

Richard Gienger
Box 283, Whitethorn
California 95589
Mobile: 707-223-6474
rgrocks@humboldt.net

Comments on (& suggested revisions to) EMC Strategic Plan Research Themes
and Critical Monitoring Questions

Kristina Wolf
Loretta Moreno
Elizabeth Forsburg Pardi
Effectiveness Monitoring Committee
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

Dear EMC and ALL --

To make a very long and involved story short:

The top Theme of the EMC should be recovery of private and state forests and associated watersheds. This should be closely connected to the touted provisions of AB 1492 which became law in 2012. Among the poorly or non-implemented provisions of that law are the failure to determine and implement ecological performance measures.

Some of the top questions which need answering are the necessary standards for achieving high quality forests and watersheds for the range of forest types and conditions. One graphic example is given on page 19 of the April 4th, 2018 Report of the LAO: "*Improving California's Forest and Watershed Management*". This relates to the continuing failure to establish sustained yield quality standards and credible evaluation and response to cumulative impacts.

You have plenty of detailed questions under multiple themes, but the broad and obvious changes necessary for adequate reform and recovery remain far, far away and unrealized. Many of the detailed questions have already been answered, like critical Questions (a) and (b) under Theme 5: Fish Habitat: and the answers are NO. (See Coho Recovery Plan and 1999 SRP Report). Part of the problem is lack of transparency, engagement, and participation by the affected, multidisciplinary, knowledgeable, public and communities. Implementation of AB 1492, we were assured, was going to change that.

Sincerely,

Richard Gienger &
on behalf of Forests Forever and Why Forests Matter