

P.O. Box 944246
SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460
(916) 653-8007
(916) 653-0989 FAX
Website: www.bof.fire.ca.gov



DRAFT MINUTES
BOARD OF FORESTRY AND FIRE PROTECTION
FULL BOARD OF FORESTRY MEETING

Sacramento, CA

January 8-9, 2008

BOARD OF FORESTRY MEMBERS PRESENT:

Stan Dixon, Chair
Pam Giacomini, Vice Chair
David Nawi
Jim Ostrowski
Bruce Saito
Lloyd Bradshaw
Gary Nakamura
Doug Piirto
Tom Walz

MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

BOARD STAFF:

George Gentry, Executive Officer
Eric Huff, Executive Officer, Forester's Licensing
Teri Ashby, Board Counsel
Chris Zimny, Regulations Coordinator
Carol Horn, Executive Assistant

DEPARTMENTAL STAFF:

Crawford Tuttle, Chief Deputy Director
Russ Henly, Asst. Deputy Director, Res. Mgmt.
Duane Shintaku, Asst. Deputy Director, Res. Mgmt.
Mark Jamison, JDSF Manager

ADA Notice- Pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, individuals who, because of a disability, need special assistance to attend or participate in a State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Meeting, may request assistance at the Board Office, 1416 Ninth Street, Room 1506-14, Sacramento, California or by calling (916) 653-8007. Requests should be made one week in advance whenever possible.

The Board's Mission:

To lead California in developing policies and programs that serve the public interest in environmentally, economically, and socially sustainable management of forest and rangelands and a fire protection system that protects and serves the people of the state.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

January 8, 2008

Time: 4:00 p.m.

1. Call to Order

Chairman Dixon called the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to order.

2. Adjourn to Executive Session

Chairman Dixon adjourned to Executive Session.

3. Reconvene Regular Session

Chairman Dixon reconvened the Board to regular session.

4. Announcement of Actions taken in Executive Session

No action was taken during the Executive Session. Roseburg Resource Products requested a 90-day extension for their THP appeal, therefore, agenda item 9 will not be heard today.

5. Approval of Minutes from the Regular Meetings of October through December 2007

01-08-05: Member Ostrowski moved that the Board approve the November and December Board minutes, with Member Giacomini's edits to the December minutes. Member Nakamura seconded the motion. All members were in favor, and the motion passed unanimously.

The October Board minutes were deferred to the February meeting.

6. Report of the Chairman

Chairman Dixon said after last month's Board Meeting that he (along with Executive Officer Gentry and Board Counsel Ashby) had a lengthy conversation regarding process for appeals before the Board. Executive Officer Gentry summarized the discussion and sent copies to Board members.

7. Report of the Director/Department

Mr. Crawford Tuttle expressed his appreciation for all those who worked on the Jackson Demonstration State Forest plan.

Mr. Tuttle said the Governor would release his budget tomorrow, but he could not release any information about the Department until tomorrow. Utilizing the provisions of Proposition 858 which was passed in March 2004, the Governor announced his intention to declare a fiscal emergency to address current budget short falls. This authority has not been used before, therefore, it would be hard to predict what action, if any would occur in the current year that would affect the Department's budget. Mr. Tuttle said the second thing that was proposed by the Governor was a Constitutional Amendment for the Budget Stabilization Act. In broad terms, the Governor was proposing a revenue stabilization fund that would, allow a certain agreed upon rate and in years where revenues were strong, place some of those revenues in a fund that would be available to support programs in years where revenues were much weaker, to hopefully reduce some of the fluctuations that we see in a budget period. This would have to be approved by the voters in the coming months.

Mr. Tuttle said fire hazard severity maps for State Responsibility Areas had been approved by OAL. Mr. Tuttle said the Department was working on local responsibility maps, they have been distributed for local agency review, and are hoping for adoption some time this spring. Mr. Tuttle said the Committee had a discussion about the Fish and Wildlife Service contacting the Department, and indicated that due to fiscal pressures they would have to reduce the Fish and Wildlife staff for technical assistance that provides advice on the issues of take of the Northern Spotted Owl. Mr. Tuttle said he would appreciate the Board's communication with the Fish and Wildlife Service on that. Mr. Tuttle said the southern units had received a \$26 million state fire assistance grant to carry out hazardous fuel reduction activities on non-federal lands and some of those funds would support Fire Safe Councils.

Mr. Tuttle said CAL FIRE staff continues to work with the Air Resources Control Board staff to begin to prepare for the ARB's scoping plan and how the forestry sector would contribute to that scoping plan.

Member Nakamura asked Mr. Tuttle how the 1996 Fire Plans were being implemented.

Mr. Tuttle said the Department had operation plans, but Mr. Ken McLean could provide the Board with more information on that subject.

8. **Report of Board's Advisory Committees**

- **California Oak Mortality Task Force (COMTF)**

No report was made.

- **Range Management Advisory Committee**

No report was made.

- **Monitoring Study Group**

Mr. Pete Cafferata gave update on the MSG. His report is contained in the Board Binder. The next meeting of the MSG has been scheduled for February 13, 2008, in Redding.

- **Professional Foresters Examining Committee.**

Mr. Eric Huff, Executive Officer for Forester's Licensing, reported that the next PFEC meeting will be held on February 28, 2008, and the PFEC will meet at least four times per year. Mr. Huff mentioned the passing of RPF Patrick Jackson. Six individuals passed the Professional Foresters Exam. Mr. Huff said the exam had a pass rate of 37%. Mr. Huff asked for Board approval for the six individuals who successfully passed the RPF exam.

Ms. Estelle Palley Clifton	RPF No. 2858
Mr. Brian D. Lindstrand	RPF No. 2859
Mr. Gregg Robert Bratcher	RPF No. 2860
Mr. Peter K. Sundahl	RPF No. 2861
Mr. Jonathan M. Pangburn	RPF No. 2862
Mr. Kameron Doss Crocker	RPF No. 2863

01-08-08: Member Ostrowski moved to accept the RPFs who successfully passed the exam. Member Nawi seconded the motion. All members were in favor and the motion passed unanimously.

9. **Public Hearing: The Board will hear an Appeal of the Director's Return, unapproved, of Timber Harvest Plan #2-06-106-SHA(4), "Blacktail THP". This hearing was scheduled for December 6th, 2007, after 8:00 a.m. The Board continued the hearing to January 9, 2007**

This agenda item will be heard at a later date.

10. **Review of the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) and Public Comment for Jackson Demonstration State Forest (JDSF) Draft Management Plan.**

Executive Officer went over the process used to develop the Final Forest Management Plan for JDSF.

- 1 The May 2002 Draft Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan was proposed as the project.
- 2 A December 2005 Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was prepared with Alternative C1 representing the Project, for the Draft Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan.
- 3 In response to public comment, the Board prepared a new alternative, Alternative G, based on Alternative C1 and elements of Alternatives C2, D, E, and F, and examined this new alternative in the 2007 Recirculated Draft Environmental Impact Report for the Draft Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan Alternative G.
- 4 At their October 10, 2007 meeting, the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection directed staff to develop the Administrative Draft Final Forest Management Plan, with this Plan to be based on Alternative G, with some modifications.

Mr. Gentry said this has been a four year process, and the Board held numerous meeting and scoping sessions, and all steps were in place.

Dr. Russ Henly said this had been a long and challenging process. Dr. Henly would like to see the Management Plan certified and adopted. He encouraged the Board to finalize alternative G as the Management Plan for Jackson.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mr. Vince Taylor, representing Dharma Cloud, said it was remarkable that all concerns in respect to the management plan could be put on one piece of paper. Mr. Taylor said there were three items he felt need clarifications in the Management Plan for JDSF. During the Interim Period, planned revenue generation from timber harvesting should not significantly exceed operational costs. An advisory body should review all timber harvest plans in sensitive areas, provided the review does not adversely impact JDSF staff's ability to move forward with the 2008 timber sale program. Amend sentence 2 in paragraph 2, page 7 of the Draft Final Forest Management Plan and the identical sentence on page II-6 of the DEIR to read "the goals for future forest structure conditions shall reflect the multiple management goals of research and demonstration, forest restoration, promotion and maintenance of watershed and ecological health, sustained-yield timber management, and recreation and human enjoyment."

Mr. Mike Jani, representing Mendocino Redwood Company, said he agreed with Mr. Taylor. Mr. Jani said there were two additional items he would like the Board to make a strong statement on: that the Department get the log flow in 2008, and when the Advisory Committee was formulated that the Board support a process that was open but to be able to get through discussions about special allocations in the forest. Mr. Jani said the interim period should not drag on forever.

Ms. Kathy Bailey, representing Sierra Club said she supported Mr. Taylor's recommendations, and it was time to move forward.

Mr. Paul Mason, representing Sierra Club, said he was encouraged to see peace in Mendocino County. Mr. Mason said he appreciated the Mendocino's Working Group's efforts, and he felt there were just a few minor outstanding issues.

Mr. Richard Gienger said he echoed all good things said by the previous speakers.

Mr. Bill Keye, representing California Licensed Foresters Association, said he was encouraged with the progress made on the Jackson Management Plan. Mr. Keye said in regard to handout from Mr. Taylor, he asked what a "sensitive timber harvest plan" was.

Chairman Dixon closed the Public Comment.

Member Giacomini asked Dr. Henly if the third recommended change related to the nine goals, and asked for clarification.

Dr. Henly said the specific wording of the goals was slightly different due to a few word changes. He said the same parallel amendment would be appropriate, and the specific goals could be substituted per the discussions at yesterday's Management Committee.

Member Nawi said there were discussions that the Board should have with CAL FIRE staff to come to consensus on some issues. He said the first bullet point on Mr. Taylor's handout had two aspects to it. The last sentence talked about limitations on long-term initiatives, and the first sentence was a limitation on timber harvesting.

Dr. Henly said they were behind the curve on the Road Management Plan, but they had a good timber inventory in place. Dr. Henly said it said long-term initiatives should be omitted, it did not say "shall be omitted", which leaves some flexibility.

Mr. Mark Jamison, Manager of Jackson Demonstration State Forest, said the primary long-term initiative would involve the road system and the resource inventories. The Road improvement would be a very substantial initiative. On the research side, Mr. Jamison said they would like to ramp up on biological/ecological analysis of the forest.

Member Walz said Alternative G already had harvest volume constraints. It was saying that JDSF could not generate revenue in the first year that would significantly exceed operational costs. Member Walz said the operational costs would not be as high the first year because you won't be able to get all the contracts out. Member Walz was concerned that any time you say "not to exceed" or "don't make too much money" when you are in a situation that you are not going to cut more than 25-35 million feet in any given year, your operational costs are not going to be the same the first year, so if you generate \$12 million in revenue and your costs are only \$2 million, it would not make sense to say "wait we have to quit harvesting". Member Walz felt the language was totally unnecessary, because there already were limitations in place and the long-term initiative of the road inventory, rehabilitation, checking for timber, have been established. Member Walz said bullet #1 was an undue restriction. Bullet #3 could be conformed to the draft charter language and that would make sense. Member Walz said bullet #1 was totally inappropriate. Member Walz said if JDSF could make a lot of money this year, but could not spend it all, why would they stop harvest; he said it did not make sense to him.

Member Nawi referred to the last sentence of bullet #1, and asked if the suggestion to the Board was to add the second to last sentence "completion of the road inventory and the road management plan and implementation of the plan", and then in lieu of the language "expand the timber inventory" use the language "peer review of existing inventory in place of that review plan to take appropriate actions to improve the timber inventory".

Dr. Henly said Mr. Tuttle said to also specify recreational planning.

Member Nawi asked if the Department was ok with the three changes, including recreational planning.

Dr. Henly said they were good with the changes.

Member Nawi said that Member Walz's comment that the limitation based on revenue was inappropriate to protect resources, and that there were adequate resource protections there, and there might be situations where a revenue limitation doesn't make any sense.

Mr. Taylor said the idea the Mendocino Working Group had was what were the principles by which the forest should be managed, and they were able to come to agreement on what those principles were, but then they got to the point of saying how do we decide between all of the competing interests, recreation, timber harvest, habitat restoration, human enjoyment. The

Group then realized that they could not appropriately answer without a lot of input from staff. Then the Mendocino Working Group decided the way to get there was to have a period of time while the plan was being developed with an Advisory Committee, public participation, and during that period of time, they want to be able to have the forest back into operation and funding it's operation so that it was doing a good job of managing the forest, without putting a huge burden on the landscape via timber harvest it. They were fine with the language of limiting the revenue generation to just the basic operations of the forest without being multi-million dollar programs, such as rehabilitating roads. There are hundreds of miles of roads that need rehabilitation which will cost many millions of dollars to get the road system in shape. The Mendocino Working Group's position was that should not take place in the interim period because they want the landscape plan get developed and the allocations made before there was major timber harvesting on the forest.

Member Nawi said the concern was resource protection, and if that was the case, shouldn't the concern be addressed in language of resource protection, assuming additional language is necessary. Member Nawi said he understood the need for this was to ensure the landscape was maintained for long-term planning purposes. Member Nawi asked Dr. Henly if there was language in the plan that addressed the concerns that Mr. Taylor raised that in the interim period activities would not be undertaken that would preclude long-term planning activities.

Dr. Henly said in looking at the short-term harvest schedule, Table 9 on page 78, which lays out the activities the Department expected to go on the forest during the initial implementation period. There are a couple of different sections to that. It says some plans which meet the requirements that the average stand diameter will be maintained or increased as a result of harvest, and that no more than 3% of the base area would be removed. Dr. Henly said that provided some very significant protection measures as well. The second tier of harvest is more mixed. There are some regeneration harvests in there, and some group selection, etc., and those harvests were established to move forward during the initial implementation period following review by the advisory body, so those have some protections built into the review process. Dr. Henly said only one of those was likely to have even-aged management. Using uneven-aged management primarily in those harvests, having the advisory group process as a means of having a review of those harvest protections. The plan dictates that efforts will be made to limit the extent of harvest in areas that have had little or no harvest increase since 1925 or have ten trees per acre greater than three inches in diameter. There are also restrictions about further review by the advisory entities, and it talks about the need for flexibility in the harvest process.

Member Nawi said it was his understanding that what this was focused on were developed to ensure that long-term planning options would not be precluded. Member Nawi asked how the Department would feel about the inclusion of a sentence for the provisions that had been discussed that would clarify the interim policy regarding activities.

Dr. Henly said there were eight different species with different habitat requirements, so it would be fairly easy to indicate what kind of activities would preclude future habitat requirements for that species.

Member Nawi had a clarification on the third bullet point. He asked if the idea was to take the language in the third bullet and make that consistent with the language of the EIR.

Member Giacomini said yes.

Member Walz said it was not his intent to circumvent their idea of not precluding options, but the idea of putting something into a plan that says “not significantly exceed operational costs” is contrary to anything making sense. All the limitations are in place. The Management Plan is very clear as to which proposed timber harvest be done. Member Walz said the bullet was not needed and would make it simpler to remove it.

Member Nakamura said thinking back to Alternative C, the flat out logging alternative, he saw Alternative G as the compromise plan in terms of allocation of landscape or silviculture to the various resource values. Member Nakamura asked if the revenue generated from Jackson goes back to Jackson or did it go to the General Fund.

Dr. Henly said the statute for the Forest Resource Improvement Program was changed last year, it removed all programs from the funding source, except for the demonstration forests. It says funds over what was needed for the management of the state forest will go to the General Fund.

Mr. Jani said he agreed with Member Walz that the goal was to get Jackson up and running, and to get the documents out and deal with the word-smithing at a policy level. Mr. Jani said he felt the bullet point was not necessary and did not need to be in the plan.

Member Giacomini said the Draft Charter had been completed.

Chairman Dixon asked if there was any reason why the Board could not adopt the final DEIR, adopt the findings, adopt the mitigation monitoring report program, and then deal with what seems to be the only issue, the recommendation by Mr. Taylor on Bullet 1 on this page.

Member Nawi said the Board could proceed with Chairman Dixon’s recommendation.

Chairman Dixon asked Board Members to consider individual motions on certifications on the final DEIR.

01-08-10: Member Ostrowski moved that the Board certify the final EIR. Member Nawi seconded the motion. The motion carried 8 to 1, Member Walz opposed.

01-08-10: Member Nawi moved to adopt the CEQA Findings. Member Giacomini seconded the motion. The motion carried 8 to 1, Member Walz opposed.

01-08-10: Member Nakamura moved to adopt the mitigation monitoring reporting programs. Member Piirto seconded the motion. The motion carried 8 to 1, Member Walz opposed.

Chairman Dixon asked the Board for direction in regard to approval of the Management Plan.

Member Bradshaw asked Dr. Henly if there was some place in the Management Plan that could address the concerns regarding Bullet Point #1.

Dr. Henly said the appropriate place to put it was in the section starting on page 77 that talked about the limitations on harvesting.

Member Bradshaw said the Board should provide a sentence or two that addressed those concerns and insert them.

Member Nawi said the sentence he proposed earlier was appropriate, but he still had a problem with the precise formulation of a policy direction from the Board that would tie the interim harvest activities and redirect those to revenue generation.

Mr. Jani said the paper that Mr. Taylor handed out was, with not too much word-smithing, where we want to be. It speaks to the interim period; it speaks to planned revenue generation and timber harvesting. He felt the word everybody was struggling with was “not significantly”, and you have to close what might be a debate on “not significantly”. Mr. Jani felt everybody understood conceptually where they want to go with it.

Member Nawi said he was not sure that was the case. He thought some people believe it is revenue generation in the wording. Revenue generation should not be a factor in determining timber operations.

Chairman Dixon was there were one or two issues to be resolved in recommended language before the Board could move forward and take action on the plan.

Member Nawi said he looked at the language in Bullet #1 by Mr. Taylor, and he wanted to suggest an alternative that he believed would meet the needs of the Mendocino Working Group. Member Nawi said to substitute the first sentence of Bullet #1 to read: “It is anticipated that revenue generated from harvest activities in the interim period would be adequate to support but not greatly exceed the revenues necessary to fund the work activities to be carried out during the interim period.” Member Nawi said both the Mendocino Working Group and the Department were ok with Member Nawi’s language.

01-08-10: Member Nawi moved for adoption/approval of the Management Plan for JDSF with the following changes.

To make the following modifications to the JDSF Management Plan:

1. Add to the end of the first paragraph on page 77 the following language:

“These restrictions are intended to assure that long-term planning options, particularly in sensitive areas, will not be precluded.”

2. New paragraph immediately following the sentence above:

"It is anticipated that revenue generated from harvest activities in the interim period will be adequate to support but not greatly exceed the revenues necessary to fund the work activities to be carried out during the interim period. Long-term initiatives should be limited in the interim period to completion of the road inventory and rehabilitation plan and its implementation, a peer review of existing

timber inventory and based on that review plans to take appropriate action to improve that inventory, recreation planning, and demonstration and research related activities."

3. Include the following language in the appropriate location, approximately page 77:

"An advisory body (the DSFAG or, when ready, the JDSF Advisory Group) shall review all timber harvest plans in sensitive areas and, if practical, all plans during the interim period, provided this review does not adversely impact JDSF staff's ability to move forward with the 2008 timber sale program. The proposed harvest plan of the PSW Research Station in Casper Creek shall have advisory body review."

4. Amend sentence 2 in paragraph 2, page 7:

"The goals for future forest structure conditions shall reflect the multiple management goals of: Research and Demonstration; Forest Restoration; Watershed and Ecological Processes; Timber Management; Recreation and Aesthetic Enjoyment; Information, Planning, and Staffing; Protection; Minor Forest Products; and Property Configuration."

The motion included the following statement by the Board:

"The Board wishes to expedite and facilitate harvest for JDSF in 2008."

Member Giacomini seconded the motion.

Member Bradshaw made a friendly amendment to Member Nawi's motion to include language in his motion to expedite harvest activities in 2008.

Member Nawi accepted Member Bradshaw's friendly amendment. As seconder of the motion, Member Giacomini accepted the amendment.

Executive Officer Gentry read back the motion for clarification.

Member Walz abstained from voting on the motion. All other Board Members were in favor of the motion.

11. Report of the Board's Committees

• Forest Practice Committee

Mr. Duane Shintaku gave an update on the possible changes to the Northern Spotted Owl review process, and he summarized the Department's concerns.

The FPC recommended that the Board produce and authorize a transmittal letter to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, which Mr. Zimny drafted. CAL FIRE staff and Member Nawi edited the letter. Members Nawi and Ostrowski along with Executive Officer Gentry and Crawford Tuttle will finalize the letter.

A summary of the Forest Practice Committee's meeting is contained in the Board Binder.

- **Management Committee**

Chairman Piirto said the Management Committee met yesterday. They had one action item.

01-08-11: Member Piirto moved that the Board approve CAL FIRE's Draft Jackson Advisory Group Charter as revised to date. Member Nawi seconded the motion. All Board Members were in favor of motion, and it passed unanimously.

- **Policy Committee**

Member Ostrowski said the Policy Committee met yesterday with good public participation. A summary of the Policy Committee's meeting is contained in the Board Binder.

- **Resource Protection Committee**

The Resources Protection Committee continued work on updating the Fire Plan. They had no action items. A summary of the Resource Protection Committee's meeting is contained in the Board Binder.

12. **Report of the Regulations Coordinator.**

Regulations Coordinator Zimny referred the Board to Tab 12 of the Board Binder which contained an updated Regulatory Schedule for 2008-2009. Mr. Zimny made a current list of potential rules that would likely occur in 2008, and an extended list of likely rules for 2009. Mr. Zimny said the timeframes for processing regulations are likely going to change. There are several proposed rule packages that could be adopted in 2008, and three of them are extremely complex and would require extensive staff time. This will be discussed at the next Forest Practice Committee.

13. **Report of Executive Officer**

Yesterday Executive Officer Gentry presented a draft report to policy committee, which was greeted by the public with reactions varied from tepid to aggressive skepticism. The report was the result of discussions between the Executive Officer and Chairman Dixon that the need for procedures more formal. There were two aspects to Mr. Gentry's report. The first aspect was rule development, which caused the most concern, because in that they talked about staff's ability to hold workshops to help develop the record for the committee that would be considering the rule. Many people felt that would remove their ability to interact with Board Members on rule development and that would be concerned about losing that aspect of the public process. Once the rule has been developed and the ISOR is ready to go, Executive Officer Gentry and Regulations Coordinator Zimny outlined what they believed were reasonable timelines to develop the rule in an orderly and efficient manner. Staff believe the rules should be fairly well developed once they get to the point of the ISOR, so as to not continually get into Option A, Option B, etc. They also wanted to set reasonable timelines and expectations for those timelines. They felt that once the ISOR went out that would mean that it was a six month process. Mr. Gentry and Zimny believe in order to do this the right way in an orderly and efficient manner the Board was looking at April for getting the rules noticed. The

priorities for rule making need to be decided well in advance. It would be helpful if around December of each year, the Board could say we have identified four rules that need to be dealt with in the coming year and the ISORs were ready to go in December. Mr. Gentry said all of those things were meant to allow for efficient use of staff's time and allow for a predictable and repeatable process, where the rule goes out for a 45-day notice, it comes back after its hearing, public comment is closed and staff then prepare the Response to Comments that they bring back as a draft Response to Comments for the Board's consideration. Executive Officer Gentry said the controversial part was the rule development itself, what he suggested was that staff could develop additional workshops where staff could develop additional information. It was not intended to have extra Board Meetings where Board Members would have to attend because of tight budget constraint, it was meant to add additional background materials to facilitate getting the rule back, but that caused concern with the public because that would not give them a chance to interact with the Board Members and there was skepticism that staff could relay that information appropriately to the Board. Mr. Gentry said he was not asking for Board action on this item, he still needed to develop the report. Timelines for rule making this year are extremely tight.

Executive Officer Gentry sent to Board Members a petition for emergency rules, asking the Board of Forestry to promulgate emergency rules, pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act Sections 1134. The letter did not follow the format that conforms with 11340.6. It does not clearly identify the rules that it was asking to have changed, and did not identify the authorities and then identify the reasons. The letter talked about a lot of issues that Mr. Gentry was even sure that the Board had authority for. Chairman Dixon asked Executive Officer Gentry to write a letter requesting they distill their concerns within the tenets of Administrative Act.

Mr. Pete Ribar, representing Campbell Timberland Management, commented on draft rule making documents presented at Policy Committee yesterday. Mr. Ribar was concerned if the Board had that kind of process that the Board and staff would continue to separate policy from science. He said it would be hard for public to attend special meetings, and he was concerned about the public participation and engagement with board members.

14. **Public Forum**

Mr. Richard Geinger said the Statement of Reasons should come out concurrently with proposed regulations. Mr. Geinger said the Coho Recovery Team met in December. Mr. Geinger said the Board and Department should pursue joint budget change proposals.

Mr. Bill Keye, California Licensed Foresters Association, invited Board Members to attend their annual meeting on March 7. Mr. Keye said regarding the Archeology Committee, that he would like to see that successful program to continue.

15. **New and Unfinished Business**

There was no new or unfinished business.

16. **Adjournment**

Chairman Dixon adjourned the January 2008 meeting of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.

Respectfully submitted,

ATTEST:

George D. Gentry
Executive Officer

Stan Dixon
Chairman

Copies of the attendance sheets may be obtained from the Board Office.