

Summary: Public Workshop on the Draft Forest Carbon Plan Concept Paper

Forest Carbon Action Team

March 23, 2016

CalEPA Building, 1001 I Street, Sacramento, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m

Note: Written comments on the Draft Forest Carbon Plan Concept Paper will be accepted until April 8th. Email comments to fcacalfire@fire.ca.gov

Contents

Executive Summary and Key Themes	1
Opening Remarks on the Forest Carbon Plan and Process	3
Presentations: Status of Work on the Forest Carbon Plan and Overview of the Forest Carbon Plan Concept Paper	4
Attendee Comments and Questions.....	6
Closing Comments	15

Executive Summary and Key Themes

This Workshop provided an opportunity for the Forest Carbon Action Team (FCAT) to present a draft Concept Paper for the Forest Carbon Plan (Plan) and to solicit public feedback on their efforts. The Plan, anticipated to be completed by the end of 2016, will provide forest carbon targets and an array of strategies to promote healthy wildland and urban forests. The Concept Paper provides an overview of the proposed goals and strategies of the Plan. It is intended to serve as a discussion document to foster interaction with and feedback from the public as the FCAT continues to develop the Plan.

Public comments expressed during the Workshop reflected a diversity of perspectives on the Plan and included comments on: terms and definitions, carbon accounting methods, carbon and industrial forestry, support for forest protection, financing strategies, and the role of stakeholders and communities. A detailed summary of individual attendee comments and questions is included in the following pages. Key themes are summarized here:

The importance of precise and accurate use of terms. Commenters suggested the FCAT consider more carefully how it uses terms in the Plan, including sustained yield, sustainable, ecosystem services, fragmentation, reforestation, and “black” carbon.

Desire for specificity and transparency in carbon accounting methods. Commenters had several questions and suggestions about carbon accounting methods. Critiques included: overly optimistic assumptions about long-term carbon storage in wood products; failure to account for carbon emissions from harvest methods, especially clear-cutting; and a need for more robust methods to address emissions from prescribed and extreme fires. There were also calls for greater transparency and specificity in carbon accounting methods, including analyses by region and forest type.

Support for protecting and enhancing urban and wildland forests. Many commenters expressed support for protecting private forestlands from conversion and parcelization, while offering different perspectives on how to achieve this. Some focused on support for conservation easements, while others focused on the need to address high regulatory costs of timber production that can potentially increase land conversion and parcelization. There was general support for elements of the plan that would protect urban forests and increase funding for tree planting. Some expressed a desire for clearer recognition of forest co-benefits, and the need to optimize not just carbon benefits but also other co-benefits that forests provide.

Carbon policy is an overlay to harvesting methods, restoration and other management questions. Some viewed the Forest Carbon Plan effort as an opportunity to pursue greater regulation of methods like clear-cutting, while others noted the net positive benefits of forestry ownership to carbon sequestration. Some viewed reforestation as an opportunity to increase carbon sequestration in some areas, while some expressed concern that current, high-density reforestation methods increase fire risks.

Financing. Commenters noted the importance of economically feasible solutions and of working with landowners to ensure they have the ability and incentives to pursue forest management practices that sequester carbon. Ideas included supporting more financing for conservation easements and urban trees, communicating the benefits of public investments in healthy forests, and public benefits charges on downstream water beneficiaries to support forest and watershed health.

Desire for additional conversation, discourse, and collaboration with stakeholders and communities. There were many requests for meaningful engagement of stakeholders and rural communities, including opportunities for two-way dialog. Several expressed concern about exclusion of rural community perspectives. Urban forestry efforts were additionally noted as an opportunity to engage with environmental justice and active transportation efforts.

Detailed Meeting Notes

Introduction and Agenda Review

Facilitator Caelan McGee of the Center for Collaborative Policy, Sacramento State University, introduced the workshop presenters and goals.

Presenters:

- **Edie Chang**, California Air Resources Board, Deputy Executive Officer
- **Liz Berger**, USDA Forest Service, Regional Forester's Liaison in Sacramento
- **Claire Jahns**, California Natural Resources Agency, Assistant Secretary for Climate Issues
- **Helge Eng**, CAL FIRE, Deputy Director for Resource Management
- **Ashley Conrad-Saydah**, California Environmental Protection Agency, Deputy Secretary for Climate Policy
- **Russ Henly**, California Natural Resources Agency, Assistant Secretary of Forest Resources Management
- **Klaus Scott**, California Air Resources Board, Greenhouse Gas Inventory Branch

Workshop goals:

- Review status of work on the Forest Carbon Plan.
- Discuss intent and contents of the draft Forest Carbon Plan Concept Paper.
- Collect comments and address questions and on the Forest Carbon Plan Concept Paper, Particularly on Goals and Strategies.
- Provide updates for next steps in planning process.

Opening Remarks on the Forest Carbon Plan and Process

Opening remarks described the context for Forest Carbon Plan development.

Mr. Eng: The Forest Carbon Action Team (FCAT) was convened in August 2014 to address the role of forests in achieving the goals of Assembly Bill 32, the California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006. The FCAT includes state and federal agencies, academia, non-governmental organizations, working forest land owners, and others working together to develop a Forest Carbon Plan (Plan). The Plan will provide forest carbon targets and an array of strategies to promote healthy wildland and urban forests. The FCAT aims to complete the Plan by the end of 2016. Goals for the Plan include:

- Develop quantitative targets.
- Identify actions necessary to meet these targets.
- Develop recommendations for funding actions to ensure net long term carbon storage by California's forests.

Ms. Conrad Saydah: The FCAT has wrestled with large challenges facing our forests and different views on how to address them, but has come to an overwhelming conviction that we need to change how we manage forests for the future. The Concept Paper lays out an approach. The FCAT needs to hear from managers, landowners, and partners about their responses to the paper and how we can achieve these goals together.

Mr. Henly reiterated the importance of public participation and input. California has 33 million acres of forestlands, plus urban forests, and addressing these challenges requires broad scale collaborative solutions. Public input is crucial to ensure that the FCAT is appropriately identifying problems and issues and identifying strategies to accomplish carbon and forest health goals.

Presentations: Status of Work on the Forest Carbon Plan and Overview of the Forest Carbon Plan Concept Paper

Ms. Chang discussed the Forest Carbon Plan in the context of other climate change efforts work in California.

- California is developing a new Scoping Plan, the state's blueprint for how to meet its climate change goals. The first Scoping Plan was released in 2008, it was updated in 2014, and now there is another update process to respond to the Governor's new goal, set in 2015, for a 40% reduction in 1990 greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by 2030. The Governor also set goals for working and forest lands to achieve zero net balance of carbon sequestration and emission.
- Because the FCAT and Scoping Plan were moving in the same direction, now we are merging these two processes, building on the work that the FCAT has done to develop targets and evaluate and select metrics.
- Timeline for the updated Scoping Plan:
 - Discussion draft – will be completed in May and heard by the Air Resources Board in June.
 - Draft Scoping Plan – will be completed in August, heard by board in Fall.
 - Final Scoping Plan – Fall 2016

Mr. Eng provided an overview of the current California Forest Carbon Concept Paper.

- The Concept Paper is a skeleton of the Plan, with much analysis to be done. This was purposeful so that the analysis can be responsive to public input at this stage.
- Mr. Eng reviewed the introduction and vision statement of the Concept Paper.
- One item the FCAT would like public input on is the definition of forest health in the Concept Paper. The Concept Paper focuses on resilience, biodiversity, and economic and ecological sustainability as cornerstones of forest health.
- The FCAT would also like public input on the analytical approach in the Concept Paper.

Mr. Henly reviewed the process and overarching vision for the Forest Carbon Plan.

- Public input will enable the FCAT to further develop the goals and strategies, which will also be incorporated into the 2016 Scoping Plan that ARB is developing.
- The Concept Paper lays the groundwork for a Plan to be focused on increasing sequestration and reducing emissions. It addresses a wide range of forest co-benefits – ecosystem, social, economic – in both urban and rural forests.
- A UC Berkeley team is beginning a study to help quantify values and costs in the Plan.
- The Concept Paper views achieving healthy, resilient forests – expected to have larger, more widely spaced trees than current forests – as a key to achieving carbon and other goals.
- The Concept Paper recognizes the need to work collaboratively at landscape scales. Implementation of goals and strategies will require significant collaboration and investment
- The Concept Paper provides information on current carbon inventories, sequestration rates, and needs for future carbon accounting.
- There will need to be adequate monitoring, reporting, and evaluation, and ability to adapt as we learn what works or does not work.
- The Concept Paper organizes Goals and Strategies along three broad themes: protect, enhance, and innovate.

Mr. Scott reviewed highlights of the methodologies used to calculate carbon storage.

- Mr. Scott reviewed the section “The Carbon Storage Potential of California’s Forest Landscapes and Urban Forests.”
- The Concept Paper combined classical methods with new, innovative methods to evaluate how carbon is currently stored in urban and wildland forests.
- The carbon quantification effort takes a portfolio approach, as different methods suit different purposes. The methods include analysis of ground-based data and biometric data and other methods.

Ms. Jahns discussed the goals and strategies for implementation in the Concept Paper.

- Strategies for forest carbon sequestration and GHG emission reduction goals are organized around the concepts of protection of existing forested lands, enhancement of carbon storage through active management and restoration, and cross-sector innovation to promote emissions reductions in other sectors that support forest health.
- Strategies address both urban and wildland forests.

Ms. Berger reviewed the section of the report on implementation and investment mechanisms at federal, state, and local levels.

- Collaboration is essential, as an “all lands” approach is necessary to implement these strategies at a landscape scale. The Concept Paper identifies a range of collaborative approaches that the Forest Service, other agencies, and stakeholders are using to implement restoration efforts.
- The Concept Paper identifies potential investment mechanisms at federal, state, local, private levels that can provide resources for meeting climate change targets.

Mr. Eng reviewed the timeline and next steps for this process.

- The FCAT plans to complete the Forest Carbon Plan in 2016.
- The FCAT is accepting public input on this draft through April 8th.
- The next draft of the Plan is to be released in August, followed by a 2nd public workshop in October. Public comments will be incorporated in November.
- Another public workshop may be held before finalizing the plan in December.

Attendee Comments and Questions

John Amodio, Yosemite-Stanislaus solutions

- Mr. Amodio offered a commendation for the draft as a strong step forward in recognizing the relevance of forest health to AB 32 goals.
- He suggests the plan development process needs more opportunity for dialog, not just written comment, with stakeholders, who have vast experience in these forests.

Paul Mason, Pacific Forest Trust

- In terms of the “enhancement” goals and strategies, it seems like there is good consensus with where we want to go with forest structure, including stand treatments in the near term to deal with the overstocked condition.
- Mr. Mason noted a lack of discussion of how to change the cycle of logging we are in right now, which is based on profitability of trees, and rotations of 40, 60, 80 years.
- Mr. Mason suggested we need a more robust discussion around mechanisms to change behavior and approaches, recognizing there is a cost to landowners for these changes.

Panelist responses:

- Ms. Conrad-Sayda noted that FCAT is very interested in hearing ideas about tax incentives and about the role that government can play in adjusting incentives for forestry approaches.
- Ms. Jahns noted that biomass strategies focus on non-merchantable timber, and that FCAT is interested to know more about opportunities to grow higher value lumber including specialty products and finer-grained wood products.

Arthur Boone, Sierra Club, Oakland Tree Team

- First, Mr. Boone stressed the importance of continuing funding to support urban tree planting, like CAL FIRE support that enabled his organization to plant 1500 trees in Oakland. He noted that more urban trees could be planted.
- Second, Mr. Boone noted that we have 40% fewer trees in the world now compared than at the start of human civilization. He asked whether increasing tree numbers back to their pre-human civilization level would increase the earth’s ability to absorb carbon dioxide and therefore make the Keeling curve go down. (The Keeling curve plots the concentration of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere over time since 1958).

- Mr. Boone suggested we should look at trees as endangered and work to protect them, including by addressing population growth and tree policy and protecting and planting more urban trees.

Karen Mackey, Bay Area resident

- Ms. Mackey was heartened that the Concept Paper encourages larger trees and biodiversity.
- She suggested a need to identify the specific forest treatments and incentives that will result in larger trees and biodiversity.

Forests Unlimited, Sonoma County

- In Sonoma County we see industry using very destructive clear-cutting methods. Some burn all the slash and apply herbicide after clear-cutting.
- First, a question: have you analyzed the impacts of these treatments including not just the impacts of removing the trees, but also the impacts from these other treatments that follow clear-cutting. We would like to see some more analysis of those treatments.
- Second, in terms of fire, recent peer-reviewed research by Hanson et al. shows the beneficial impacts of fire and the destructive impacts of salvage logging. We would like to see analysis of salvage logging impacts in the Plan.

Spencer Eldred, Mountains Recreation & Conservation Authority

- Mr. Eldred suggested exploring how urban forestry incentives can be used to improve active transportation in urban areas. This relates to encouraging higher density housing.
- Urban tree planting should recognize environmental justice and geographic equity. There is great potential for tree planting in non-traditional areas.
- The Authority is concerned about the impacts on wildlife corridors and megafauna of climate changes that force species to migrate up and down hillsides.

Panelist responses:

- Ms. Jahns noted FCAT's desire to integrate plans that focus on forest co-benefits like wildlife and water. This includes the State Wildlife Action Plan, which views corridors as important for facilitating migration of species impacted by climate change.
- Ms. Chang would like to hear more about the first comment on using forestry incentives to promote active transport and urban density.
- Another panelist noted that California is spending significant funds on urban forestry, and there is a need to ensure that it stays in the Governor's proposed budget moving forward.

Craig Thomas, Sierra Forest Legacy

- First, Mr. Thomas noted some definitions in the report that need refinement.

- Conflation of *sustained yield forestry* with *ecological sustainability*. Sustained yield forestry is about rotation forestry, not ecological sustainability. We may need to accept declining timber harvests to produce larger trees.
- Conflation of *ecological fragmentation* and *land cover fragmentation* measured using satellite imagery. You can have forest cover that is highly ecological fragmented in terms of connectivity and forest type.
- *Black Carbon*. Large landscape megafires are not a good thing, but getting back to a more natural fire regime, which can be a good thing, will mean more black carbon emitted from these landscapes. The Forest Service wants to promote restoration to more fire-resilient forests by using fire.
- Second, Mr. Thomas urged caution on assumptions about carbon storage in wood products. For example, wood storage in building products may promote a housing industry that paves over farmland and has other carbon implications. Shipping trees across the ocean has a large carbon burden.

Panelist responses:

- Ms. Chang noted that the comment about black carbon shows the challenge of dealing with highly variable and complex natural lands sector. Although we come to this from the perspective of carbon sequestration and management, we recognize that there are other values we are managing for. The challenge is finding the balance. CARB recognizes it's not helpful for us to say there should be no more fires.
- Ms. Jahns expressed agreement with Mr. Thomas, noting that the FCAT wants to focus on innovation opportunities, including in housing and building programs, such in-fill development and density.
 - Those kinds of synergies can be built into into the Scoping Plan.

Kimberly, Sonoma County

- Treatments should prioritize activities with immediate best impact.
- There should be lower reliance on fire and a greater priority placed on restoration.
- If guidelines and plans are enforceable, they should be communicated to CAL FIRE. Effort is wasted if we can't bring these concepts to bear.

Susan Robinson, Ebbots Pass Forest Watch (Comments submitted online)

- Ms. Robinson commented that California must have transparency in estimated emissions from timber harvest and lost carbon sequestration due to industrial timber management panel.
- The date ranges of data in Table 4 leave out years with some of the highest industrial clear-cutting and drought years, which may invalidate conclusions.
- In the short term it is imperative that we get fewer forest emissions and sequester as much forest carbon as possible. Science shows that clear-cutting and even-aged management produces more emissions than other forms of logging.

- Industrial timber companies should not be able to take credit for carbon sequestration on not for profit or public lands.
- FCAT should look at Pennsylvania Forest climate report analysis of projected forest species change by region and elevation.
- FCAT should examine two recent reports on deforestation rates in Oregon and Clearcutting of Climate Stores by the Center for Sustainable Economy.
- Replanting practices after clear-cutting are producing overly dense, even aged, non-biodiverse tree plantations, that increase fire risk near rural communities and are contrary to California's climate goals. Board of Forestry could change the regulation requiring 300 trees per acre to be replanted.

Panelist responses:

- Mr. Scott Klaus responded that the trends in Table 4 are based on Forest Inventory and Analysis (FIA) plot re-measurement data, and reflect just a subset of plots and years for which we had data.

Kerri Timmer – Sierra Business Council (Comments submitted online)

- What policy outcomes or changes do you expect to see from the Plan, such as changes to requirements for how utilities contract for purchase of bioenergy, such as the California Public Utilities Commission recent resolution E-4770?
- Do you anticipate proposing any changes in the Disadvantaged Communities definition – as part of the CalEnviroScreen update – to accommodate the concept paper's call for assisting rural forested communities, which are not generally identified in the top 25% of CalEnviroScreen-defined DACs?
- How do you intend to develop specific quantification methodologies, especially for co-benefits of forest health activities? In other words, how will you involve stakeholder and interest groups – will there be anything, such as working groups or advisory groups that will provide discussion opportunities beyond just public comment periods? And if so, how does one get involved in that process?
- How long before these methodologies get incorporated into AB 32 scoping planning, agency guidelines, and competitive funding program guidelines?

Panelist responses:

- Ms. Chang: We have been thinking and evolving about this in the Scoping Plan process. We did macro-economic analysis in 2008 which didn't really consider forest impacts. This year we've been discussing with agency partners how we can start to quantify land use benefits and other co-benefits. We would like to ask you for assistance on how we do this. Our model allows inputs that show different kinds of benefits. Our staff are working to figure out what information is out there in terms of land use change and other co-benefits that could be used for the modeling effort.
 - As part of the Scoping Plan, have had one workshop on how to do economic modeling. The UC Berkeley study is another effort.

- We'd like to hear from you in your written comments.
- Ms. Jahns noted that measuring co-benefits is hard to do in a standardized way. ARB has revolutionized the use of carbon dioxide equivalents to look at greenhouse gas emissions across sectors.
 - Within California Natural Resources Agency, we are taking small steps toward funding for co-benefits. We'll ask applicants to show how their programs produce co-benefits. For the GHG reduction fund, the primary benefit must be GHG reductions, but there are many other co-benefits.

Rondall Snodgrass, North Coast

- The Plan does not acknowledge the benefits of public investment in wildlife and conservation achieved through bond measures including Propositions 70 and 84. Public investment has made our forests healthier.
- Mr. Snodgrass is encouraged by the analysis of what we get when we invest money for cap and trade. Forest health is one of the best investments.
- How much money is available for this panel to put to use in moving forward?
- Region-specific analysis could help answer questions on a finer scale – for example, is the North Coast carbon positive or negative?
- We need investment to stop privately owned forests from being divided and sold, which is happening in the North Coast for marijuana production, in response to low market value for timber.
- Mr. Snodgrass would like to see recommendations on how cap and trade money will be spent. We need innovative instruments for landowners, who want to be involved but can't afford certification under AB 32, to enter into carbon sequestration.
- Mr. Snodgrass encourages a plan for reinvesting in programs that have worked.

Kathryn Phillips, Director, Sierra Club California

- Ms. Phillips commented that the report's use of the term "ecosystem services" refers primarily to what the forest provides to humans, as opposed to what it supplies to the planet, ecology, wildlife, etc. This term generally refers to services to humans by the ecosystem. This usage could diminish other values.
- For harvested wood products, the analysis of carbon sequestration needs to look at the whole lifecycle. What kind of methods and related emissions are used to extract the wood, and what are the emissions from milling, transport, and use of the product. Looking at the whole cycle may show lower emissions benefits.
- In terms of emissions from biomass, there is a need to consider the alternatives that biomass would be substituting for, including less polluting kinds of energy such as solar, renewable, battery storage, conservation, and energy efficiency.
- Innovative strategies can include abandoning clear-cutting and even-aged management on private lands.
- In terms of incentives, regulation can be a good incentive. We regulate lots of things to benefit society. Many people recognize that clearcutting is not beneficial to society.

There is a lot of evidence that it's not good for GHG emissions. Let's use this opportunity to regulate this practice.

- There needs to be some way to encourage private landowners to enhance and protect wildlife corridors and habitat.

Panelist responses:

- Edie – “ecosystem services” does include a broader range, including both the intrinsic value of healthy ecosystems, and values for humans. We are using it that way in the paper, consistent with how scientists have been using it since 1997.

Gary Graham Hughes, Friends of the Earth

- We are operating on a carbon debt in California – forests are severely depleted in terms of carbon reservoirs due to deforestation.
- The Plan should look at old growth characteristics for forest health baseline, for example include standing dead trees as part of forest health.
- Mixed forests are being converted to conifer-exclusive forests through forestry practices, hack and squirt.
- Mr. Hughes expressed support for increasing urban forests, but noted that urban forests don't have soil. So there should be a decoupling of urban forests from measuring of carbon in rural forests.
- The suggestion that carbon sequestration in wood products is forest carbon sequestration is not right – once the trees leave the forests they are an anthropogenic carbon reservoir.
- Forest carbon offsets are scientifically indefensible because the carbon debt in forests just reflects past deforestation.
- Using carbon harvested from clearcuts for offsets is inconsistent with international carbon accounting approaches.

Peter Miller, NRDC.

- Will the Plan address imported wood products? The majority of our forest sector emissions come from imported wood products.
- (Ms. Jahns asked Mr. Miller how he would propose doing this.)
- There is a parallel with the energy sector, where if we buy electricity from a coal plant in Utah, we make an effort to account for and address the emissions associated with that. We could do same for the wood products sector.

Panelist responses:

- Ms. Chang: Virtually all consumer products have associated emissions, but we don't account for them. We address electricity because AB 32 calls it out.
- Mr. Eng: It's true that California imports the vast majority of its wood products consumption, and that's something we should look at.

Gary Rynearson, Green Diamond Resource Company

- Mr. Rynearson expressed appreciation for this effort.
- He would encourage this process to not become embattled in the discussions about silvicultural methods.
- That debate occurred in the conversation about AB 32 offset protocols. There is a net benefit of maintaining forestry ownership of land in terms of sequestering carbon.
- We support the use of conservation easements to protect land, but also there should be treatments for fuel hazard reduction.
- Low timber value, in part due to high regulatory costs, increases forest fragmentation.
- We need to come up with systems that reduce regulatory costs but don't reduce environmental protection standards.
- In terms of biomass, the solution needs to be economically feasible or it won't work.
- The report does not address the need to look at underperforming acres, i.e., acres that should be restocked to benefit carbon storage.

Michelle Passero, The Nature Conservancy

- It would be helpful up front if the Plan as clear as possible on framing what is a GHG reduction. How we are defining it, what trend are we aiming for, how we will approach it, what are the interventions we will do.
- More specificity and definition in the carbon accounting protocols will clarify and reduce confusion.

John Bernstein, Trust for Public Land

- The Concept Paper relies a lot on the Stewart and Sharma paper for analyzing carbon sequestration in wood products. This is a weak basis for this major section of the paper. The analysis is not applicable to long-lived forest types. The paper needs more discussion on that.
- There has always been a shortage of money for conservation easements that would provide carbon benefits. There are many, many willing landowners who would enter conservation agreements.

Jim Cramer, Volunteer, Sierra Club

- In terms of sequestering carbon in wood products, some wood products are short-lived, while others are long-lived. It's not clear how your methods account for that.

Carlin Starrs – UC Berkeley Center for Fire Research (Submitted online and in person)

- Ms. Starrs submitted written comments as well to the record.
- Ms. Starrs suggests using a consistent approach to accounting for climate benefits and impacts related to forests and forest products, including clarifying how harvested wood products can fit into climate mitigation strategies.
- Ms. Starrs comments that developing a shared understanding of the relative importance of different benefits and co-benefits for major forest types is important.

John Amodio, Yosemite Stanislaus Solutions

- California's GHG reduction targets can't be achieved without addressing the trend of megafires. CARB's current GHG accounting is incomplete because it doesn't factor in wildfire emissions. Will you be updating that?
- Funding: engaging partners and beneficiaries beyond the Sierra Nevada region is essential. Downstream beneficiaries should pay a public benefits charge as a revenue stream for enhancing forest and watershed health. Is this being considered/evaluating moving forward?
- A public benefits charge could also address wood and biomass utilization, making it more economically feasible. Restoring forest health requires far-reaching advances in utilization of biomass. I urge full consideration of public benefit charge.
- I didn't hear a response to an earlier question about updating of socioeconomic criteria that is prejudiced against rural areas (DAC definition).

Panelist response:

- Ms. Chang:
 - The white paper lays out series of potential actions that we are thinking of. It would be great to hear more, in written comments, about the public benefits charge and how it could be done.
 - How DAC communities are defined is described in statute. There is a recognition that some communities are not covered under CalEnviroScreen. We recognize the need for broader geographic diversity.

Amy Granat

- We represent people with a ground level perspective of forests. The Concept Paper is very theoretical and shows very few attempts to incorporate practical considerations.
- The Plan needs to have practical solutions for people who live in the communities and work in the forests. A lot of these communities are economically disadvantaged, for example with schools running out of money that depending on logging.
- Actions should be derived collaboratively with these stakeholders and communities.

Chuck Mills, CA Re-Leaf

- Thank you for the robust discussion of urban forestry in the Plan and recognition of threats.
- The strategies section should address reinvigorating efforts to maintain existing canopy.
- The proposed green infrastructure program at Cal Natural Resources Agency can be another key element for implementing this overall effort, in addition to CAL FIRE's lead role.

Gary Burnheim, Sonoma

- Mr. Burnheim echoed others' skepticism about relying on sequestration in wood products for carbon accounting.

- He suggested attributing carbon emissions for imported wood products to the entity that has authority to authorize imports.
- It's important to think about the average length of time that wood products stick around versus how long they would have stuck around as trees in the forests.
- CAL FIRE functions mainly as an agent for logging companies. There will need to be regulation to incorporate something that's going to work on the ground.
- Mr. Burnheim suggests looking more closely at the idea that forest growth exceeds harvest, and using this idea to justify industrial forestry.

Craig Thomas

- Mr. Thomas shared a map of the Rim Fire area with panelists.
- Mr. Thomas noted concerns about "reforestation" as a concept, and the use of public resources toward efforts that may prove counterproductive or ineffective.
- In the Rim Fire area, it's risky to reforest with confers. Homogenous stand structure with linked crowns is very risky in terms of fire. So reforestation is going toward a model that's vulnerable to fire and will burn over and over again.
- Forest plantations are getting hit hard by drought and bug kill.
- There is more need to think about how to reforest those areas.

Nazar Visav, Water, Sound, Air and Light Quality

- We want to restrict hunting.
- We are striving to uplift our consciousness.
- Yesterday two healthy pine trees were cut down by Flood Control. Why are we cutting trees? Who gives the order and decides what tree need to be cut?
- We strive to have a healthy garden and preserve healthy trees.

Panelist response:

- In response to the concern about the trees being cut down, Mr. Henly replied noted the "right tree in the right place" concept. Sometimes trees are inappropriately located in terms of flood control or are causing infrastructure damage, or other problems. The idea is to plant trees in the right places so you won't have to remove large healthy trees later.

Rondall Snodgrass

- Will this panel suggest a budget to the Governor?

Panelist response:

- No, the budget process starts in November when we solicit info from agencies about what funding they need to implement these plans.
- We may suggest that there is a large need for funding in this paper, but we won't suggest the source from which funding should originate.

Closing Comments

Panelists thanked participants for their comments, passion, and interest. They invited participants to submit additional, detailed comments, and noted the desire for comments that will help make the plan implementable and adaptable.