

PARTNERING TO PROVE RESULTS

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Effectiveness Monitoring Committee

November 16, 2017

California Association of Resource
Conservation Districts

Russ Henly



Overview of Presentation

- Origin of the Effectiveness Monitoring Committee (EMC)
- Goals
- Importance
- Membership
- How we do our Work
- Accomplishments thus far

Origin of the EMC

- Proposal from Board's Monitoring Study Group in 2009; modeled after Washington's Cooperative Monitoring, Evaluation, and Research Committee
- Board approved Charter in August 2013
- Members appointed and first meeting held October 2014
- First Strategic Plan approved by Board in late 2015

Goal of the EMC

“Establish a collaborative, transparent, and science-based monitoring effort and process-based understanding of the effectiveness of the California Forest Practice Rules and other forestry-related laws and regulations on maintaining or enhancing water quality, aquatic habitat, and wildlife habitats....”

From the EMC Charter

Importance of our Work

- In FY 2015-16, CAL FIRE received or reviewed THPs and NTMP notices of operation covering 148,000 acres and Exemption or Emergency Notices totaling over 2.7 million acres.
- Several iterations of effectiveness evaluation done for THPs and NTMPs in the past, mostly focused on streams, riparian areas, and sediment sources.
- Mainly done by CAL FIRE or an interagency team; limited outside collaboration.
- New Legislative direction for evaluating outcomes from timber operations under Emergency and Exemption Notices (2016: AB 1958 and 2029; 2017: SB 92)

EMC Membership

- Members are appointed by Board
- Number of members is not fixed
- Open nomination process for vacancies
- Candidates for membership are to:
 - Have scientific and natural resource professional backgrounds; and
 - Have demonstrated previous collaboration in resource monitoring or scientific studies.
- Two Co-Chairs
 - Board member
 - CNRA Assistant Secretary of Forest Resources Management

EMC Membership

- Seven Monitoring Community Representatives
 - University (3)
 - Large forest landowner monitoring specialists (3)
 - Consultant in Geology/Geomorphology
- Eight Agency Representatives
 - USDA Forest Service Research
 - National Marine Fisheries Service
 - CAL FIRE
 - State and Regional Water Boards (3)
 - Department of Fish and Wildlife
 - CA Geological Survey

How we do our Work—Strategic Plan

- Strategic Plan guides our processes and defines critical questions to be addressed through monitoring.
- Annual process for review, update, and Board approval.
- Establishes 10 monitoring themes with underlying critical questions and direct linkages to specific Forest Practice Rules (Appendix D)

How we do our Work—Monitoring Themes

- Watercourse and Lake Protection Zone (WLPZ) Riparian Function
- Watercourse Channel Sediment
- Road and WLPZ Sediment
- Mass Wasting [Landslides] Sediment
- Fish Habitat
- Wildfire Hazard
- Wildlife Habitat: Species and Nest Sites
- Wildlife Habitat: Seral Stages
- Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Effects
- Wildlife Habitat: Structures

How we do our Work—Resources

- New staff position at Board of Forestry and Fire Protection established in part to support EMC.
- Other staff support from Board Executive Officer, a CAL FIRE hydrologist, a CAL FIRE biologist, and a North Coast Regional Water Board geologist.
- Two-years of project funding at \$425,000/year.

How we do our Work—Meetings

- Open to the public and webcast.
- Meet about every 6-8 weeks on average.
- Meet in different parts of state to allow for better public access.
- Mostly informal format in order to allow for full discussion of matters and provide public input opportunities.
- Transparency is important; EMC complies with Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act.

How we do our Work—Effectiveness Monitoring Proposals

- Issue public calls for effectiveness monitoring concept proposals twice per year.
- Highly interactive process for review of proposals leads to stronger projects in terms of science and close linkage to specific Forest Practice Rules or related regulations.
- Structured process for ranking proposals, based on 4 categories and 25 possible points.
- Separate process for deciding allocation of funds.

Accomplishments thus Far

- In FY 2016-17, we ranked 6 proposals and funded the 5 of these that requested funding for a total of \$376,000 from EMC.
- Several of these projects also had funding from other sources (SWRCB, Save the Redwoods League, CAL FIRE).
- Project proposers and collaborators include USDA Forest Service Research, UC Davis, Michigan Tech University, CAL FIRE, Regional Water Boards, CA Geological Survey, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife

Accomplishments thus Far

- In FY 2016-17, we are working to review and rank the 11 projects currently in hand.
- These projects request just over \$1 million in funding (over twice what we have available).
- Project proposers and collaborators include UC Berkeley, Cal Poly SLO, Oregon State University, Redwood Forest Foundation, CAL FIRE, Dept. of Fish and Wildlife, private consultants.
- Work on funded projects started in 2016; too early to have results yet.

Examples of Projects Funded

- Statistical design for two projects.
- Effectiveness of Road Rules in reducing hydrologic connectivity and sediment discharge to streams.
- Effectiveness of Forest Practice Rules in protecting water quality during post-fire timber salvage operations.
- Effects of forest stand density reduction (i.e., different harvest levels) on nutrient cycling and transport.

Closing Observations

- Having a collaborative, open process for effectiveness evaluation projects makes for better projects.
- Open process should contribute to a higher level of trust in the outcomes of the projects.
- Direct connection to the Board means there will be a strong basis for adjusting Forest Practice Rules based on findings.

EMC Website

http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/board_committees/effectiveness_monitoring_committee/