

BOF-EMC Priorities Matrix

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>EMC Critical Questions</u>
FPC	1	<p>NSO Rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The key issue identified in stakeholder meetings is the identification of activity centers and the longevity of these activity centers 	<p>Theme 7: Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages, Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures</p>
FPC	1	<p>Class III watercourse crossings as a required mapping feature within a Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dry Class III watercourses can be crossed during harvest and does not involve any review requirements; as a result, mapping these watercourses and watercourse crossings is not required in a Plan (14 CCR § 916.3(c)(2)) Certain Review Team members would like to have these mapped so that they have an opportunity to review them 	<p>Theme 1: WLPZ Riparian Function, Theme 2: Watercourse Channel Sediment</p>
FPC	1	<p>Responsiveness to new technology such as tethered logging</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do current regulations allow for responsiveness to new technology? Regulations were just updated to incorporate tethered logging methodologies This is likely a policy issue rather than in need of additional science 	<p>Theme 1: WLPZ Riparian Function, Theme 2: Watercourse Channel Sediment, Theme 4: Mass Wasting Sediment</p>
FPC	1	<p>Botanical Resource Considerations in Plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are currently no regulations in the Forest Practice Rules that govern how 	<p>Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts</p>

BOF-EMC Priorities Matrix

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>EMC Critical Questions</u>
		<p>botanical resources are treated in the THP process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance exists from both CDFW and CAL FIRE, but stakeholders have indicated that it is implemented inconsistently and is sometimes unclear • A key issue is that no effectiveness monitoring has been done to assess whether the current process is working in the 20+ years that it has been used 	
FPC	2	<p>Monitoring for Adaptive Management in Watersheds with Coho Salmon</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From the 2019 Priorities: “14 CCR § 916.11 requires the Board to develop a monitoring and adaptive management program for timber harvesting operations in watersheds with coho salmon... The Board has since established a new science-based, multi-stakeholder, and multi-disciplinary Effectiveness Monitoring Committee (EMC) for the purpose of reviewing the efficiency and effectiveness of the Board’s Forest Practice Rules relative to forestry and environmental protection, including the protection of watershed resources critical to listed species such as coho salmon. The FPC will review the history and requirements of 14 CCR § 916.11 to ensure the mission and activities of the EMC adequately address the 	Theme 5: Fish Habitat

BOF-EMC Priorities Matrix

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>EMC Critical Questions</u>
		<p>purposes stated for this Rule and will determine if any additional specific Board action is necessary.”</p>	
FPC	2	<p>Variable Retention Silviculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 CCR § 913.4(d) is not currently used widely, apparently because of the complexity of the rule and potentially long-term management requirements following harvest • Question: are the spatial and temporal constraints in this rule necessary to meet its premise of resource objectives? • A literature review may be done to address the biological resource objectives to see what retained structure is adequate 	<p>Theme 6: Wildlife Hazard, Theme 7: Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages, Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures</p>
FPC	3	<p>Transition Silviculture use after Selection Silviculture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee Chair indicated that this is a process issue and probably does not need additional science to resolve the issue 	<p>Theme 6: Wildlife Hazard, Theme 7: Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages, Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures</p>

BOF-EMC Priorities Matrix

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>EMC Critical Questions</u>
MC	1	<p>Group B Designation for Monterey Pine, Eucalyptus, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only an issue in the coastal zone where a coastal development permit is required for harvest of these species • Inland, these species can be harvested with little oversight because they are not subject to the Forest Practice Act as non-commercial species • Not a high priority for science according to the Committee Chair, more of a policy issue 	<p>Theme 6: Wildlife Hazard, Theme 7: Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages, Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures</p>
MC	1	<p>Basal Area Stocking Standards</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some landowners (largely inland) are having trouble with stands converting to white fir due to lack of sufficient openings for pine regeneration when they use uneven aged management and meet current requirements for basal area stocking standards. • These landowners are looking for more flexibility to use more group selection and transition silvicultural methods to facilitate more openings and more pine regeneration. • Perhaps EMC projects testing implementation of these more flexible standards on ecologically unique stands could be useful to see if the rules are effective or need revision? This can already be done with alternative prescriptions, but is potentially perceived as difficult to get approved. 	<p>Theme 6: Wildlife Hazard, Theme 7: Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages, Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures</p>

BOF-EMC Priorities Matrix

<u>Committee</u>	<u>Priority Level</u>	<u>Topic</u>	<u>EMC Critical Questions</u>
MC	1	<p>Maximum Sustained Production Rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some stakeholders have indicated that it may be problematic that 14 CCR § 913.11 does not contain guidance on factoring carbon stocks into the MSP calculations • The Committee Chair indicated that this topic should probably be discussed more fully in Committee and a problem statement developed before any science would be useful 	<p>Theme 6: Wildlife Hazard, Theme 7: Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages, Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures</p>
MC	3	<p>Pilot Programs for SERM Option (v) Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This topic is related to the projects which use the nonstandard operational provision in 14 CCR § 916.9(v) • Pete Cafferata indicated that this provision is rarely used due to perceived increases in plan review timelines • This provision is also used for accelerated wood placement projects 	<p>Theme 1: WLPZ Riparian Function, Theme 2: Watercourse Channel Sediment, Theme 5: Fish Habitat</p>
RPC	Ongoing	<p>Invasive Forest Pests</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This topic is only being addressed through periodic updates by the California Pest Council at this time. 	<p>Theme 11: Hardwood Values, Theme 10: Wildlife Habitat: Structures, Theme 8: Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages</p>

*FPC = Forest Practice Committee, MC = Management Committee, RPC = Resource Protection Committee

**Priorities are ranked by level of importance with 1 being the highest