

VanSusteren, Jane@CALFIRE

From: Rudolph Giuliani <foresteryart@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 23, 2024 11:51 AM
To: Public Comments@BOF
Subject: Wet Areas, Meadows, and Restoration Activities, 2023

Warning: this message is from an external user and should be treated with caution.

Dear Ms. Van Susteren

In reviewing the proposed revisions to Sections 913.4, 933.4, and 953.4, Foresters in Admiration of Riparian Timberlands (FART) would like to voice the following concern:

Provision (e)(6) requires project proponents to consult with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (and Regional Water Quality Control Boards in some instances), prior to the submittal of a plan, but proposed revisions to (e)(6) on lines 16 and 17 of page 4 eliminate the requirement for the project proponent to provide documentation of the consultation to CAL FIRE.

This results in a condition where multiple agency personnel may spend a great deal of state time and resources developing recommendations that will never make it to the Lead Agency. This process will waste a bunch of time, which stinks for everyone, and amount to nothing but silence at the end: a classic "Silent but Deadly" situation.

Additionally, the "Initial Statement of Reasons" does not describe the specific purpose or necessity of the proposed repeal, as required by Section 10 of Title 1 of the California Code of Regulations.

FART would loudly recommend retaining the existing and functional requirement to include documentation of agency consultations in plans where such consultation is required by law.

Respectfully,

Rudolph Giuliani (not that one)