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Legislatively Mandated Monitoring
SB 901 and others

• Address the use, compliance, and effectiveness of Exempt and Emergency timber harvests

• Monitoring is rapid and repeatable, objective, and anonymous
  • “Are we getting the end result intended by a particular harvest permit?”
  • Not focused on enforcement or scrutiny of individual projects

• Open to participation and input from all Review Team Agencies
Legislatively Mandated Monitoring
SB 901 and others

• Initiated in 2018 as pilot work, continued in 2019 with the first official report approved by the Board
  
  • 2019 report focused on Emergency Notices
    • (Post-fire salvage, and insect/drought related mortality)

• Monitoring is ongoing
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2019 and 2020 EX-EM #’s

- Exemptions majority of accepted Notices, most predominantly in the Cascade Forest Practice Area.
• Emergencies dominated by wildfire related harvests
• Nearly a 25,000 acre increase in 2020
• Cascade Forest Practice Area has the majority of acreage and accepted Notices
• Exemptions most prolific in the Cascade Forest Practice Area

• Over 500 accepted Notices for 0-150 Foot 1038(c) EX in 2019
• Exemptions most prolific in the Cascade Forest Practice Area

• 0-150 Foot 1038(c) EX again was the most accepted document type in 2020
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2020 EX-EM Monitoring

1038(c) Focus

• As the most accepted Exemption type, focus was placed on the 1038(c) 0-150 Foot Fire Hazard Reduction Exemption

• **Intent**
  • Reduction of horizontal and vertical fuel continuity
  • Improvement of defensible space around legally permitted structures

• Technical Rule Addendum No. 4 visual guide
1038(c) Monitoring

Overview

• Random sample of 1038(c)s accepted in 2019, stratified by fire hazard severity zone

• 75 Notices sampled, for 10% margin of error, 95% confidence level in results

• Monitoring was rapid and simple
  • Focused on 12 nearest residual conifers and stumps for up to three treated structures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forest Practice Area</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Coast)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Cascade)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Sierra)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>75</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• As expected and by design, 1038(c)s had a minimal *reported* footprint and timber volume removal

• Largest reported harvest areas related to treatment of multiple structures
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Generally treated 1-2 structures per Notice, 95% involved at least one residential home

• Others treated infrastructure such as water treatment and communications facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treated Permitted Structures Per Exemption (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Structure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treated Residential Homes Per Exemption (#)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

- 36 landowners were willing to report cost estimates associated with timber ops
- Of these, 75% reported a financial loss from operations
- Estimates reported ranged from $1,000 to $50,000 (multiple structures), with an average of $11,500
- Two landowners reported a profit from operations
- Seven landowners reported breaking even
  - Anecdotally, they mentioned LTOs trading labor/equipment time for timber
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Classified watercourses found within, or associated with, 17% of 1038(c)s
  • Watercourses were overwhelmingly adequately protected from operations and sediment discharges
  • Majority were Class III and Class IV watercourses
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Slash treatment met and exceeded expectations on nearly all Notices

• Flammable vegetation/grass/litter/duff was absent in excessive amounts near structures on most Notices, but present to some degree on many

• Hardwood/Ornamental trees were found within 30 feet of structures on over 50% of Notices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Absent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slash &gt;1” Diameter</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slash &gt;1” Diameter, &gt;25% of harvest area</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piled fuel/slash to be burned or chipped</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping or Mastication of fuels within treatment area?</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipping or Mastication of fuels outside treatment area?</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Standing Conifers in treated area?</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dead Standing non-commercial trees in treated area?</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• 57% of the 1038(c)s had another structure on a separate parcel within 100 feet or less

• This represents a potential exposure source not directly treatable through forest management alone

• 74% of these occurrences were on parcel sizes < 1 acre in size
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Generally, many 1038(c)s exhibited treatments that resulted in reduced exposure to fire from residual conifers
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

- Example: Post-harvest defensible space >60 feet, estimated increase of 36 feet from pre-harvest.
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Others represented conifer removal for non-fire related goals
  • Increasing sunlight, hazard tree removal per many landowners
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Majority of measured stumps were 10-20 or 20-30” in diameter

• Well over 50% of stumps were at least within 50 feet of a structure

• Only two Notices had stumps >150 feet away from a structure in absence of any other harvest permit
  • The distances were not excessive or outside the realm of professional error
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• 31% of Notices met the TRA No 4 recommendation for single tree species within 30 feet of homes

• On average, 84% of Notices eliminated or had absent surface-to-crown vertical fuel continuity
Results

- Basal area decreased as distance to structures decreased
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Just over 50% of Notices resulted in a mean defensible space of 30 feet or more following operations

51% of Sample
≥30 feet mean defensible space per permitted structure

49% of Sample
< 30 feet mean defensible space per permitted structure

30 Foot Zone
30-122 Feet, 53 Feet on average

30 Foot Zone
5-29 Feet, 19 Feet on average
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• Just over 50% of Notices resulted in a mean defensible space of 30 feet or more following operations
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

• 7% of all trees, found on 41% of 1038(c)s, represent trees that likely should have been treated per the Exemption intent

• Close proximity to structure, vertical fuel continuity present, high live crown ratio
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

- Parcel size seems to heavily influence results, per TRA No. 4, PRC codes, and other FPR considerations
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

- Before/After of mapped 1038(c) boundaries

- 2020 North Complex, all treated homes were >50% damaged per DINS (Damage Inspection) data
1038(c) Monitoring

Results

- Indicative of difficulty protecting homes in wind driven active crown fires
- Limited scope case study, not appropriate for broad scale inference relative to 1038(c)s
- 1038(c)s represent a perfect time for integration of Forest Practice and Defensible Space inspections, home hardening actions
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1038(c) Monitoring

Conclusion

• Important Exemption type for landowners to manage timber on their property

• Not always used for intent (fire hazard reduction), sometimes just a general “catch-all”

• Compliance with watercourse protection and harvest-related slash treatment overwhelmingly positive

• Additional guidance and research needed relative to TRA No. 4, defensible space objectives, and treatment of non-commercial tree species near homes
1038(c) Monitoring

Recommendations

• CAL FIRE should develop additional guidance for landowners and Licensed Timber Operators on the requirements of the 1038(c) to ensure that the intent of the Exemption is met. Focus should be placed on the need to adequately treat the area within 30 feet of the structure.

• CAL FIRE could consider integration of guidance with broader landowner and LTO education on fuels and home hardening treatments, as well as guidance for implementing these treatments based upon the best available science.

• Consider revising the FPRs to provide clearer direction to landowners and LTOs on the required elements of 1038(c). This might include better integration of FPR 1038 language and Technical Rule Addendum No. 4 with the requirements of PRC §§ 4290 and 4291.

• Revisions might include better clarification on the requirements within Zone 1 of TRA #4.

• Guidance is needed on how to treat hardwood and/or ornamental within 30 feet of the structure.
1038(c) Monitoring

Recommendations

• Broader guidance should be given on Exemptions so that landowner objectives can be coupled with the appropriate Exemption type.

• CAL FIRE could consider integration of Forest Practice and Defensible Space inspections where 1038(c) Exemptions are utilized. The 1038(c) Exemption presents an opportunity for achievement of both Forest Practice and Fire Prevention objectives toward structure resilience to wildfire and should be noted in Defensible Space reporting in the future.

• If activities are explicitly identified and mapped, post-fire effectiveness of 1038(c) treatments could potentially be integrated into the incident Damage Inspection process.
1038(c) Monitoring and annual EX-EM Report
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