026 and will strengthen the state's ability to monitor progress of state and federal forestry programs.



- **Post-Fire Emergency Data & Imagery Collections:** CNRA and the California Geological Survey (CGS) are collecting and processing on-demand remotely sensed data and imagery to provide timely public safety information following a wildfire. Emergency managers can use the data to assess post-wildfire geologic and hydrologic hazards on state and federal responsibility areas. This work includes a contracting relationship with the federally recognized Yurok Tribe to perform data collection and processing.
- **Integrated Observatory for Redwood Forest Health:** In partnership with UC Davis, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, CARB and CAL FIRE, CNRA is installing the first-of-its-kind redwood forest observatory consisting of two eddy covariance flux towers in the California redwood forest ecosystem. Instruments on these towers will provide near-real time understanding of how redwoods respond to climate change, wildfire, and management to help land managers protect this iconic forest ecosystem undergoing rapid change.

This body of work will endeavor to quantify current conditions associated with forest structure, water supply, carbon, biodiversity, and various other vital services, assessing the impact of management, and evaluating risk to these ecosystem services (e.g., fire and climate variables), directly informing adaptive management and future investments.

## Wildfire Preparedness and Emergency Response

### Utility Right-of-Way Vegetation Management

While other programs, predominately led by CAL FIRE, address wildfire prevention and preparedness, Program staff regularly work with the Office of Energy Infrastructure Safety and other agencies in relation to utility right-of-way vegetation management and wildfire hazard mitigation. Cumulatively, across the state, the power utilities are actively implementing their [Wildfire Mitigation Plans](#) to manage vegetation along tens of thousands of miles of utility infrastructure, much of this located in forested areas of the State.

The expertise and support of Program staff assist in the development permits, review Wildfire Mitigation Plans, and conduct field inspections where commercial species are involved. Program staff are critical to enabling the pace and scale of vegetation management required to mitigate risks to public safety from wildfire hazards associated with utilities, while protecting vital natural resources. In recognition of the long-term and increasingly intensive need for permits associated with utility right-of-way vegetation management, the Water Boards are developing a statewide permit that, if adopted, would provide utility companies an efficient permit path for Wildfire Mitigation Plan activities while ensuring water quality protections.



### Watershed Emergency Response

When major wildfire incidents occur, whether from natural or human-caused starts, CAL FIRE's [Watershed Emergency Response Team](#) (WERT) partners with Program staff from CGS to rapidly evaluate the potential for debris flows and flooding following intense rainfall in an area affected by wildfire. Certain Program staff are deployed during or immediately after major fire incidents, and work with local authorities to identify communities or infrastructure at risk from post-fire flooding, debris flows and rock fall hazards, and devise mitigation and safety measures where needed. Additionally, review team staff frequently and closely interface, post-fire, to provide regulatory and permitting support for landowners attempting post-fire salvage operations and hazard tree removal work.

In FY 23-24, the 2023 fire season was relatively low, compared to the previous 5 years, however an early heat dome in the summer of 2024 created extremely dry conditions and another season of over one million acres of land being burned with multiple WERT deployments. These deployments ranged from low-level, recon investigations to large teams depending on fire size and values at risk (VARs). Over 10 WERTs, at various level, were deployed in the 2024 calendar year. Even when WERT's are not deployed a significant amount of time occurs annually involving the screening of fires to determine if a WERT deployment is necessary. The annual variability of WERTs reflects the variable climatic conditions California has experienced over these years.

### Governor's Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force and Action Plan

The AB 1492 Leadership Team was identified as an interagency coordination group to assist the [California Wildfire and Forest Resilience Task Force](#) (Task Force) in implementing certain Key Actions outlined in the [Wildfire and Forest Resilience Action Plan](#) including:

- 1.35 Complete Permit Synchronization Workplan
- 1.36 Complete Timber Harvesting Plan Guidance Documents
- 1.37 Improve and expand the Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration database CalTREES
- 1.38 Enhance the California Vegetation Treatment Program (CalVTP) implementation
- 4.5 Develop Statewide Forest Ecosystem Monitoring System
- 4.8 Develop Consistent Reporting Tools

Program staff's contributions to each of these Key Actions was outlined earlier in this report.



## APPENDIX

This Appendix is intended to supplement the Report to the Joint Legislative Budget Committee on the Timber Regulation and Forest Restoration Program for FY 2023-24. The contents herein provide additional data required by legislation.

### Departmental Staffing and Costs

#### Natural Resources Agency

CNRA currently has three dedicated staff supporting the Program efforts (Table 1): The Deputy Secretary for Forest and Wildfire Resilience, a Senior Environmental Scientist, and an Executive Assistant. The Deputy Secretary for Forest and Wildfire Resilience position ensures the effectiveness of the timber harvest review programs by coordinating activities among departments, interacting with stakeholders, providing leadership for the development of the Program and its role in California forest health and wildfire mitigation efforts. The Senior Environmental Scientist was added at CNRA in FY 2017-18 to provide direct support to the Deputy Secretary for Program operations and development of statewide forest monitoring and data initiatives.

**Table 1. CNRA Program Expenditures (\$1,000) and Positions (PY), Fiscal Years 2017-18 through 2023-24.**

Budget Item	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Authorized Expenditures	\$2,236	\$1,793	\$1,523	\$1,513	\$1,550	\$1,573	\$1,590
Actual Expenditures	\$765	\$520	\$530	\$501	\$641	\$677	\$906
Authorized Positions	3	3	3	3	3	3	3

\*Estimated projection

#### CAL FIRE and Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

There has been no significant increases in CAL FIRE Program or BOF staffing since FY 2017-18. Authorized expenditures for CAL FIRE and the BOF since FY 2016-17 are displayed in Table 2.



**Table 2. CAL FIRE and BOF Forest Practice Expenditures (\$1,000) and Staff for FY 2016-17 through 2023-24.**

Budget Item	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Authorized Expenditures	\$30,016	\$41,935	\$20,444	\$18,907	26,290	24,417	24,533
Actual Expenditures	\$23,246	\$19,508	\$16,939	\$13,414	24,515	27,481	20,005
Authorized Positions—CAL FIRE	123	123	123	123	123	123	123
Authorized Positions—BOF	2	4	4	4	4	4	4

The BOF received its first position and funding in FY 2015-16 to support the Board’s Effectiveness Monitoring Committee and other Board functions. In FY 2016-17, the Board received an appropriation of \$450,000/year for two years to fund forest practice effectiveness monitoring projects under the Effectiveness Monitoring Committee. In FY 2018-19, this funding was made permanent and ongoing.

Table 3 provides details on CAL FIRE and BOF forest practice program expenditures and staff for FY 2023-24.

**Table 3. All CAL FIRE and BOF Positions (PY) by Regions/Branches in Fiscal Years 2023-24.**

CLASSIFICATION	Northern Region	Sacramento	Southern Region	Legal Office	Total
Senior State Archeologist	1	1	1		3
Attorney III				1	1
Executive Secretary I		1			1
Forestry Assistant II	6	4			10
Forester I (non-supervisory)	25	5	3		33
Forester II (supervisory)	21	3	1		25
Forester III	3	3			6
Forestry and Fire Protection Administrator		1			1
Office Assistant (typing)	3.5		0.5		4
Office Tech (general)	8	1	0.5		9.5
Program Tech II	4				4
Research Data Analyst I (GIS)	2		0.5		2.5



<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>Northern Region</b>	<b>Sacramento</b>	<b>Southern Region</b>	<b>Legal Office</b>	<b>Total</b>
Research Data Analyst (GIS)	4				4
Research Data Specialist (GIS)	2				2
Research Data Manager- (GIS)	1				1
Staff Services Analyst	3	2			5
Secretary	2				2
Staff Environmental Scientist					
Senior Environmental Scientist (Specialist)		4			4
Assoc. Gov't Program Analyst		2			2
Sr. Accounting Officer		1			1
Senior Programmer Analyst		2			2
Other			1		1
Senior Environmental Scientist, Specialist (Board of Forestry and Fire Protection)		2			2
AGPA, Board of Forestry		1			1
Assistant Executive Officer, Board of Forestry		0.25			0.25
Executive Assistant, Board of Forestry		1			1
<b>Total</b>	<b>89.5</b>	<b>38.5</b>	<b>7.5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>136.5</b>

Department of Fish and Wildlife

Tables 4 and 5 provide historic and reporting-year fiscal and staffing information for CDFW's Timberland Conservation and Fire Resiliency Program. In FY 2019-20, the addition of staff and funding provided through the SB 901 budgetary process in 2018 allowed CDFW to engage in expanded responsibilities related to fire resiliency and timber harvest monitoring.



**Table 4. CDFW Appropriations, Expenditures (\$1,000) and Positions (PY) in Fiscal Years 2016-17 through 2023-24.**

FY	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019 - 20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
<b>Legislative Appropriations and Expenditures</b>								
Appropriation	\$8,876	\$11,167 <sup>a</sup>	\$9,448	\$10,853 <sup>b</sup>	\$10,34	\$10,312	\$10,730	\$10,989
Expenditures	\$9,520	\$9,854	\$9,837	\$10,613	\$9,088	\$10,023	\$10,268	\$10,320
<b>Positions Authorized</b>								
Timberland Conservation and Fire Resiliency Program	37	37	37	52	49.2	49.2	49.2	49.2
Watershed Enforcement Team	3	3	3	3	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>49.2</b>	<b>49.2</b>
<b>Positions Filled</b>								
Timberland Conservation and Fire Resiliency Program	40	41	34.5 <sup>c</sup>	47.2 <sup>d</sup>	46.7 <sup>d</sup>	45.2 <sup>d</sup>	45.2 <sup>d</sup>	44.5 <sup>d</sup>
Watershed Enforcement Team	3	3	3	0 <sup>b</sup>	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>37.5</b>	<b>47.2</b>	<b>46.7</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>45.2</b>	<b>44.5</b>

<sup>a</sup> In FY '17-'18, an extra \$1.5m was allocation from the Timber Fund for cannabis remediation restoration.

<sup>b</sup> 3 Non-TCP cannabis/watershed cleanup (not standard CDFW enforcement) PYs funding for these positions was redirected from TRFRF to the continuous appropriation (started in FY 19/20) Cannabis Tax Fund. Funding for these activities have been



continuously appropriated for Watershed Enforcement Team expenditures, but this funding has not been used since FY 19-20.

<sup>c</sup> In FY 18-19, an internal budget leveling exercise led to staffing reductions in CDFW.

<sup>d</sup> 4.5 PYs are funded through the General Fund, not TRFRF.

Table 5 provides details on the staffing of CDFW's Timberland Conservation and Fire Resiliency Program by position classification for FYs 2023-24.

**Table 5. CDFW Timberland Conservation and Fire Resiliency Program Positions (PY) by CDFW Regions and Branches Filled in Fiscal Year 2023-24**

<b>CLASSIFICATION</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>HCPB</b>	<b>BDB</b>	<b>OGC</b>	<b>Total</b>
Environmental Program Manager	1						1			<b>2</b>
Environmental Scientist	10.5	3	2	1	1		2	2		<b>21.5</b>
Administrative Staff	2	1								<b>3</b>
Research Analyst II		1								<b>1</b>
Senior Environmental Scientist Supervisor	3	1	0.5				1			<b>5.5</b>
Staff Counsel									0.5	<b>0.5</b>
Senior Environmental Scientist Specialist	3	3	1	1		1	2			<b>10</b>
<b>FY 23-24 Total</b>	<b>19.5</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>44.5</b>

HCPB – Habitat Conservation Planning Branch, BDB – Biogeographic Data Branch, OGC – Office of General Counsel, Note: 4.5 person years are funded through the General Fund in FY 2023-24.

State and Regional Water Boards

Table 6 provides historic and reporting-year fiscal and staffing information for the Water Boards' Fund expenditures and PY allocation. Note that the table below differs from previous reports in that starting in FY 20/21 the table only reflects expenditures and PY sourced from the Fund. Actual total Fund expenditures in FY 2023-24 were \$4.329 million.



**Table 6. Water Boards Timber Harvest Program Expenditures (\$1,000) and Positions (PY), Fiscal Years 2015-16 through 2023-24\***

<b>Forest Program Budget</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
Appropriations	\$9,171	\$8,847	NA*	NA	\$3,573	\$4,370	\$4,329	\$4,557
Actual Expenditures	\$8,602	\$8,722	NA*	\$10,582	\$3,263	\$4,370	\$4,329	\$4,286
Authorized Positions	36.2	35.2	35.2	53.2	17.5	17.2	17.5	17.7

Table 7 provides reporting-year staffing information for the Water Boards’ allocated Fund positions. Note that in prior year reports The Water Boards included other related forestry positions funded by sources other than TRFRF.

**Table 7. Water Boards Forest Activities Program Positions in FY 2023-24.**

<b>Class Title</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>State Board</b>	<b>Total</b>
Engineering Geologist	4.9	4.5	1		10.4
Env’l Prog Mgr I (Sup)	0.2				0.2
Env’l Scientist	1.6	1.2		1	3.8
Sr Engr Geologist	0.7				0.7
Sr Env’l Scientist (Sup)		1			1
Sr WRC Engineer		0.4	0.1		0.5
Supvg Engineering Geologist		0.2			0.2
Water Res Cont Engr	0.9				0.9
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>6.8</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17.7</b>

Department of Conservation

The California Geological Survey (CGS) is part of the Department of Conservation (DOC) and provides geological technical support for timber harvest, vegetation management, and fuel reduction projects and associated permitting, including evaluating slope stability, erosion control measures, watercourse crossing, road, and skid trail design and maintenance, providing education, and conducting monitoring as well as performing post-disaster risk assessments. Since 2013, California Geological Survey Staff have increased from 13 to 19 people. The FY 15/16 TRFR multi-agency BCP allocated DOC/CGS additional funding to support 4 PY, bringing total allocations to 19 PY, however position authority was not granted. Thus, 4 of the 19 DOC/CGS TRFRF staff are not in permanent authorized positions.

Table 8 provides historic and reporting-year fiscal and staffing information for the DOC/CGS’s timber harvest programs.



**Table 8. Department of Conservation Timber Harvest Program Expenditures (\$1,000) and Positions, Fiscal Years 2015-16 through 2023-24.**

Budget Item	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
Authorized Expenditures (TRFRF)	\$4,134	\$4,242	\$4,428	\$4,630	\$4,382	\$4,739	\$4,926	\$5,029
Total Expenditures*	\$3,857	\$3,953	\$3,988	\$4,473	\$3,824	\$4,699	\$4,197	\$4,461
Authorized Positions	19	19	19	19	19	19	19	19

Table 9 provides details on the position classifications for DOC’s timber harvest program staff, for FY 2016-17 to FY 2023-24. Fund expenditures are lower than allocated due to significant expenditures for post-wildfire hazard analysis and geological technical assistance to State Demonstrations Forests which are funded by CAL FIRE and geologic hazards related mission tasks in forested lands funded through Cal OES.

**Table 9. DOC Authorized Staff (PY) by Region, Fiscal Years 2015-16 to 2023-24.**

CLASSIFICATION	Sacramento	Santa Rosa	Eureka	Redding	Total
Sup. Eng. Geologist	1				1
Sr. Eng. Geologist	2	1	1	1	5
Eng. Geologist	2	2	2	2	8
Research Program Specialist II (GIS)	1				1
Research Analyst II (GIS)	1				1
Assoc. Gov. Program Analyst	1				1
Office Technician	1				1
Graduate Student Assistant	1				1
<b>Total*</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>19</b>

\* DOC/CGS authorized staff (PY) has remained constant since FY 15-16.

### Workload Analysis

The tables below (Tables 10-13) quantify the workload faced by the Review Team agencies. Prior to the implementation of AB 1492, information was presented on a calendar year basis; however, AB 1492 instead required that the information be presented on a fiscal year basis (July 1-June 30). The tables provide a detailed look at workload for all the Review team agencies for FY 2023-24. Note that not all agencies face the same tasks. Table 11 captures responsibilities under the Forest Practice Act and Rules. Tables 12 and 13 capture CDFW and Water Boards responsibilities under



timber-harvesting-related laws that they administer, such as Fish and Game Code §1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements and Waste Discharge Requirements, respectively.

**Table 10. Review Team Work under Forest Practice Act and Forest Practice Rules for FY 2023-24**

Summary of Work	CAL FIRE	CDFW	CGS	Water Boards
<b>Number Timber Harvesting Plans (THPs)<sup>1</sup></b>				
First Review <sup>3</sup>	328	260	303	328
Pre-harvest Inspection	220	140	159	128
Second Review	237	141	106	237
Approved <sup>2</sup>	220	-	-	-
<b>Number of Nonindustrial Timber Management Plans (NTMPs)<sup>1</sup></b>				
First Review <sup>3</sup>	24	13	24	24
Pre-harvest Inspection	10	4	11	6
Second Review	14	9	7	14
Approved <sup>2</sup>	12	-	-	-
<b>Compliance/Enforcement</b>				
Compliance Inspections (Non-PHI)	2,843	16	7	291
Violations	251	5	-	20
Administrative Civil Penalties Initiated	20		-	0
Total Active Administrative Civil Penalties	111		-	0

<sup>1</sup>Includes Substantial Deviations for THPs and NTMPs which go through the same discretionary permit review process and includes Plans still under review from the previous fiscal year.

<sup>2</sup>CAL FIRE as the lead agency is eventually responsible for the approval of all Plans.

<sup>3</sup>First Review figures reflect filed, returned, and resubmitted Plans.

**Note:** Agency THP/ NTMP numbers are generated from CalTREES workflow tasks as completed by the review team during the course of Plan review.

Tasks tracked by CDFW show a fairly consistent level of effort from 2015-16 to 2023-24. A summary of CDFW work products during FY 2023-24 is included in Table 11. Table 13 covers all Water Boards related Program activities.



**Table 11. Department of Fish and Wildlife, FY 2023-24**

<b>Action</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R2</b>	<b>R3</b>	<b>R4</b>	<b>Total</b>
§ 1600 Lake and Streambed Alteration Agreements Issued	99	12	10	4	<b>125</b>
§ 1600 Amendments Issued	35	1	1	1	<b>38</b>
§ 1600 Inspections Conducted	21	7	0	0	<b>28</b>
Exemptions Reviewed for Sensitive Resources	7	99	0	27	<b>133</b>
Master Agreements for Timber Operation Under Review (MATO)	0	1	0		<b>1</b>
§ 1600 Sub-Notifications Under a MATO	84	11	0	0	<b>95</b>
Habitat Conservation Plans/NCCPs/Safe Harbor Agreements Under Review	0	1	0	0	<b>1</b>
Species Consultations Conducted	153	6	8	5	<b>172</b>
CA Endangered Species Act Status Reviews Conducted	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
FLAR and Other Grant Proposals Reviewed	4	8	2	0	<b>14</b>
Forest Conservation Easements Reviewed	6	0	0	0	<b>6</b>
EM/EX Monitoring Visits Conducted	6	31	0	10	<b>47</b>

No reportable activities occurred in CDFW's Region 5 or 6 in FY 2023-24.

**Table 12. Water Boards Forestry Program Activities, FY 2023-24 by Region**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R6</b>	<b>Total</b>
Waivers or WDR's Under Development or Renewal	2	1	1	4
Plans Enrolled in Waste Discharge Requirements OR Waivers of Waste Discharge Requirements (THPs, NTMPs, WFMPs)	117	46	1	164
Emergency Notices and Exemptions enrolled in Waivers or WDRs	467	673	11	1,151
Federal Timber Projects Reviewed	4	122	5	131
Federal Timber Projects Enrolled	7	41	5	53



---

In the past 4 fiscal years, THP and NTMP submittals have remained fairly stable averaging about 200 submittals for THPs and 8 for NTMPs each year. The average acre per approved THP being 372 acres per Plan and NTMPs at 247 acres per Plan. Every year changes in regulation add to the complexity of Plan review, staff are continuously training and learning new rules for Plan compliance. It is also important to understand not all CAL FIRE staff hired through the Forest Practice Program are dedicated to the review of Timber Harvesting. Others fulfill the administrative support and the broader ecological monitoring goals of the program. To help better understand the trends by Fiscal year for review team workloads Table 13 provides details of the Region Review tasks since FY 2014-15.



**Table 13. CAL FIRE Workload History from Fiscal Year 2014-15 through Fiscal Year 2023-24.**

*Corrections to previous years' numbers from past reports are from QA/QC of Forest Practice data.*

Workload Measure	2014-15	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
THPs Filed <sup>1</sup>	282	240	234	262	284	228	205	189	178	192
THPs Returned <sup>1</sup>	124	129	73	79	84	88	85	76	79	82
THPs Recirculated <sup>1</sup>	22	12	3	3	1	2	1	1	1	0
THP PHIs Conducted <sup>1</sup>	272	206	223	253	234	239	197	175	163	183
THPs Approved <sup>1</sup>	260	216	220	267	244	234	210	183	174	198
THP Acres Approved <sup>2</sup>	128,644	93,533	91,179	105,523	100,888	122,648	92,809	62,314	56,414	72,889
NTMPs Filed <sup>1</sup>	10	11	16	15	15	11	10	7	10	5
NTMPs Returned <sup>1</sup>	5	6	7	8	4	11	5	6	6	6
NTMPs Recirculated <sup>1</sup>	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
NTMP PHIs <sup>1</sup>	9	11	13	14	11	13	11	5	9	6
NTMPs Approved <sup>1</sup>	12	8	14	14	14	13	8	9	6	8
NTMP Acres Approved <sup>2</sup>	3,367	1,542	6,500	4,448	2,410	4,295	1,555	2,482	1,889	1,742
NTOs Submitted	132	105	139	174	106	85	99	80	107	98
NTOs Returned	*	*	*	*	4	19	18	14	12	4
Sub Dev Filed <sup>3</sup>	93	30	72	92	36	41	25	20	21	23
Sub Dev Returned <sup>3</sup>	*	*	*	*	2	3	3	11	5	4
Sub Dev PHI Conducted <sup>3</sup>	*	*	*	*	11	22	11	8	12	14
Sub Dev Approved <sup>3</sup>	*	*	*	*	42	38	26	16	21	24
SYPs Approved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
WFMPs Approved	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PThPs Submitted	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	5	6	4
Plans Withdrawn / Canceled	15	8	8	9	4	4	18	13	20	6
Exemption Notices Submitted	1,785	1,914	2,510	2,021	2,028	2,292	1,672	1,256	1,009	1,022

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



<b>Workload Measure</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
Exemption Notices Returned	*	*	*	*	148	182	219	124	143	91
Emergency Notices Submitted	270	501	83	194	305	158	466	399	239	127
Emergency Notices Returned	*	*	*	*	49	34	157	114	116	29
Minor Deviations Submitted <sup>4</sup>	2,437	2,633	2,729	4,149	3,087	2,792	2,633	2,344	2,066	2,341
Inspections <sup>5</sup>	3,325	2,950	3,967	3,473	2,705	3,090	2,950	3,045	2,746	2,843
Violations <sup>4</sup>	201	271	472	445	289	309	271	284	220	251
Administrative Civil Penalties Initiated	13	9	65	82	29	43	55	19	26	20
Total Active Administrative Civil Penalties	48	45	79	99	89	85	98	112	109	111

\* CAL FIRE Data prior to CalTREES - incomplete and thus not reported.

<sup>1</sup>Includes Plans submitted in the prior fiscal year.

<sup>2</sup>Reported acres are from documentation of record; actual acres harvested may differ.

<sup>3</sup>Sub Dev = Substantial Deviation (Major Amendment) for both THPs and NTMPs

<sup>4</sup>Includes all harvest document types.

<sup>5</sup>Inspections other than preharvest inspections.



## Detail on Timber Harvest Activity for FY 2023-24

Below are brief summaries of timber harvesting statistics generated from CalTREES.

### Number and Acreage Extent of Timber Harvesting Documents Processed

Table 14 displays the number of timber harvest documents filed, submitted, returned, and approved along with the acreage covered by them for FY 2014-15 through FY 2023-24. As stated previously, emergency notices typically follow stochastic events, primarily fire incidents, and the number of notices and acreages associated with the notices are connected to the amount of fire activity that occurred in the year previous. Exemption notices can also follow stochastic events, such as drought mortality and the number of exemptions that were submitted to address the issue between 2015 to 2020. However the majority of the acreages associated with exemptions are primarily submitted by large landowners to capture small amounts of dead, dying or diseased trees, using the 14 CCR 1038(b) exemption to conduct those operations.

### Average Time for Plan Review

For context and understanding of the trends that the plan review time data show, it is important to emphasize that many factors determine how long it takes to review a THP or NTMP, from the time of submission to approval. These factors include<sup>1</sup>:

- Availability of review team staff.
- Time of year the plan is submitted, with associated weather and potential wildfire constraints (e.g., CAL FIRE Forest Practice staff are out of the office responding to wildland fires; winter weather conditions prohibit access for field review).
- Quality and completeness of the information originally submitted.
- Number of questions generated by review team on the plan submitted, and/or the number of changes required of the RPF.
- Promptness of the submitter's response to questions or requests for changes.
- Size and complexity of the plan.
- Wildlife, water, traffic safety, and other issues raised by the public.

Some factors are under the control of the review team agencies, some in control of the submitter, and some are subject to the vagaries and seasonality of California's weather. Another major factor that can delay plan reviews is when a new wildlife species comes under candidacy or listing under the State or Federal Endangered Species Acts after a plan is already under review.

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed discussion of these factors, see the [Redding Pilot Project June 2014 Supplemental Report](http://resources.ca.gov/docs/forestry/Redding_Pilot_Project_Draft_Supplemental_Report_8-7-14.pdf) ([http://resources.ca.gov/docs/forestry/Redding\\_Pilot\\_Project\\_Draft\\_Supplemental\\_Report\\_8-7-14.pdf](http://resources.ca.gov/docs/forestry/Redding_Pilot_Project_Draft_Supplemental_Report_8-7-14.pdf))



Some other factors determined by CAL FIRE include, but are not limited to, the large number of public comments on sensitive harvest plan projects, controversial conversion THPs that require Environmental Impact Reports approved by a local government and lack of timely response by project proponents to Review Team questions.

### Review of Timber Harvest Permits for Filing

The first step in the review of a submitted harvest plan is the determination by the review team whether it is accurate, complete, and in proper order to file the plan with CAL FIRE and then to initiate the next phases of review. This includes specified required elements or precursor steps, such as notifying adjacent property owners. If these elements or steps have not been addressed, the plan is returned to the submitter for correction. Concerns have arisen at times over the rate of plan returns. CalTREES is being designed to check for common filing errors and alert the submitter while entering information into the system, thus reducing the likelihood of CAL FIRE having to return a plan during review for filing. This error-checking can help to speed up the overall process for the plan submitter. Additionally, a “Timber Harvesting Plan Filing Checklist” is also available on the CAL FIRE Forest Practice website for plan writers as guidance to help reduce returns with submitted harvest Plans. Forms are regularly revised to keep up with current regulations and to continue to make improvements.

### THP Review Times

Table 14 provides THP and NTMP approval numbers, area in acres, and review days for FY 2023-24 by the three regional CAL FIRE review team offices where plans are filed, based on the location of each plan. Note, per the Forest Practice Act and Rules, the estimated review period for THPs requiring a field inspection as part of the review process is approximately 75 calendar days, without allowable extensions. The times provided in Table 15 include delays that are beyond the review team’s control, such as those due to weather (e.g., snow prohibits access for inspection purposes), delays in RPF response to questions from the Review Team, delays due to public comment, and delays due to sensitive species evaluations, etc. With some exceptions, the regulatory timelines provide for extensions to allow for additional review necessary due to extended field evaluation, the submission of additional information or substantial public comments.



**Table 14. Approved Plan Review Statistics, by CAL FIRE Review Team Office  
FY 2023-24**

Review <sup>1</sup> Team Office	Plan Type	Count	Acres	Minimum Days in Review	Maximum Days in Review	Average Days in Review	Median Days in Review
Santa Rosa	THP	135	35,669	40	301	87	71
Santa Rosa	NTMP	6	964	58	172	103	86
Redding	THP	49	30,257	34	358	107	83
Redding	NTMP	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fresno	THP	11	6,237	41	282	123	105
Fresno	NTMP	0	0	0	0	0	0

<sup>1</sup>Santa Rosa (Coast District) = Region 1; Redding (Northern District) = Region 2; Fresno (Southern District) = Region 3 & 4

**Note:** The times provided in Table 14 include delays that are beyond the review team’s control, such as those due to weather (e.g. snow prohibits access), delays in RPF response to questions from the review team, delays due to public comment, pandemic challenges, and delays due to sensitive species evaluations, etc. Individual Plan outliers greater than one year in review have been removed to represent more accurate time frames. Substantial Deviations are not included.



Figure 1 Map of CAL FIRE Forest Practice Districts and Region offices.

CAL FIRE Review Team offices (Figure 1) continue to respond to previously identified challenges to enhance efficiency. Despite new and recurring challenges, the review teams continue to show a steady long-term trend toward efficient plan review.

NTMP Review Times

For NTMPs, the review times are longer and more variable than THPs for many reasons. NTMPs are non-expiring plans, often addressing an entire forest ownership of up to 2,500 acres. They are typically much larger and more complex than standard THPs, and take longer to review, especially since these are lifetime, non-expiring plans. Because of these characteristics, NTMPs generally have a longer regulatory review time than THPs.

Number of Field Inspections per CAL FIRE Inspector

Table 15 reports the types and number of field inspections made by CAL FIRE, including the number of each inspection type made per inspector on an average basis. While the numbers correlate well with the numbers of harvest documents submitted by type (e.g., THPs, NTMPs, Exemptions) the numbers here are further reflective of the discussion above regarding shifts in THP activity and the variability of use of Exemptions and Emergencies as new regulations are implemented and conditions change in the forested areas of the state (e.g., drought, wildfire, recovery).



**Table 15. Number of Field Inspections made by CAL FIRE, FY 2014-15 through 2023-24.**

*Corrections to previous years' numbers from past reports are from QA/QC of Forest Practice data*

<b>Harvest Document Type</b>	<b>2014-15</b>	<b>2015-16</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2021-22</b>	<b>2022-23</b>	<b>2023-24</b>
Timber Harvesting Plans	2,533/44	2,315/4	1,969/3	1,590/22	1,522/21	1,410/24	1,063/17	1,056/20	844/17	1,143/20
Nonindustrial Timber Management Plans	358/6	318/6	331/6	340/5	381/5	218/6	179/5	155/4	212/7	221/6
Working Forest Management Plans	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	1/1	0/0	1/1	0/0	4/2
Program Timber Harvesting Plan	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3/1	5/3	6/2	6/2	14/5
Emergency Notices	359/5	519/7	417/6	371/6	382/14	417/14	375/10	646/20	623/17	660/20
Exemption Notices	1,307/23	1,508/26	1,238/23	1,274/17	1,938/26	1,185/24	1,132/26	1,101/24	1,007/23	755/18
Illegal Non-Permitted Activities	86/2	63/1	79/2	62/1	93/1	63/3	55/3	79/4	53/2	45/2
<b>Totals</b>	<b>4,422/77</b>	<b>4,536/80</b>	<b>3,946/73</b>	<b>3,625/50</b>	<b>4,453/69</b>	<b>3,297/73</b>	<b>2,809/64</b>	<b>3,044/75</b>	<b>2,745/68</b>	<b>2,842/73</b>

*Number/Average per Inspector*



As demonstrated in Table 15, there has been significant variability in the numbers and types of inspections conducted. The variability in the number of inspections conducted is due to many variables, including periods of increased drought and fire activity that increases the number of submitted harvest documents. CAL FIRE inspectors' workload is largely dependent on economic health of the forest products industry. When log prices are high enough for landowners to make a reasonable profit, the number of harvest documents and ground activities increases. Likewise, economic downturns can lead to less harvest documents and less on the ground activity, hence less inspections.

#### Number of Active Plans and Acres under Active Plans

Table 16 shows statistics on "active plans," which includes all approved plans that are available for operation in a given year. Plans that are available to be operated on are considered "active" regardless of whether any harvest activity actually occurs. Because AB 1492 increased the lifespan of THPs, this number may trend upward since any given THP now can be operated over a longer period (up to seven years instead of five).

The number of acres under Exemptions (maximum of one-year operating life) are particularly large because landowners can place their entire property under an Exemption for removal of relatively small volumes (less than 10 percent of the average volume per acre) of dead and dying trees [14 CCR § 1038(b)] when compared to a THP or NTMP. This is compounded by overlapping fiscal years when reporting "active" plans.



**Table 16. Number of Active<sup>1</sup> Plans and Acres<sup>2</sup>, FY 2016-17 to 2023-24.**

*Corrections to previous years' numbers from past reports are from QA/QC of Forest Practice data.*

Harvest Document Type	Count	Acres														
FY	16-17	16-17	17-18	17-18	18-19	18-19	19-20	19-20	20-21	20-21	21-22	21-22	22-23	22-23	23-24	23-24
THPs	1,131	597,451	1,222	626,702	1,359	663,233	1,381	690,166	1,118	519,741	1,120	525,348	1,113	454,919	1,119	460,435
NTMPs <sup>3</sup>	794	328,406	808	332,656	820	333,471	827	333,584	796	315,120	841	334,924	846	335,471	848	332,957
NTMP <sup>3</sup>	238	40,255	288	44,364	119	2,449	140	9,801	108	13,280	60	10,037	93	10,824	142	17,983
Emergency Notices <sup>4</sup>	302	42,455	268	29,414	492	57,788	441	62,085	432	83,465	806	190,063	618	185,784	430	132,037
Exemptions <sup>5</sup>	4,870	5,629,689	4,439	6,369,652	3,958	6,370,809	4,148	5,456,965	3,724	5,648,989	2,777	5,648,989	2,167	5,365,008	1,973	3,342,270
<b>Totals</b>	<b>7,335</b>	<b>6,638,256</b>	<b>7,025</b>	<b>7,402,788</b>	<b>6,748</b>	<b>7,427,750</b>	<b>6,937</b>	<b>6,552,601</b>	<b>6,178</b>	<b>6,580,595</b>	<b>5,604</b>	<b>6,709,361</b>	<b>4,837</b>	<b>6,352,006</b>	<b>4,512</b>	<b>4,285,682</b>

<sup>1</sup>An Active Plan is an approved plan that does not have an approved Final Completion Report or has not reached the statutory expiration date.

<sup>2</sup>Acres reported are from the documentation of record.

<sup>3</sup>NTMPs alone are not operational but represent total operation areas. NTMP notices of timber operation (NTOs) better reflect operational activity on NTMPs; however, submitted NTO acres often reflect total potential acres that are being operated on, not necessarily the actual number of acres timber operations and are valid for only one year and can be resubmitted during multiple years.

<sup>4</sup>Valid for up to one year except for some Emergency Notices filed in 2021-2022 for fire damage which could have been extended an additional year with CAL FIRE approval.

<sup>5</sup>Valid for up to one year, acres do not necessarily reflect harvest areas as many Exemptions are submitted for an entire property and often only portions of the potential are actually harvested.

**Note:** The CAL FIRE Region offices have been entering the expired date differently for several years for older data years. The implication is that a Plan may have appeared to be active longer in the Redding and Fresno Office than in the Santa Rosa office in the past.



Overall Accounting of Program Fund Personnel Activities

CAL FIRE tracks the activity for CAL FIRE Program Fund-funded staff using a Personnel Activity Report, or PAR. Staff complete and file the PAR information monthly. The consistent top two activity areas for CAL FIRE have been the “Review and Processing of Harvest Documents” and “Forest Practice Inspections.” A past trend to note was the gradual increase in “Other Forestry Related Duties” which included assistance to the CFIP and VMP programs. Though the current 2023-24 FY decrease in the “Other Duties” was likely due to a better understanding of categories with slight increases in “Training” and “Data Management” as CAL FIRE transitioned the PAR database to a different storage platform along with new leadership. It is also apparent that the “Emergency Response” percentages are directly related to the fire activity during the fiscal year.

**Table 17. CAL FIRE Program Fund Staff Activity Accounting, Percent of Total Staff Time FY 2016-17 to FY 2023-24.**

<b>Activity</b>	<b>FY 2016 -17</b>	<b>FY 2017 -18</b>	<b>FY 2018 -19</b>	<b>FY 2019 -20</b>	<b>FY 2020- 21</b>	<b>FY 2021 -22</b>	<b>FY 2022 -23</b>	<b>FY 2023- 24</b>
Review and Processing of Harvest Documents	21.0	21.3	21.6	22.5	18.9	18.3	16.3	16.92
Forest Practice Inspections	22.6	19.5	21.3	26.1	19.9	25.0	21.4	19.48
Emergency Response	10.3	8.7	8.9	3.8	14.6	8.5	5.7	3.17
Participating in Mandated Training	7.8	11.0	10.7	7.5	8.0	6.9	8.7	13.07
Other Duties as Required	6.6	9.2	6.0	7.0	6.6	6.5	8.8	10.17
Supervising and Managing the Forest Practice Program	8.6	8.6	8.9	7.3	6.5	6.7	7.7	9.50
Processing and Managing Data Related to Forest Practice	9.7	8.9	8.7	8.9	9.6	9.4	9.5	11.15
Other Forestry-Related Duties	8.4	7.5	7.8	11.0	11.8	14.3	15.0	8.50
Forest Practice Law Enforcement	2.4	2.8	2.9	3.4	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.55
Official Response and Public Records Act Requests	0.9	0.8	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	1.04
Program or Project Monitoring	0.8	1.0	1.2	1.3	0.9	0.7	1.9	1.50
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Related	0.3	0.2	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.33
Ecological Performance	0.4	0.4	1.0	0.5	0.4	0.4	1.1	1.63
Litigation	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.1	0.0	.01
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>							



Timber Harvest Numbers: County-by-County

**Table 18. Accepted Exemptions by County for FY 2023-24.**

(Notes: county sub totals are above the itemized exemption list for that county, and only includes Exemptions submitted in reporting FY)

<b>COUNTY – Exemption Type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Acres</b>
<b>ALPINE</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1.7</b>
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	6	1.5
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	0.2
<b>AMADOR</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4,817.40</b>
Christmas Trees	1	4,520.00
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	2.5
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	2
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	2	288.9
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	2	4
<b>BUTTE</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>45,723.20</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	11	45,681.00
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	3	33.4
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	2.8
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	5	6
<b>CALAVERAS</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>8,477.80</b>
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	73.5
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	8	5.8
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	6	8,398.50
<b>DEL NORTE</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>165,315.40</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	1	165,228.00
Forest Fire Prevention	1	29
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	2	3.4

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



COUNTY – Exemption Type	Count	Acres
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	26	47
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	2	8
<b>EL DORADO</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>4,864.20</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	5	4,221.00
Christmas Trees	2	59
Forest Fire Prevention	2	24.2
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	2.9
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	6	544
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	2	8.6
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	1	4.5
<b>FRESNO</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>19,416.60</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	3	18,634.60
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	12	285
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	1	497
<b>HUMBOLDT</b>	<b>178</b>	<b>20,321.00</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	26	17,676.80
Christmas Trees	1	290
Forest Fire Prevention	23	1,185.70
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	21	48.5
Oak Woodland Management	20	757.3
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	18	204.1
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	55	122.4
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	14	36.3
<b>LAKE</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3,525.00</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	6	3,523.00

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



COUNTY – Exemption Type	Count	Acres
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	1	1
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	1	1
<b>LASSEN</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>53,129.50</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	6	52,077.00
Christmas Trees	1	190
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	6	694
Post Fire Recovery	1	1
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	9	167.5
<b>MADERA</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0.3</b>
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	1	0.3
<b>MARIPOSA</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,377.00</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	4	1,351.00
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	22
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	2	4
<b>MENDOCINO</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>1,728.80</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	8	1,313.00
Forest Fire Prevention	6	310
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	8	17.2
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	3	14.8
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	9	38.5
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	6	35.4
<b>MODOC</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>98,129.00</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	5	97,375.00
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	754

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



COUNTY – Exemption Type	Count	Acres
<b>MONO</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>250</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	1	250
<b>NAPA</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>1,322.30</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	2	803
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	2	58
Forest Fire Prevention	2	433.8
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	2	3.4
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	2	10.5
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	2	13.6
<b>NEVADA</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>41,615.10</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	25	35,313.30
Christmas Trees	1	5
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	6	191.5
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	14	23
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	2	5,939.70
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	70	142.6
<b>PLACER</b>	<b>41</b>	<b>46,933.20</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	10	45,913.10
Christmas Trees	1	8
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	4	391
Forest Fire Prevention	3	292
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	5	8.2
Oak Woodland Management	1	100
Post Fire Recovery	1	8
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	5	186.5

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



COUNTY – Exemption Type	Count	Acres
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	11	26.4
<b>PLUMAS</b>	<b>89</b>	<b>39,643.30</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	8	26,651.10
Christmas Trees	3	9,790.70
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	9	2,485.30
Forest Fire Prevention	20	413.3
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	24	13.6
Post Fire Recovery	1	0.8
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	4	266.9
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	18	18.3
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	2	3.4
<b>SAN DIEGO</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>190.9</b>
Forest Fire Prevention	1	190.9
<b>SAN MATEO</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>1,381.30</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	4	1,375.00
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	2.8
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	2	3.5
<b>SANTA CLARA</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0.3</b>
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	0.3
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	1	0.1
<b>SANTA CRUZ</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>1,861.00</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	5	189.5
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	1,606.00
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	2.9
Post Fire Recovery	3	2.7
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	44	57.9

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



COUNTY – Exemption Type	Count	Acres
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	1	2
<b>SHASTA</b>	<b>44</b>	<b>481,813.00</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	24	341,149.70
Christmas Trees	6	139,754.40
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	690
Forest Fire Prevention	5	189
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	3	5.6
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	3	11.3
Small Timberland Owner	1	10
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	1	3
<b>SIERRA</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>45,319.30</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	8	42,317.00
Christmas Trees	3	1,200.00
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	4	1,359.00
Forest Fire Prevention	2	440.3
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	1	1
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	1	2
<b>SISKIYOU</b>	<b>95</b>	<b>158,619.10</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	32	119,861.00
Christmas Trees	3	19,432.00
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	35	18,920.00
Forest Fire Prevention	5	320
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	7	13.6
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	11	47.5
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	2	25

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



<b>COUNTY – Exemption Type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Acres</b>
<b>SONOMA</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>4,343.40</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	8	3,924.90
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	4	87
Forest Fire Prevention	5	201.9
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	1.1
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	4	56.6
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	4	62
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	1	10
<b>TEHAMA</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>112,088.20</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	10	112,062.30
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	1	0.8
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	3	19.8
Structure Protection (150 to 300 feet)	3	5.3
<b>TRINITY</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>43,260.60</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	17	39,483.70
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	4	3,031.00
Forest Fire Prevention	4	262
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	2.9
Oak Woodland Management	10	472
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	2	8
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	1	1
<b>TULARE</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>715.6</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	2	681.6
Drought Mortality and Unmerchantable Sawlog	2	34

Assembly Bill 1492 Timber Regulation and  
Forest Restoration Fund Program Report



<b>COUNTY – Exemption Type</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Acres</b>
<b>TUOLUMNE</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>17,273.50</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	10	12,799.00
Christmas Trees	1	4,419.00
Less than 3 Acre Conversion	1	0.3
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	2	50.6
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	4	4.6
<b>YUBA</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>17,444.20</b>
10 Percent Dead, Dying Diseased, Fuelwood, or Woody Debris	8	17,015.60
Forest Fire Prevention	1	299
Public / Private Utility Right-of-Way	2	126.3
Structure Protection (0 to 150 feet)	3	3.3
<b>Totals</b>	<b>982</b>	<b>1,440,901.00</b>



**Table 19. Approved THPs with Silviculture Categories Acres by County for FY 2023-24.**

County	Approved Count	Clearcut	Evenaged (no clearcut)	Unevenage	Conversion	Inter- mediate	Special Prescriptions (no conversion)	Alternative Prescription
AMADOR	1	0	0	35	0	43	368	647
BUTTE	1	0	0	31	27	0	0	261
CALAVERAS	3	698	0	84	1	0	71	434
DEL NORTE	13	875	0	207	18	315	13	0
EL DORADO	3	0	0	90	11	360	358	1,028
HUMBOLDT	70	4,723	171	6,217	52	561	1,981	294
LASSEN	3	0	0	0	57	0	0	1,324
MENDOCINO	43	41	266	9,881	28	567	3,154	0
MODOC	1	0	0	0	10	0	20	462
MONO	1	0	0	62	0	0	0	0
NEVADA	5	148	0	341	22	189	0	0
PLACER	5	0	3	403	9	684	18	0
PLUMAS	1	0	0	5	2	0	0	136
SAN MATEO	2	0	0	169	0	0	2,634	0
SANTA CLARA	2	0	0	119	0	0	0	0
SANTA CRUZ	2	0	0	260	0	0	0	0
SHASTA	11	827	0	2,387	99	3,402	719	2,658
SISKIYOU	7	0	753	1,733	1	738	22	1,470
SONOMA	2	0	0	969	0	0	375	0
TEHAMA	4	865	0	159	171	1,610	1,025	1,130
TRINITY	10	2,504	0	1,237	98	22	69	349
TUOLUMNE	4	1,470	0	132	4	70	303	0
YUBA	4	402	69	520	63	396	65	0
<b>Totals</b>	<b>198</b>	<b>12,552</b>	<b>1,262</b>	<b>25,040</b>	<b>674</b>	<b>8,957</b>	<b>11,195</b>	<b>10,193</b>

Note: "No Harvest" Silviculture acres are not included.



**Table 20. Approved and Available NTMPs by County During FY 2023-24.**

<b>County</b>	<b>Count</b>	<b>Acres</b>
AMADOR	4	921
BUTTE	6	1,801
CALAVERAS	15	6,441
DEL NORTE	2	70
EL DORADO	18	5,507
FRESNO	3	2,080
GLENN	1	1,160
HUMBOLDT	252	109,622
LAKE	12	6,436
LASSEN	9	4,311
MADERA	5	1,018
MARIPOSA	6	4,094
MENDOCINO	267	88,541
MODOC	1	713
NAPA	4	4,117
NEVADA	11	2,858
PLACER	3	1,702
PLUMAS	9	6,610
SAN MATEO	5	1,719
SANTA CLARA	4	3,495
SANTA CRUZ	36	6,665
SHASTA	32	13,048
SIERRA	8	3,751
SISKIYOU	27	13,977
SONOMA	56	24,451
TEHAMA	4	1,519
TRINITY	25	8,478
TUOLUMNE	18	5,908
YUBA	5	1,944
<b>Totals</b>	<b>848</b>	<b>332,957</b>