

From: [Tom Woodhouse](#)
To: [Public Comments@BOF](#)
Subject: Please extend the public comment period.
Date: Wednesday, July 01, 2015 10:09:18 AM
Attachments: [5-day notice and rule text sent and posted 062315 drought mortality amendments.pdf](#)
[TEXT.txt](#)

PLEASE EXTEND THE PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD ON THIS ISSUE.
Thank you, Tom Woodhouse Mendocino County Third District Supervisor
707-367-6334

From: [Linda Jupiter](#)
To: [OAL Reference Attorney](#)
Cc: [Public Comments@BOF](#)
Subject: End Hack and Squirt
Date: Thursday, July 02, 2015 12:59:30 PM

Greetings,

I am writing against the Hack and Squirt procedure.

The large number of dead trees creates a fire hazard in both the short and long term. In the short term, the dead pine needles create a receptive ignition bed for embers or any ignition source. In the long term, trees which die today will begin to deteriorate and fall to the ground in significant numbers in approximately 7-10 years. These falling trees represent a potential hazard to any life or property within reach of the falling tree.

Trees that die and are left to burn or rot will ultimately result in the release of carbon and other greenhouse gases during combustion. Utilizing logs to create long lasting wood products or utilizing logs to produce energy to offset the consumption of fossil fuels has direct benefits to the State, which will help meet the goals within Executive Order B-30-15.

It is in the interest of the state to encourage the removal of dead and dying trees to reduce the fire and falling hazard from dead and dying trees across the state. It is also in the interest of the state to encourage long term carbon sequestration by retaining the carbon held in the tree in some form of value added product..."

These regulations are immediate and necessary to, in part, facilitate appropriate fuel modification and reduce the falling hazard associated with deteriorating trees. Appropriate fuel modification can:

- Reduce the risk of fire to timberlands.
- Reduce large, damaging wildfires.
- Decrease losses of homes and structures due to wildfire.
- Enhance firefighter safety.
- Increase public safety.
- Increase the efficiency of fire suppression operations relating to how, when, and where firefighting assets are deployed.
- Reduce the cost of fire suppression.
- Increase forest health.

(Please note that this also applies to "Hack and Squirt" trees that are left to die and fall to the ground in Mendocino County. In addition, we have the vaporization of hack and squirt chemicals if burned or allowed to decompose.)

Thank you for doing the right thing; **end Hack and Squirt in Mendocino County.**

Regards,
Linda Jupiter
Fort Bragg

June 30, 2015

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
OAL Reference Attorney
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, California 95814
E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov.

Thembi Borrás, Regulations Coordinator
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 944244-2460
E-Mail: publiccomments@BOF.ca.gov

RE: 1) California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Emergency Regulations for Removal of Dead & Dying Trees-Proposed Emergency Action Public Comments & Questions

2) Public Comment Deadline: July 6, 2015

3) Formal California Public Records Act Requests

To: The California Board of Forestry & Fire Protection, OAL Reference Attorney & Mr. Borrás, Regulations Coordinator.

The California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection adopted an emergency regulation for the removal of dead and dying trees at its June 17, 2015, meeting...This regulation will be submitted to the Office of Administration Law on July 1, 2015, and the public comment period will close at 5 P.M. on July 6, 2015. This emergency action and short public comment period raises many questions:

- 1) Why did your agency choose the 4th of July weekend for this short public comment period which would deny most public entities and the public time to make a comment on this emergency regulation?
- 2) We are formally requesting that the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection extend their public comment period in order to give various public agencies, counties, and the public a chance to make public comments.
- 3) This proposed emergency logging action, by the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection, could have been taken last year, throughout the entire year, or earlier this year when the fire hazard summer season was not as critical. Why did the California Board of Forestry wait until we are in mid-summer (100+degree Heat), during the third year of drought conditions to take this action?

4) Listed below you will find the links regarding this Notice of Proposed Emergency Action. We have requested that the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors request a brief extension of the public comment deadline in order for the following questions to be addressed regarding Mendocino County and Humboldt Counties which we are now adding as part of our public comment:

A) It is alleged that the State of California Forest Practice Rules (Amendment 1038), are to be changed in this proposed Emergency Action. These rules were established for the protection of forest and other lands through established logging procedures. Exactly what rules will be exempted by this proposed action?

B) What percentage of logs will be cut in volume in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties respectively?

C) What is the cumulative impact of this type of logging?

D) What will be the rules set out by this exemption to protect our local watershed areas?

E) Why aren't existing rules for this type of logging being left in place?

F) What California government agency will mark, in advance, the trees to be cut (and number in our area), during this exemption period?

G) Roads may need to be put in place in some areas. What action will be taken to make sure that these roads won't undermine our watershed and erosion sensitive areas?

H) According to the request for an emergency exemption their proposed rule states: "**...The large number of dead trees creates a fire hazard in both the short and long term. In the short term, the dead pine needles create a receptive ignition bed for embers or any ignition source...**" **In the long term, trees which die today will begin to deteriorate and fall to the ground in significant numbers in approximately 7-10 years...**" **This statement raises the following questions:**

H1) In the "Hack & Squirt" areas (where trees are killed by various applied herbicides), in Humboldt and Mendocino Counties, will those who engaged in these practices be required by the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to remove their dead trees and other fallen trees and debris, at their own expense? The practice in Mendocino County is not to remove the trees killed by various herbicides.

H2) How many acres of trees in Mendocino County have these herbicide trees been left to die-in-place where they will remain an increasing fire hazard for years? (The same question for Humboldt County.)

H3) Due to the length of time, according to their report, dead trees can remain standing before falling to the ground this raises many questions. Thus, dead "hack and squirt" trees are an ongoing fire hazard for years. With various private and other entities killing trees in this manner should they not be required to stop the practice of leaving the dead trees in place or remove them instead of killing them with herbicides? If the trees were cut down then replanting and the restoration of these areas could begin quickly and the threat of forest fires could be reduced.

H4) Shouldn't the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection should require the "hack and squirt" entities to remove, at their own expense, unwanted trees instead of leaving them as dead trees standing for 7 to 10 years increasing local fire hazards in Mendocino and other counties?

H5) Has the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection identified the areas across California where "Hack and Squirt" policies are in place? If so please provide the total number of acres involved in these programs and in how many areas are these herbicide treated trees are left to stand for years without being removed, increasing California forest fire hazards? (California Public Record Act Request of a map and the number and scope of these programs in tree counts and acreages.)

H6) The California Board of Forestry and other state agencies and private entities should not be allowed to use herbicides to kill trees and leave them standing without removing them. Will your board ban this practice in California due to the increased fire hazards that these practices exacerbate?

5) Loggers don't like to cut dead trees because the wood gets extremely hard in a short period of time and may not be commercially economical to harvest and use. This proposed emergency clear cut logging proposal looks like a "for-profit windfall" for loggers to take trees that may not be dying or diseased through their exemption of Forest Practice Rules. Is this correct?

A) How will you prevent loggers from just cutting trees that are commercially viable and leaving the rest along with the debris?

B) Your agency is fully aware that no loggers will be involved in your emergency program without being allowed to cut old growth and commercially viable trees. Thus, what is your justification for exempting certain forest practice rules for loggers and other entities?

6) And why change the Forest Practice Rules and Regulations for the removal of branches, dead trees, and other debris removal at the time of logging? This type of exemption could leave more dead fuel left on the ground as a growing fire hazard.

7) What types of planting is to take place in logged areas for restoration and when will this take place to protect the areas from erosion in Mendocino County and other logged areas in California?

8) There are also concerns now being expressed regarding fast logging in an emergency and then regretting the decimation at a later date because certain rules were exempted by this emergency action. Why aren't you keeping the protections built into your own rules and regulations to prevent a different type of disaster from emergency logging without your own rules in place?

9) **Please note that your tree counts each year may be suspect for the following reasons:** As stated in their documents dead trees can stand for 7 to 10 years. Thus, your tree counts could be counting the same dead trees over and over again each year increasing their totals. Time for some questions about the validity of your tree counts. Please justify your tree counts which show that you aren't counting the same dead trees each year. This could include the maps of areas where your tree counts are made each year. (Request for copies of your maps under the California Public Record Act which show that you agency is not counting the same dead trees each year.)

10) Loggers are likely to take so-called dying trees because they can make a profit. And they will leave everything but the viable wood on the forest floor (and other areas), because they don't chip or remove brush from areas where they have cut unless required by the State to do so.

A) If the California Board of Forestry and Fire Prevention was serious they should require that the regulations in the Forest Practice Rules be followed to make sure that all the dead trees and tree debris in the fire areas is also removed under current Forest Practice Rules.

B) How will these exemptions apply to the special needs of Mendocino and Humboldt counties respectively?

C) Will your agency be working closely with local fire departments and other entities to prevent logging related forest fires? Will your agency be notifying, in advance, local fire departments of logging dates in their respective counties?

11) Is it correct to state that your emergency plan has no protection built into it for protecting areas like the Russian River Watersheds, Eel River Watersheds and other watersheds in Humboldt and Mendocino Counties? Also no protections for wildlife, erosion control, rivers and stream damage, etc. It is an extremely poor State emergency exemption plan from what is known about this plan at this time. Did your agency personally contact any county supervisors about this plan? If so, when were they contacted?

12) Where is the map for the dead and dying tree survey conducted in Mendocino and Humboldt Counties? How many trees are schedule for removal in each of California's counties? (Information requested under the California Public Records Act.) In addition, your emergency plan has no record

of any evaluations of what constitutes your definition of a “dying tree” or whether it is recovering from various impacts and needs to be saved.

13) Will any California Agencies be subsidizing the cost of logging dead and dying trees and removal during your emergency time periods?

14) This letter regarding your proposed emergency logging plan mentions Mendocino and Humboldt counties. Many of these questions should be discussed with regard to unregulated logging exemptions throughout the entire State. I am concerned that certain areas in the State are to be clear cut without public knowledge. How many areas are designated for clear cutting and where are they located in California?

I have great concerns about this Proposed Emergency Logging Plan and I do believe that Mendocino County should have time to assess the possible impacts to our county. (I have raised the issue about Humboldt County because of watershed issues as we have adjacent borders. I hope that the Mendocino County Board of Supervisors will ask questions and also ask for an extension of time for public comment before this emergency plan is implemented.)

Many areas, that have been identified by our own Mendocino County fire departments and other entities, may benefit from this program if it is a well-regulated program which does not allow the logging of old growth Redwoods and other healthy trees. We have many Douglas Fir trees in our coastal region in Mendocino County which are dead trees standing or where the trees have fallen after years of standing dead well-documented in photographs taken since 2002; where these early tree declines were photographed several times a year through June 2015. (Note that we do not believe that all dead trees in our area were caused by drought conditions since historical records show that tree decline in our area has been obvious since 2002/2003. Our photographs are available upon request.

We should be sure that our watershed, forest lands, and other areas are protected from unlimited logging and old growth removal of trees, removal of trees that are in recovery, and that the removal of dead trees, debris, and other fire hazards are not left onsite after logging has taken place.

There are many more questions with regard to your questionable emergency proposal. Once again we feel that a good plan with proper restoration and tree planting needs to be part of this plan once the areas are logged, the dead and dying trees and debris are removed. Restoration needs to be in the plan due to the possibility of flooding rains and erosion problems in some areas. Any plans of sending debris and dead or unwanted trees to waste-to-energy plants should be reconsidered as wood waste does not provide enough heat to power these plants unless it is mixed with toxic materials which burn hot enough to produce power.

We are opposed to your current emergency plan for logging dead and dying trees at this time. And we reiterate our request for an extension of time for public comments and dialog with your agency regarding local plans which need to be addressed by local officials.

Notes on possible areas of needed investigation into tree and entire suites of plant communities in decline that should be investigated by the State of California:

(We also believe that ever-increasing UV and Infrared radiation, documented by the EPA, yearly UV graphs since 1994, has impacted entire suites of tree and shrub species which have been in decline, in some areas, and in Mendocino and Lake Counties for years. It should also be noted that UV Radiation readings in California for the past several weeks have been in the Very High or Extreme range according to EPA Radiation Alerts. If these yearly ever-higher UVA, UVB, UVC, and infrared radiation readings have not been investigated by your agency as a possible cause of tree declines, we encourage your agency to investigate this possible cause of tree deaths and other types of tree declines.) See EPA Link: <http://www2.epa.gov/sunwise/uv-index>



In Mendocino and Lake Counties "...Whether in forestlands, in public parks, along rivers and streams, in watered areas, golf courses or on private property, our trees are showing signs of major health problems or dying in record numbers. In some areas the majority of trees have died and left entire watersheds in jeopardy. Declines are showing up in such species as chamise, ceanothus (buck brush), red bud, laurel, yellow willow, black willow, elderberry, leather oak, black oak, blue oak, interior live oak, walnut, Yerba Santa, Manzanita, and toyon. We have found similar sites in Sonoma County that included live oak, valley oaks, ceanothus, chamise, pears, apples, plums, roses, and a number of ornamentals..." The "...larger question of just exactly why they are all infected, and what it is that could trigger such a broad response to an entire suite of plant communities...remains unanswered..." by Allan Buckmann, Associate Wildlife Biologist, Central Coast Region, California Department of Fish & Game on July 22, 2007. (Note that Mr. Buckmann has since retired. Also note that our photographed Oak Trees in decline in Mendocino and Lake Counties were not in areas infected with Sudden Oak Death.)

Suggested Reading: THE DYING OF THE TREES, by Charles E. Little, Penguin Books – 1995

NASA Quote With Regard to Climate Change Based on their Studies:

NASA October 2005 Newsletter, Page 8 states: "...Clouds are the largest variable controlling Earth's atmospheric temperature and climate. Any change in global cloud cover may contribute to long-term changes in Earth's climate. Contrails, especially persistent contrails, represent a human-caused increase in the Earth's cloudiness, and are likely to be affecting climate and ultimately our natural resources..." http://asd-www.larc.nasa.gov/GLOBE/Count/Oct2005/ConEdNews_p8.pdf

IPCC Report: "Aviation and the Global Atmosphere"

<https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/special-reports/spm/av-en.pdf>
<http://www.ipcc.ch/ipccreports/sres/aviation/>

EPA Jet Fuel Emission Report:

<http://www.epa.gov/oms/regs/nonroad/aviation/r99013.pdf>



“...**NASA scientists** have found that cirrus clouds, formed by contrails from aircraft engine exhaust, are capable of increasing average surface temperatures enough to account for a warming trend in the United States that occurred between 1975 and 1994. According to Patrick Minnis, a senior research scientist at NASA’s Langley Research Center in Hampton, Va., there has been a one percent per decade increase in cirrus cloud cover over the United States, likely due to air traffic. Cirrus clouds exert a warming influence on the surface by allowing most of the Sun’s rays to pass through but then trapping some of the resulting heat emitted by the surface and lower atmosphere. Using a general circulation model, Minnis estimates that cirrus clouds from contrails increased the temperatures of the lower atmosphere by anywhere from 0.36 to 0.54°F per decade...”

<http://earthobservatory.nasa.gov/IOTD/view.php?id=4435>



How Aircraft Emissions Contribute to Warming

Aviation contributes up to one-fifth of warming in some areas of the Arctic – Stanford University Study – Professor Mark Jacobson, a Stanford engineer

<http://www.nature.com/news/2009/091221/full/news.2009.1157.html>

How is increased cloud cover, (from aviation impacts and releases water vapor, a greenhouse gas), impacting tree health in California?

Has the State of California conducted any studies into this issue with regard to tree decline from changing climate caused by aviation and higher UV Radiation impacts?

<http://www2.epa.gov/sunwise/uv-index>



- CC:** Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
 Humboldt County Board of Supervisors
 Sonoma County Board of Supervisors
 Marin County Board of Supervisors
 Sonoma County Water Agency
 Russian River Flood Control & Water Conservation District (Ukiah, CA)
 Ocean Protection Coalition (Fort Bragg, CA)
 California Department of Fish & Wildlife
 Tom Howard, Ca State Water Resources Control Board
 California Department of Fish & Wildlife

July 6, 2015

TO: OAL Reference Attorney
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, CA 95814
staff@oal.ca.gov

Thembi Borrás
Regulations Coordinator
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
P.O. Box 944246
Sacramento CA 944244-
2460
[.ca.gov](mailto:publiccomments@BOF.ca.gov)

publiccomments@BOF

RE: NOTICE OF PROPOSED EMERGENCY ACTION, PURSUANT TO GOV-11346.1(b)
“DROUGHT MORTALITY AMENDMENTS, 2015” Dated June 23, 2015

As a former biologist with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife with experience in weather observation and forestry management practices, and a 13 year researcher on the tree die-offs and drought conditions in California and across the USA, I hereby inform you of my protest against the proposed actions and I recommend denial as proposed and offer the following comments.

The Drought: **ONE: The Governor proclaimed a State of Emergency to exist throughout the state of California due to severe drought conditions. Executive Order B-29-15.**

The decision of emergency drought conditions is based on rainfall and not on actual growth conditions, and is not an accurate description of the situation for many areas of the State.

TWO: From 2014 California Pest Conditions Report, and THREE: The majority of the insect and fungal invasion is not a result of stress from the “declared drought” as it is from periodic high levels of solar burning. The drought is recent but the problem has been occurring on and off for many years with elevated Ultra-violet and Infra-red light intensities which create drought like conditions by burning canopies and accelerating the loss of forest moisture at sporadic intervals. The burns are followed by periods of regeneration, with many trees almost fully recovered. Intense and elevated levels of UV and IR, which are a fact, can be correlated to the burns on the tops of exposed trunks and limbs which have died off several feet leaving dead branches at the ends, similar to freezing.

Many of these trees are considered as “dying trees”, but they are not ... at least in the North Bay Area. While many have died almost immediately, most are recovering. Looking at healthy areas on the sides and portions of the trunks and limbs that are in the shade illustrates solar involvement, since many of these trees are in recovery. This condition is obvious on the trees. It should also be obvious that this condition is responsible for high levels of stress and a clear stress factor for the invasion of insects and fungus.

It is not clear from the aerial surveys whether the trees counted as dead are “in the burn” or are recovering. The proposed plans may be greatly overstated and could completely nullify all of the work that has gone into forest management programs developed over many years for proper timber management, and has the potential to cause serious environmental damage.

Further, implementation of the program would have to wait for better climate conditions due to excessive present fire hazard conditions, so I see no justification whatever to not include this management in existing programs with supplemental evaluations by specific reviews to address streamlining the process for specific projects. It would be more advisable to create a special review team with agency coordination to evaluate situations and recommend specific programs that will not endanger other forest resources.

It should also be obvious that extensive tree tip death is not caused by squirrels or lightning as some propose, since at current levels of overall impacts it would be impossible. What are needed are better forest evaluations by persons who have been following the actual trends and can tell the difference between a dying tree and a recovering tree. Everything has changed with the climate.

North Coast Assessments: Rosalind Peterson and I have been assessing tree health for many years, and completed general surveys of plant conditions observed on driving routes in the North Bay from inland to the coast and it is clear to us that the severe burning has occurred on many years with serious impacts in 2008 when most of the forest looked like it was dying. As with freezing, burning kills branch tips and when and if they recover, do so by massive epicormal sprouting and regrowth. For the past two years, we have witnessed a substantial percentage of trees recovering their canopies and filling in. It is clear that the “declared drought” is not responsible for the die-off. Many recovering trees still have dead branch tips still sticking out in the North Coastal Areas, but they are not “dying trees” but recovering trees. My concern is that these trees will be identified as “dying” and commercially logged, when in fact they constitute the forest reserve. Differing areas may need differing operational plans.

There is also rapid growth of young trees in most of Napa, Lake and Mendocino counties that also question the drought conclusion. There are local exceptions in specific areas such as Lake Mendocino and along an approximately five mile strip along the coast with no to very little recovery and serious levels of dead and down material in the understory. Coastal parks have been cutting many trees in campgrounds which could pose public hazard, but most of the country is “wild” with little danger of trees falling on anyone. These types of sites could be managed by a special “safety crew” when they pose dangers to roadways, buildings, etc.

The proposed regulations clearly do not identify these conditions and leave the impression that major logging is needed to correct the problem based on inaccurate assessment of overall conditions but support the program to allow timber removal without maintaining proper forestry procedures. There are many false and broad assumptions used to support a questionable program and avoid good timber management.

Aside from improper management scenarios presented, the question of the definition of “dying trees” is presently undefined, ambiguous, and misleading. It should be stated as “dying trees that are beyond recovery” (and not just “dying trees”) with known accumulation of fuel loading, with that decision made by reviewing agencies. These evaluations are needed prior to any harvest program since the trees identified as dying due to dead branch tips and tops but are recovering have the greatest logging potential. It is this class of trees that money interests are looking for and probably what is driving this “emergency.”

I do not see private logging companies as sensitive to removal of dead and down material as there are disposal costs and difficult removal and use problems. They generally don’t clean up after themselves and dead wood is difficult to work with and pays nothing. Fire worries about accumulating pine needles are nothing compared to fallen limbs and trees and logging slash.

Further, an emergency declaration would not be implemented until better weather conditions are present and therefore no need to rush this through. The short review period is ridiculous and seems to be intended to force such a program without adequate review.

FOUR: Regulatory Relief for drought Mortality.

“... Trees that die and are left to burn or rot will ultimately result in the release of carbon and other greenhouse gasses during combustion. ..Utilizing logs to create long lasting wood products or utilize logs to produce energy to offset consumption of fossil fuels has direct benefits to the State, which will help meet the goals of Executive Order B-30-15. ...”

- a. Energy generation plants have proven unworkable with wood fuel which generates too little energy, and would add little to offset the consumption of fossil fuels.
- b. It would be difficult to “... provide “retention of the carbon held in the tree in some form of value added product” since dead trees have little added product value other than firewood. The “added product value” is really a clear indication of intentions to give the loggers merchantable and usable timber for these products. If the decision is made a tree is not recovering, then it would meet the requirements, however, if it is recovering it does not.
- c. If the present marginal economic conditions of too many logs for current milling capacity and reduced profits inhibit landowners from pursuing tree removal, how do you propose to meet any of the goals of this program? Is there emergency funding to assist or is this just report filler?

FIVE: Annual Structures loss. Pursuant to GOV § 113342.545 - The call for immediate action.

Since the action cannot be implemented prior to January 1, 2016 under PRC § 4554.5, why the rush to a short review? This makes no sense at all.

OTHER INFORMATION

I protest this change in rules that would remove review by agencies. With their concurrence, there must be ways to streamline the process in many areas, but no good reason to abandon sensitive practice rules, and as proposed, the practice could open up the forests to serious abuse.

The present conditions indicate that better evaluations should be required to identify “dying trees in recovery” from dying trees that are not recovering. To cut trees recovering would be to remove forest integrity. If a cleanup operation is needed for fire control or home protection, it should stick with the removal of dead materials standing and in the understory, with attention to the problem areas. Trees that will not recover are the real fire/damage hazards. Further, many of the internal forest dead trees are habitat for nesting and denning birds, squirrels and other forest wildlife and need to be retained in some percentage.

CLIMATE: Of major concern, are the man-made changes in climate that are not being recognized by any forest manager or government agency, which have increased UV and IR levels and increased plant stress. The primary influences are “Weather Modifications for Profit” which extends across the USA and provides

clients with snow or rain, and “Persistent Jet Contrails” which are worldwide and are modifying the weather.

Both of these influences are moving water resources from their normal patterns to alternate and more chaotic distributions and influencing drought locations and extremes. Both come from a “Rob Peter to Pay Paul” mentality and need major environmental laws and specific review. There are presently no atmospheric regulations whatever other than a nebulous Clean Air Act that does not include testing for metals and other specific contaminants. Both programs are affecting forest resources and our weather in a very chaotic fashion. Most forest managers are ignorant of these programs or deny they exist, and this plan is an example.

Weather for profit or weather modification can provide one area with water or snow, but it takes from other locations that then have drought. There are, presently, more than one hundred “weather for sale” operations that are permitted without any environmental review ... no evaluation of water ownership, no evaluation of related drought, no evaluation of forest and reservoir impacts, and no evaluation of related fire hazard increases. Localized releases of silver nitrate (one of the cloud forming metal nuclei) may bring local rain, but it takes that moisture from other areas. This is really water theft for profit and it alters the climate and stresses the vegetation and impacts everyone. These programs may be having a significant effect on forestry management and most of the related problems.

“Persistent Jet Contrails” have been observed for decades and are seen in the skies by everyone who has looked up. They are called many things and generally discredit the observer to keep them as secret as possible (you really don’t see that elephant in the sky), but NASA states (2005): “Persistent jet contrails form man-made clouds, trap warmth in the atmosphere exacerbating global warming, contribute to long-term changes in Earth’s climate, and affect natural resources.” All of these factors can be seen in forest ecology changes, so it raises a number of questions, including why are they not publically discussed or included in climate models? Everyone should be apprised of this.

My weather observations (13 years of) indicate that persistent jet contrails are present almost daily and turn into High-thin cirrus. Weather science dictates that high-thin cirrus creates a cap on the atmosphere, increases storm intensity, creates a greenhouse effect trapping heat, and increases solar radiation effects and drought conditions in concert with the NASA statement, and are seriously influencing the current climate and forest conditions.

My assessment of jet cloud pollutants were based on fallout from the clouds hitting the Earth, and were made by testing lichens (rhymes with hikin’) to provide the level and type of pollutant in the air and rainwater, and the tests indicate large amounts of Nano-sized metallic particles including aluminum, barium, strontium, lead, and many others are falling from the sky and are not part of the average continental dust exchange. They are ignored because they are so small and hard to see, but they are the silver haze in the sky. They are known to alter forest soil pH to be more basic conditions.

Nano size metallic particles also ionize the air column and create extreme flammability conditions where the air seems to explode. These conditions pose a serious threat to fire fighters (what they are now experiencing) and overall fire intensity. Larger burns also remove many sound trees and promote further forest loss. Metals and associated pH changes need testing to reveal this explosive component and possible soil toxicity for conifer regeneration. The aluminum is changing the soil pH to a more basic condition and below 5.3 is toxic to conifers (Shasta area). This can be checked easily.

Many of the forestry and drought problems would have relief by terminating both “weather for profit” and “persistent jet contrails” programs with efforts toward stabilizing natural climatic conditions. What the real weather might be remains to be seen since these programs are enormous, and where the proposed rules fall apart.

In the interim, forest removal of dead, down and irrecoverable dying trees needs to move forward with someone responsible for the determination of real fire danger and “tree death”, and there is no reason so imperative that this plan should go forward as is without some natural resource protections. The rush on this is overly stated and appears to be politically motivated to put pressure on the agencies under the guise of management. The process could and should be streamlined, but we should not abandon our environmental heritage in the name of fire control, with an increase in timber harvest without review.

The third issue is allowing the poisoning of trees that are left standing now occurring on several forests. This is practice significantly increases forest fire flammability and contrary to good forestry management. It is hard to imagine that these trees are not adding huge fire hazards to an already poor situation and the practice needs to be terminated. We need to return to selective logging/cutting that removes problems while maintaining forest structure.

Respectfully submitted,

Allan Buckmann
Weather Observer, US Air Force
California Department of Fish and Wildlife Biologist, Retired
Researcher

Home Website: California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

<http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/>

Interesting Links:

http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/board_business/binder_materials/

Proposed Rule Packages:

http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/regulations/proposed_rule_packages/

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

Notice of Proposed Emergency Action, pursuant to GOV § 11346.1(b)

“Drought Mortality Amendments, 2015”

Notice Date: June 23, 2015

http://bofdata.fire.ca.gov/regulations/proposed_rule_packages/drought_mortality_amendments_2015

July 5, 2015

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
OAL Reference Attorney
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, California 95814
E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov.

Thembi Borrás, Regulations Coordinator
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 944244-2460
E-Mail: publiccomments@BOF.ca.gov

RE: 1) California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Emergency Regulations for Removal of Dead & Dying Trees-Proposed Emergency Action Public Comments & Questions
2) Public Comment Deadline: July 5, 2015 - Public Comment #2
3) Formal California Public Records Act Requests

To: The California Board of Forestry & Fire Protection, OAL Reference Attorney & Mr. Borrás, Regulations Coordinator.

We are filing a protest against this emergency logging proposal for the following reasons:

- 1) The California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (referred to as Board below), notes in their records that dead and dying trees have been studied and counted in California for years. This includes information that this Board has known about these issues for years and failed to take any prior action even after their tree survey in April 2015, when the fire danger from any logging activities would have been less, if implemented.
- 2) It is required that any forest activities, such as use of chain saws and other motorized equipment, be “severely restricted” during the fire season each year. Thus, the implementation of this emergency action eliminating some forestry rules for fire protection, etc., should not be considered at this time until proper state and county protections are in place which will prevent fire hazards from these type of activities this summer and fall in a severe drought year with limited water supplies and fire fighters across the entire State of California.
- 3) According to OAL emergency rules: “...At least 5 working days before filing with OAL, the state agency must mail and post an emergency Notice...” It is alleged that the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection did not mail and post, in a timely manner an emergency notice to the public, nor to any local elected entities, like cities and counties and their

respective fire protection units, that would be impacted by this emergency notice across the entire state. Therefore, we allege that the July 6, 2015, public comment ending date is invalid.

- A. The emergency notice in Ukiah, California was not posted until June 28, 2015 (Sunday), when it appeared in the Ukiah Daily Journal newspaper. Thus, the notice was not made public in Mendocino County five days prior to the Board filing with OAL on July 1, 2015.
 - B. Since the Board has known about the dead and dying tree situation in California for years it does not seem that this constitutes an “emergency” where some forestry rules and regulations should be exempted from being followed due to extreme fire hazard dangers in California.
 - C. Since the emergency notice appears to include every area in the State of California for logging and tree removal, the elected officials in each county should have been notified of this emergency declaration in order to prepare their local fire protection agencies for this type of logging in their respective counties. We feel that the Board failed to take this action in a timely manner and therefore their public comment deadline should be extended until proper notification is made to all public agencies that would be impacted by this emergency program.
- 4) Under the AOL rules the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection: “... should choose desired effective date and count backwards at least 17 days...” The Board Notice in the Ukiah Daily Journal states: “...The Emergency Rule may be approved as early as July 11th...” (July 11, 2015, is a Saturday. Counting back 17 days was the June 25, 2015, date.)
- A. Notice was not posted in Mendocino County until June 28, 2015. Thus, the notification period is too short to be considered as proper notice.
 - B. Without a map and proper logging plans in place, along with the trees marked, and areas designated for cutting marked in each county, there is inadequate time for each county to prepare for emergency fire protection plans in the areas to be immediately logged.
 - C. Fires are now burning in California beginning to increase the demands on local fire protection agencies. Without prior notification and logging plans in place for each county it is impossible for stressed local agencies to deal with possible fires which may be caused by logging activities of both landowners and loggers under the Board’s emergency rules.
- 5) According to OAL Rules & Regulations: “...During the first 5 days of OAL’s review, the public may submit comments to OAL with a copy to the state agency...” The notice posted in the Ukiah Daily Journal on June 28, 2015, in Mendocino County states: “...regulations will be submitted to the Office of Administrative Law on July 1, and the public comment period will end at 6 P.M. on July 6th...”
- A. It is alleged that this public comment deadline date is invalid as the public should have at least 5 working days to make their public comments or ask questions.

- B. Many government offices in California, at both the state and local levels were closed on Friday, July 3, 2015, to celebrate Independence Day on July 4, 2015.
 - C. It should also be noted that public comments cover working days and do not include weekends and holidays.
 - D. Thus, the public comment period should be extended and notice should be given to all of the 60 counties in California where emergency logging may take place and extra fire protection in those areas proposed for logging can be included in local plans.
- 6) According to OAL Rules and Regulations: "...The agency generally has until the 8th day of OAL's 10-day review to submit rebuttal to any public comments to OAL..." Since the public comment deadline date is flawed (see above information), those agencies wishing to make a public comment may have been denied the ability to make public comments in a timely manner. Thus, OAL should require the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection to extend the public comment period.
- 7) In addition, the following information should be taken into consideration:
- A. In 2007, The US Geological Survey stated: "Tree Deaths in The Sierra Nevada Mountains of California Has Doubled since 1983, stress and diebacks have occurred from Alaska to Mexico, and since 1997, more than 20 Million hectares, or 50 million acres have been affected." The problem is not just local but widespread and related. What factors can produce such a condition? Since 2007, this information has been available to the California Forestry and Fire Protection Board. The Board could have acted at any time to reduce the impacts of dead and dying trees in California at any time...especially in years where logging and forest clean up could have taken place.
 - B. **"Tree Crown Mortality Associated with Roads in the Lake Tahoe Basin: a Remote Sensing Approach"** by Yuanchao Fan, August 2011, suggests other problems which should be considered besides drought in some areas. It should be noted that tree decline and deaths have been noted in the Lake Tahoe Basin and the Sierra Nevada forests for years. Thus, this emergency plan, if implemented, should have not only a county by county plan but be implemented with rules and regulations that minimize the hazards of logging and fires during this drought period, when we have limited water, and firefighting resources. We encourage the OAL to reject this emergency plan by the Board.
http://www.cabnr.unr.edu/weisberg/publications/yfan_thesis.pdf
 - C. We do know that tree death and decline can be from a wide variety of tree problems over various years and not necessarily driven by drought alone. One example is "Elytroderma Disease Reduces Growth and Vigor Increases Mortality of Jeffrey Pines at Lake Tahoe Basin; California". This problem was also noticed on Ponderosa Pine Trees in California. Bark Beetles were also found in this area and contributed to tree decline and mortality.
http://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/documents/psw_rp155/psw_rp155.pdf

The study goes on to state: "...We had expected that the severe drought of 1976-1978 would further weaken the trees and result in increased levels of mortality, particularly among the remaining trees of poor vigor and heavy infection. Result of the study showed this not to be true. The heaviest mortality recorded occurred between June 1974 and June 1976...mortality was caused by continued stress from Elytroderma disease and associated bark beetle activity. Mortality during the prolonged drought in California, summer 1976 to summer 1978, was actually less than that recorded during the pre-drought years...weakening of trees by the disease also predisposes the stand to attack by bark beetles, which further increases mortality and damage..."

- D. The OAL should take into consideration that drought may not be the entire cause of tree decline and death in California, as noted in the above report. Our trees in California have stood in periodic dry, critical, and drought conditions for years, and survived. The consideration that other causes of tree decline such as high and extremely high levels UVA, UVB, UVC, and infrared radiation, diseases, bark beetles, and other conditions should be considered in any decision. Calling this a drought emergency that should suspend some forestry rules and regulations should be inadequate in light of the potential fire hazards and potential of unregulated logging in California.
- E. The trees in Oak woodlands (those not impacted by sudden oak death), of California have lived through in years of historical droughts in California. I have the 100 year rainfall records in Mendocino County for your information which shows periods of time when our area has been in drought conditions from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Lake Mendocino and from local fire departments. This data has not shown that trees have died or are in a dying condition due merely to dry, critical or drought conditions as trees have been dying or in decline from a variety of reasons.
- F. In California periodic droughts have occurred over the past one-hundred years. A study of local rainfall records from various fire departments and others who have kept written records for years, like the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers at Lake Mendocino in Ukiah, can verify this local information. The weather and rainfall cycles in California vary from year-to-year and drought periods can be expected.

8. What has changed in California is the large number of ongoing weather modification programs as listed by NOAA (Maryland Office), in the western states – (See Attached Document). These weather modification programs, whether by PG&E (Pacific Gas & Electric Company), the City of Los Angeles or other private or public entities in California, have the potential to change local micro-climates and weather in the areas in which they are now used. It is clear that there have been no past or recent studies on the impacts of these programs on areas which are deprived of rainfall or snow due to the implementation of these ongoing yearly programs. (Please note the number in California.)

I have attached a letter, regarding both political and legal ramification of small scale weather modification, signed by John H. Marburger, III, Director, Executive Office of the President, Office of Science and Technology Policy, Washington D.C. December 13, 2005, which reads in part:

Local Political & Legal Ramifications

- **Because small scale weather modification (e.g., cloud seeding) may promote rain in one area to the detriment of another, weather modification could result in inter-state (including Indian Tribes) litigation or private citizen litigation against the modification programs.**
- **The legal and liability issues pertaining to weather modification, and the potential adverse consequences on life, property, and water resource availability resulting from weather modification activities, must be considered fully...”**

It should also be noted that other local conditions throughout California may impact tree health and have been for years. This condition means that we should restore our forest lands and other areas to prevent forest fires by following procedures that remove the dead trees and clear away underbrush so that fires have less to burn. These procedures should be used all year long instead of during the hottest months of the year when the fire danger is at its highest and whether the State of California is in a drought or non-drought year.

8) I am formally requesting copies of the following information under the California Public Records Act: **CALIFORNIA GOVERNMENT CODE SECTION 6250-6270**

<http://www.leginfo.ca.gov/cgi-bin/displaycode?section=gov&group=06001-07000&file=6250-6270>

- A. A copy of the formal logging emergency notice (with dates), that was posted and sent out by the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection.
- B. A copy of where the Board posted this logging emergency information and the entire listing of agencies and other entities to whom this information was submitted including dates of notification.
- C. Will this emergency logging plan violate NOAA ESA Rules and Regulations? Were they consulted (either at the national level or California State level), prior to this emergency being declared by the Board? If the appropriate agencies were consulted I am requesting copies of letters of notification and copies of their respective responses to either the Board or OAL.
- D. Was the California Department of Fish and Wildlife notified of this emergency logging plan by the Board? If this agency was consulted I am requesting copies of the Board letters of notification and copies of their respective responses to either the Board or OAL.

- E. Were any county supervisors in the State of California notified of this action? If yes, please provide a listing and date of notification?
 - F. Were any counties contacted with regard to coordinating a plan, in their respective counties, to implement the Board's emergency logging plan? Which ones were contacted, date of contact, and did any of them have time to submit a plan to either OAL or the Board?
 - G. Copies of or links to documents or maps relied upon by Board to declare a logging emergency in the State of California?
 - H. Did the Board provide to OAL the listing of forestry and other rules and regulations that will no longer be in effect once this emergency logging plan is in effect? I would like a copy, or link to, the listing rules and regulations which will no longer be applicable under this emergency logging plan. Also a copy of the Board justification for these exemptions under this emergency.
 - I. What will be the cost to local agencies and fire protection districts for implementation of this emergency plan or any fires that may be started by loggers or homeowners implementing this emergency plan during the summer and fall months while the fire hazard is high? Will the Board be required to reimburse local counties and fire districts for public notification of the rules and regulations of this logging emergency plan? Will the Board be required to reimburse local county and fire districts for fighting any fires caused by this emergency logging plan? Please provide a copy of the costs and what the Board will reimburse local communities, especially to fight any fires, caused by this emergency logging plan.
- 9) Did the California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection file all of the required documents required by the OAL Checklist on Emergency APA Rulemaking? And were they all filed in a timely manner with the appropriate public comment deadlines met? If either or both answers is "no", then what action will OAL take at this time to correct this problem?
- 10) What constitutes an emergency in the State of California? "...'Emergency' means a situation that calls for immediate action to avoid serious harm to the public peace, health, safety, or general welfare..."
- A. The California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection should have implemented a dead tree, authorized dying tree, and debris removal program years ago. In order to reduce the fire hazards this Board should be implementing a complete and comprehensive yearly program to remove dead trees and underbrush using prescribed and already approved practices. Thus, OAL should refuse to approve this logging emergency application by the Board.
 - B. The finding of an emergency should only be required if the problem can be addressed in a short period of time, in a specified area, and is a critical problem with only short-term solutions. The dead and dying tree problem in California has been ongoing for years and will continue into the future.

- C. Solutions should not be on an emergency basis which threatens old growth trees, has the potential to involve massive clearcutting, cutting roads into forest lands which may erode later with normal rainfall patterns, increase destruction of watershed areas, may violate ESA, increases areas subject to erosion from unregulated logging activities, and could possibly increase fire hazards from these activities. Where other tree problems exist, like Bark Beetles and diseases, which may or not be driven by drought, long-range dead tree and debris removal or controlled fires at various times of the year, may be a better plan because it requires that forestry rules and regulations be upheld and will be in effect for a long period of time.
 - D. The California definition of “emergency” in this case is too broad for a logging emergency to be declared when so many other issues exist. We agree that trees in some areas pose a fire safety threat to local communities. However, a statewide unregulated logging plan, that can be extended indefinitely, is not the answer or a solution except in small, selected areas which may or may not help local landowners near forest lands, wild shrubs, and grass areas.
 - E. All of the dead and dying trees, along with debris cannot be removed to ensure public safety between now, during a high fire hazard season, and the end of this year. It would require a massive unregulated logging program due to the scope and number of trees involved.
- 11) It is alleged that the Board “emergency statement” is based only upon expediency, convenience, general public need. Therefore, for the following reasons, this logging program should not be called an emergency except in isolated cases where public safety is paramount.
- A. It clearly is easier for the Board to implement the logging of dead and “so-called” dying trees, if the Board declares an emergency and waive’s normal forestry rules and regulations to implement the program because safety rules and slash removal can be avoided by loggers.
 - B. The Board knew of this problem and had identified it existed years ago and could have implemented programs to reduce this impact years ago. This Board has had plenty of time, even today, to address this issue even in 2013, 2014, and earlier in 2015.
 - C. How does the Board address their failure, to take action on this dead, diseased, and dying tree issue, in previous years or even earlier this year? I would like a copy of their justification for waiting so long to take action under the California Public Records Act.
 - D. Since this emergency is intended to promote fire and public safety has this plan been approved in advance by the State Fire Marshall and Cal-Fire? Please provide copies under the California Public Records Act of their respective approval of this emergency logging plan and the mitigation measures that they will implement, during any logging by homeowners and loggers, to prevent fires while the plan is in effect? If not approved by the State Fire Marshall then is this emergency logging plan as effective as federal standards for such plans?

- E. Is this emergency logging plan readily understandable to homeowners and loggers along with other public agencies? Are there interpretations which are not clear or ambiguous (may have more than one meaning), with regard to implementation of this plan?
- F. In areas impacted by dead, diseased, fungus impaired or dying trees the USDA Forest Service, State of California, the Board, and others are “responsible for the protection of forest health”. The USDA, the State and other agencies are charged to respond to overall changes in forest health threats; to develop prevention, suppression, and restoration strategies; and to provide expert advice on the management of forest insects and diseases. This has been the policy for years.

Has the Board provided to OAL a listing of recent programs and responses to dead, diseased, and dying trees over the past several years in California? If the Board provided a listing of these programs please provide a copy, or link, to us under the California Public Records Act. If there are programs why haven't they been implemented in the past several years? We know from a search of the information on dead, diseased, and dying trees that programs have been developed to reduce the fire hazards and also improve forest health along with many studies on causes and remedies.

- 12) Does this plan clearly designate that healthy green trees will not be cut within the dead and dying tree removal project areas? Does this plan clearly designate and mark the trees in areas which should be cut down and removed? Will individual homeowners, private companies, and loggers be advised of marked areas for cutting trees? If this is clearly designated in the emergency logging plan for each county please provide a copy of this plan under the California Public Records Act.
- 13) The Board also makes the assumption that dying trees cannot recover over time. It is imperative that trees that are in recovery not be logged under this emergency plan. Also it is imperative that recovering trees not be marked for removal so loggers will not cut them down. The Board's emergency logging plan does not cover this set of circumstances.
- 14) What potential forest disturbances will be caused by the Board's unregulated emergency logging plan? It is clear from reading the emergency plan that the Board did not list these potential disturbances, known from previous logging in many areas in California, or is making any attempt to protect these emergency logging areas from these disturbances. This is another reason for OAL to reject this emergency logging plan. Several studies in the Kenai Peninsula, "...found that salvage logging not conducted in a manner specifically to reduce fuels resulted in increased amounts of small fuels..." U.S. Forest Service information.
- 15) Usually dead and dying trees are identified as trees that have certain characteristics like: Dead or fading foliage high in the tree crown (which may or may not be caused by high UV or Infrared Radiation), boring dust in the Bark crevices and at the tree base, and small pitch tubes (globules of pitch) appear on the trunk on the infested trees some of which are noted by the U.S. Forest Service. The Board's emergency logging plan does not appear to define dying trees adequately for implementation of logging by private companies, homeowners or loggers.

If the Board's emergency plan does clearly define "dying" trees please provide a copy under the California Public Records Act.

- 16) Are "Old Growth" trees are being targeted for removal in the Board's emergency logging plan to make logging profitable so that loggers will be interested in this emergency logging plan? Please provide a copy of any Board policies with regard to this emergency plan that either allows or prohibits the logging of "old growth trees". If this plan excludes any mention of "old growth" trees then it must be assumed that the logging of "old growth trees" will be permitted under the plan as a profit motive for loggers. A very limiting definition of "old growth" may allow a tremendous amount of timber to be harvested in some areas. And this may negative current timber harvest plans that have already been approved by various agencies.
- 17) Has the Board determined the diameter of trees that will be allowed to be cut during this emergency program? If, so please provide a copy of this information.
- 18) Has the Board, in identifying all dead and dying trees for removal, designated safety buffers and required the leaving two wildlife snags per logged acre? What type of trees, in various designated logging locations will be left as wildlife snags? Please provide a copy of documents in this emergency logging plan, of areas where there will be designated safety buffers, and wildlife snags left in place.
- 19) Has the board in their emergency logging plan identified the locations where there are categorical exclusions for logging by county or throughout the State as a whole? If so, please provide a copy of these exclusions. Will individual homeowners, private companies, local county agencies, fire protection departments, and others be advised in a timely manner of these exclusions?
- 20) Will anyone, including private homeowners, loggers, and private companies be required to obtain a permit, containing categorical exclusions, to log under this emergency logging plan? If the answer is yes, then I am requesting a copy of this permit.
- 21) What other Board regulations will be implemented to improve Forest Health and reduce risk of high intensity wildfires besides logging?
- 22) Forest lands play a critical role in providing clean water for consumption through watershed areas which should be protected at all costs. Does this Board's emergency logging plan identify by county or statewide these areas and provide protection for these critical areas and limit erosion from logging in these areas? It should be noted that water is becoming scarce and that any emergency logging plan should protect these areas. If yes, please provide a copy of this plan.
- 23) In 2014, according to the Board Notice in the Ukiah Daily Journal, an "estimated 3.3 million trees died" throughout California. The Board noted that over 1 million trees died in 2013. It is unclear if the same dead trees were counted each year during State surveys. And it is unclear if the reason for all of these trees dying is only drought when other impacts like bark beetles

and other pests, climate change, disease, killing trees through the use of herbicides, and other factors may be the long-term past and future ongoing cause.

- 24) It also appears, from the Board's emergency logging plan, that any area of the State of California may be logged. There are no designations of areas which are exempt from logging under this emergency plan. We object to this broad categorization as some areas could be logged without further public notice to local county agencies and the public.

Thus, it is questionable if this action by the Board constitutes a "drought" emergency. Please designate what studies, the Board has presented to OAL, that have been conducted showing that the dead and dying trees, in the past four years, have been killed due to drought in all counties in California. (This request under the California Public Records Act.) It is apparent in studying California rainfall records that many trees have died prior to the start of this latest drought.

The Board's emergency logging plan does not include an understanding of local community conditions and characteristics that may illuminate areas where forest managers and local residents can all take action and suggest plans for their local areas. Local forest and fire prevention knowledge is often higher than assumed by forest managers in distant regional state offices and the California Board of Forest & Fire Protection.

Many research findings suggest that to address large-scale forest health problems, it is vital to understand the complexity of forest social systems as well as the complexity of ecosystems. And since drought may or may not be a factor, relying only on an ongoing emergency logging plan may not be the best answer to California's dead and dying tree problems. Long-term consistently sound plans have already been devised by various state and federal agencies for the removal of dead, diseased trees, slash, and debris in California and in other states.

The requirement that any public comments and responses be received in writing is difficult when the public comment period encompasses a holiday weekend shortening the mailing time for documents to reach OAL and the Board. I am submitting all of the documents, signed and in writing, along with E-Mails, of our public comments by July 6, 2015. Since the public comment period encompasses a holiday weekend, when the Post Office was closed on Saturday, July 4, 2015, the signed letters and documents will be mailed and postmarked on Monday, July 6, 2015. This is another reason for the public comment period to be extended.

We look forward to hearing from you in the near future in writing. If you have any questions or need additional information please contact us.

Sincerely,

Rosalind Peterson
Post Office Box 499
Redwood Valley, CA 95470
(707) 485-7520

CC: Mendocino County Board of Supervisors
501 Low Gap Road, Ukiah, California 95482

U.S. Congressman Jared Huffman
Ukiah District Office, 559 Low Gap Road, Ukiah, CA 95482 - Phone/Fax: (707) 671-7449

California State Senator Mike McGuire
200 South School Street, Suite F, Ukiah, CA 95482; (707) 468-8914

California State Assemblyman Jim Wood
200 South School Street, Suite D, Ukiah, CA 95482; (707) 463-5770

Attachments:

- 1) **Also note UCAR/NCAR listing of Weather Modification Program Map in U.S. & Worldwide which could impact climate and change local weather patterns:**
<http://www2.ucar.edu/news/weather-modification-multimedia-gallery>
- 2) NOAA Listing of Weather Modification ongoing in the Western States in 2014
Note California Listings
- 3) NOAA Listing of Weather Modification ongoing in the Western States in 2013
Note California Listings
- 4) EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT, OFFICE OF SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY
POLICY, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20502
Weather Modification Letter to U.S. Senator Hutchison

December 13, 2005

The Honorable Kay Bailey Hutchison
United States Senator
284 Russell Senate Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

Dear Senator Hutchison:

This letter is in response to S. 517, “the Weather Modification Research and Development Policy Authorization Act of 2005,” reported out by the Senate Committee on Commerce, Science and Transportation on November 17, 2005 (Senate Report No. 109-202). While the Administration recognizes the Committee’s interest in weather modification research and development, there is a host of issues -- including liability, foreign policy, and national security concerns -- that arose in the past and should be adequately considered before the U.S. Government undertakes the coordinated national research program this legislation would require.

The Administration respectfully requests that you defer further consideration of the bill pending the outcome of an inter-agency discussion of these issues that the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) would coordinate – with the Department of Justice on legal issues, with the Department of State on foreign policy implications, with the Departments of Defense and State on national security implications, and with pertinent research agencies to consider the reasons the U.S. Government previously halted its work in this area. At the conclusion of this review, the Administration would report back to you on the results of these discussions so you are fully apprised of all possible issues associated with authorizing a new Federal program on this topic.

Specifically, the Administration believes concerns in the following areas must be better understood:

- *Local Political & Legal Ramifications*
 - Because small scale weather modification (*e.g.*, cloud seeding) may promote rain in one area to the detriment of another, weather modification could result in inter-state (including Indian Tribes) litigation or private citizen litigation against the modification programs.
 - The legal and liability issues pertaining to weather modification, and the potential adverse consequences on life, property, and water resource availability resulting from weather modification activities, must be considered fully before the U.S. Government could take responsibility for this new research program.

- *International and Foreign Policy Implications*
 - Small and large scale (e.g., hurricane) weather modification efforts could benefit the United States to the detriment of other countries (such as Canada or Mexico).
 - Given global weather patterns, whether one country “owns” its weather so as to assert intra-border control with extra-border consequences, must be considered under present international conventions.
 - The manner in which such a program could benefit or harm the present U.S. positions on foreign policy matters, such as global warming/climate change, should also be considered.

- *National Security Implications*
 - The U.S. Government’s previous weather modification programs were part of our Cold War history; restarting them today could promote (possibly hostile) foreign responses.
 - In 1978, the United States became a party to an international treaty banning the use of weather modification for hostile purposes. While modification for peaceful purposes is allowed, whether well-intentioned programs could be considered “hostile” and perceived to violate this ban should be considered.

- *Research Issues*
 - The Department of Commerce’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration’s (NOAA) primary atmospheric and meteorological research focus is on improving weather forecasting, which has proven to save lives and property. NOAA abandoned weather modification activities some time ago in favor of other research areas that more directly relate to the agency’s core mission and responsibilities.
 - Redirecting funding to focus on weather modification can shift funds away from other important programs such as research to improve weather forecasting capabilities for severe weather events and research to better understand climate variability and change.

In addition to discussing these concerns on an interagency basis, and in recognition of your interest in this area, OSTP would be willing to charter a study to address the above issues. This study would be conducted by the Science and Technology Policy Institute (STPI), a federally-chartered research and development center that provides objective, technical advice to OSTP. The study would address the history and current status of weather modification research. Such a study will help us understand the technical position of this field of science, the significance of the issues discussed above, and the field’s historical context.

The Administration requests that you not move forward with your legislative proposal until a better understanding can be developed of the full range of possible implications.

Senator Kay Bailey Hutchison
December 13, 2005
Page 3

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "John Marburger, III". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "John" being the most prominent.

John H. Marburger, III
Director

cc: The Honorable Ted Stevens
Co-Chair
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

The Honorable Daniel K. Inouye
Co-Chair
Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation

A SUMMARY OF WEATHER MODIFICATION ACTIVITIES REPORTED IN 2012*

File No.	Project/State	ST	Months		Agent		Area	Operator	Sponsor	Purpose	Initial Rept.	Inter. Rept.	Final Rept.
			2012	Days	Agl - gms	CO2-lbs.							
11-1527	Western Kansas Mod. Pgm	KS					6,766	Western KS Groundwater	Western KS Groundwater	Hail Suppress.	Y		
11-1528	Northeast Nevada	NV	Jan-Apr	27	20,177		3,000	Desert Research Institute	Southern NV Water Authority	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1529	Walker Basin Project	NV	Jan-Apr	16	12,361		3,000	Desert Research Institute	Desert Terminal Lakes Program	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1530	Tahoe-Truckee	NV	Jan-Apr	35	28,038		1,240	Desert Research Institute	Truckee River Fund	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1531	Southern/Central Utah	UT	Jan-Apr	28	49,520		10,000	North American Weather	Utah Water Resources Development	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1532	High Uintas	UT	Jan-Apr	24	10,464		1,000	North American Weather	Duchesne County Water Conser.	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1533	Alta and Snowbird	UT	Nov-Dec	8	1,176		10	North American Weather	Alta Ski Lifts Company	Augment Snow	Y	Y	
11-1534	Northern Utah	UT	Jan-Apr	21	14,216		1,250	North American Weather	Cache County	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1535	Clark County	ID	Jan-Mar	28	21,259		2,850	Clark County	Clark County	Augment Snow	Y		Y
11-1536	Telluride Ski Area	CO	Jan-Mar	19	7,617		500	Western Weather Consultants	SW Water Conservation Dist	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1537	Purgatory/W. San Juan	CO	Jan-Mar	21	9,351		600	Western Weather Consultants	SW Water Conservation Dist	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1538	Eastern San Juan Program	CO	Jan-Feb	8	5,248		800	Western Weather Consultants	SW Water Conservation Dist	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1539	Central CO Program	CO	Jan-Feb	23	12,201		100	Western Weather Consultants	Vail Associates, Inc.	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1540	DWD/Upper Ark. Program	CO	Jan-Apr	34	49,405		8,000	Western Weather Consultants	Denver Water Department	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1541	Upper American River	CA	Jan-Apr	23	35,760		190	Weather Modification, Inc.	Sacramento Municipal Utility District	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1542	Upper Payette River Basin	ID					938	Idaho Power Company	Idaho Power Company	Prec. Enhance	Y		
11-1543	Wind River River	WY	Jan-Apr	11	14,700		1,247	Weather Modification, Inc.	State of Wyoming	Snowpack	Y		
11-1544	Wyoming Weather Mod.	WY	Jan-Mar	22	8,340		50	Weather Modification, Inc.	Wyoming Water Dev. Office	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1545	Mokelumne	CA	Jan-Apr	22	20,818		170	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Pacific Gas and Electric Co.	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1546a	Kings River	CA	Jan-May	16	12,803		2,225	North American Weather Const.	Kings River Conservation District	Aug. Precip	Y		Y
11-1546b	Lake Almanor	CA	Jan-Apr	12	20,662		500	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Pacific Gas and Electric Co.	Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1547	Gunnison River Basin	CO	Jan-Apr	20	14,960		3,000	North American Weather Const.	Gunnison County	Aug. Snowpack	Y		Y
11-1548	Santa Barbara & San Luis	CA	Jan-Apr	9	6,750		200	North American Weather Const.	Santa Barbara County Water Agcy.	Aug. Rainfall	Y		Y
12-1550	SW Texas Rain Enhan.	TX					9,133	SW Texas Rain Enhancement	SW Texas Rain Enhancement	Rain En/Hail Supp	Y		
12-1551	W. Texas Weather	TX	Mar-Oct	44	15,148		9,900	W. Texas Weather Mod. Assoc.	W. Texas Weather Mod. Assoc.	Rain Enhance.	Y		Y
12-1552	W. Kansas Weather	KS	Apr-Sept	18	11,409	282	6,766	W. Kansas Groundwater Mgmt.	W. Kansas Groundwater Mgmt.	Hall Suppress	Y		Y
12-1553	N.D. Cloud Mod. District I	ND	Jun-Aug	32	29,652		1,416	Weather Modification, Inc.	ND Atmospheric Resource Board	Rain Enhance	Y		Y
12-1554	N.D. Cloud Mod District II	ND	Jun-Aug	42	110,202	4,768	8,953	Weather Modification, Inc.	ND Atmospheric Resource Board	Rain Enhance	Y		Y
12-1555	PGCD Precipitation	TX	Apr-Sept	26	20,040	2,000	6,378	Panhandle Groundwater	Panhandle Ground Water	Rain Enhance	Y		Y
12-1556	Stanislaus	ND	Jan-May	24	31,820			Weather Modification, Inc.	Weather Modification, Inc.		Y		Y
12-1557	Upper Tuolumne	ND	Jan-Mar	25				Weather Modification, Inc.	Weather Modification, Inc.		Y		Y
12-1558	Tahoe-Truckee	NV	Nov-Dec				1,030	Desert Research Institute	Truckee Meadows Water	Augment Snow	Y		
12-1559	Walker Basin	NV	Nov-Dec				1,360	Desert Research Institute	Desert Terminal Lakes Program	Augment Snow	Y		
12-1560	Northeast Nevada	NV	Nov-Dec				2,400	Desert Research Institute	Southern NV Water Authority	Augment Snow			
12-1561	Mokelumne	CA	Nov	3	2,118		170	Pacific Gas & Electric Co.	Pacific Gas and Electric Co.	Augment Rain	Y	Y?	
12-1562	Alta and Snowbird	UT	Oct-Dec				10	North American Weather Consult.	Alta Ski Lifts Company	Snowpack	Y		
12-1563	High Uintas	UT	Nov-Dec				2,000	North American Weather Consult.	Duchesne County Water Conserv.	Snowpack	Y		
12-1564	Western Uintas	UT	Dec				600	North American Weather Consult.	Weber Basin Water Conservancy	Snowpack	Y		
12-1565	Northern Utah	UT	Dec				1,250	North American Weather Consult.	Cache County, Utah	Snowpack	Y		
12-1566	Kings River	CA	Nov-Dec				2,225	North American Weather Consult.	Kings River Conservation Dist.	Augment Precip.	Y		
12-1567	Clark County	ID	Nov-Dec				3,170	Clark County	Clark County	Augment Snow	Y		
12-1568	Stanislaus Weather Mod.	CA	Nov-Dec				74	Weather Modification, Inc.	Northern California Power Agency	Incr. Precip.	Y		
12-1569	Upper Tuolumne River	ND	Feb-Mar	3	3,850			Weather Modification, Inc.	Weather Modification, Inc.				
12-1570													
12-1571	Upper American River	CA	Nov-Dec				190	Weather Modification, Inc.	Sacramento Municipal Utility Dist.	Inc. Snowpack			
12-1572	Eastern San Juan Program	CO	Nov-Dec				800	Western Weather Consultants	SW Water Conservation District	Winter Snowpack	Y		

*Final reports are required for confirmation of project occurrence during the calendar year.

A SUMMARY OF WEATHER MODIFICATION ACTIVITIES REPORTED IN 2014*

File No.	Project/State	ST	Months		Agent		Area (Sq. Mi.)	Operator	Sponsor	Purpose	Initial Rept.	Inter. Rept.	Final Rept.
			2014	Days	Agl - gms	CO2-lbs.							
12-1579	Upper Payette River	ID	Nov-Dec	9	27,524		938	Idaho Power Company	Idaho Power Company	Prec. Inhance.	Y		Y
13-1590	Eastern San Juan Program	CO	Jan-Apr	13	11,426		800	Western Weather Consultants	Eastern San Juan Program	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1591	Telluride Ski Area	CO	Jan-Apr	21	10,817		500	Western Weather Consultants	Telluride Ski & Golf Company	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1592	Purgatory/West. San Juan	CO	Jan-Apr	22	16,530		600	Western Weather Consultants	SW Water Conservation District	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1593	Central Colorado Program	CO					100	Western Weather Consultants	Vail Associates, Inc.	Snowpack	Y		
13-1594	CO Mountain River Basin	CO	Jan-Apr	33	44,303		8,000	Western Weather Consultants	Denver Water Department	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1595	Clark County, Idaho	CO					3,170	Marty & Conni Owen	Clark County	Augment Snow	Y		
13-1596	Upper American River	CA	Jan-Apr	22	62,690		190	Weather Modification, Inc.	Sacramento Municipal Utility Dist.	Augment Snow	Y		Y
13-1597	Walker Basin	NV	Jan-May	15	22,266		1,360	Desert Research Institute	US Bureau of Reclamation	Snowfall	Y		Y
13-1599	Tahoe-Truckee	NV	Jan-May	24	17,987		1,030	Desert Research Institute	Truckee Meadows Water	Snowfall	Y		Y
13-1600	Santa Barbara & San Luis	CA	Jan-Apr	11	2,265		200	North American Weather Consult.	Santa Barbara County Water Agency	Winter Rainfall	Y		Y
13-1601	Southern & Central Utah	UT	Jan-Apr	18	14,634		10,000	North American Weather Consult.	Utah Water Resources Dev. Co.	Winter Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1602	Boise River, Idaho	ID	Jan-Apr	24	9,512		3,500	North American Weather Consult.	Boise Project Board of Control	Winter Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1603	Lake Almanor	CA	Feb-Apr	10	17,867		500	Pacific Gas & Electric	Pacific Gas & Electric	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1604	Mokelumne	CA	Jjan-Apr	17	19,555		170	Pacific Gas & Electric	Pacific Gas & Electric	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1605	Medicine Bow/Sierra Madre	WY	Jan-Apr	15	12,158		50	Weather Modification, Inc.	Wyoming Water Dev. Office	Snowpack	Y		
13-1606	Wind River Range	WY	Jan-Mar	12	13,755		1,247	Weather Modification, Inc.	Wyoming Water Dev. Office	Snowpack	Y		
13-1607	Kings River	CA	Jan-Apr	18	12,824		2,225	North American Weather Consult.	Kings River Conservation District	Increase Precip	Y		Y
13-1608	High Uintas	UT	Jan-Apr	25	6,002		2,000	North American Weather Consult.	Duchesne County Water Conserv.	Incr. Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1609	Northern Utah	UT	Jan-Mar	19	11,370		1,250	North American Weather Consult.	Cache County, Utah	Incr. Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1610	Alta & Snowbird	UT					10	North American Weather Consult.	Alta Ski Lifts Company	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1611	Western Uintas	UT	Jan-Mar	19	6,378		600	North American Weather Consult.	Weber Basin Water Conservancy	Snowpack	Y		Y
13-1612	Upper Payette River	ID					938	Idaho Power Company	Idaho Power Company	Prec. Enhance.	Y		
13-1613	Gunnison River Basin	CO	Jan-Apr	25	14,578		3,000	North American Weather Consult.	Gunnison County	Augment Snow	Y		Y
13-1614	Stanislaus Weather	CA					74	Weather Modification, Inc.	Northern California Power Agency	Incr. Precip.	Y		
13-1615	Walker River Basin	NV	Jan-Mar	12	19,920		TBD	Weather Modification, Inc.	Desert Research Institute	Incr. Precip.	Y		Y
14-1616	West Texas Weather Mod.	TX	Apr-Oct	40	8,262		9,900	West Texas Weather Mod	West Texas Weather Mod	Rain Enhance.	Y		Y
14-1617	Western Kansas Weather	KS	Apr-Sep	22	2,486		2,303	W.Kansas Groundwater	W. Kansas Groundwater	Hail Suppress.	Y		Y
14-1618	PGCD Enhancement Prog.	TX	Apr-Jul	10	11,040		6,378	PGCD	PGCD	Rain Enhance.	Y	Y	
14-1619	ND Cloud Mod. District I	ND	Jun-Sep	28	29,709		1,416	Weather Modification, Inc.	N.D. Atmospheric Resource Board	Rain Enhance.	Y		Y
14-1621	ND Cloud Mod. District II	ND	June-Sep	42	87,049	2,755	8,953	Weather Modification, Inc.	N.D. Atmospheric Resource Board	Rain Enhance.	Y		
14-1622	Kaweah River Cloud	CA					828	RHS Consulting, Ltd.	Kaweah Delta Water Conservation	Precip. Increase	Y		
14-1623	Upper American River	CA	Nov-Dec	8	35,620		190	Weather Modification, Inc.	Sacramento Municipal Utility Dist.	Increase Precip	Y		
14-1624	Wind River Range	WY					180	Eden Valley Irrigation	Eden Valley Irrigation	Increase Precip	Y		
14-1625	Clark County, Idaho	ID					3,170	Marty & Conni Owen	Clark County	Augment Snow	Y		
14-1626													
14-1627													
14-1628	Eastern San Juan Program	CO					800	Western Weather Consultants	Southwestern Water Conservation	Snowpack	Y		
14-1629	Central Colorado	CO					100	Western Weather Consultants	Vail Associates	Snowpack	Y		
14-1630	Central Colorado Mountain	CO					8,000	Western Weather Consultants	Denver Water Department	Snowpack	Y		
14-1631	Kings River	CA	Dec	4	3,791		2,225	North American Weather Con.	Kings River Conservaiton District	Increase Precip	Y	Y	
14-1632	High Uintas	UT	Nov-Dec	11	4,948		2,000	North American Weather Con.	Duchesne County Water District	Increase Snow	Y	Y	
14-1633	Northern Utah	UT	Dec	7	5,206		1,250	North American Weather Con.	Cache County, Utah	Increase Snow	Y	Y	
14-1634	Alta & Snowbird	UT	Nov-Dec	12	1,824		10	North American Weather Con.	Alta Ski Lifts Company	Increase Snow	Y	Y	
14-1635	Mokelumne	CA					170	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Snowpack	Y		
14-1636	Lake Almanor	CA					500	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Pacific Gas & Electric Company	Snowpack	Y		
14-1637	Stanislaus Weather	CA					74	Weather Modification, Inc.	Northern California Power Agency	Increase Precip	Y		
14-1638	Upper Toulumne Weather	CA					1,615	Weather Modification, Inc.	Turlock & Modesto Irrigation	Increase Precip	Y		
14-1639	Santa Barbara & San Luis	CA	Nov-Dec	6	345		200	North American Weather Con.	Santa Barbara County Water Agen.	Augment Precip	Y	Y	
14-1640	Gunnison River Basin	CO	Nov-Dec	12	9,592		3,000	North American Weather Con.	Gunnison County, Colorado	Augment Snow	Y	Y	
14-1641	Southern & Central Utah	UT	Nov-Dec	12	15,982		10,000	North American Weather Con.	Utah Water Resources	Augment Snow	Y	Y	
14-1642	Wyoming Weather Mod	WY					1,247	Weather Modification, Inc.	State of Wyoming	Increase Snow	Y		
14-1643	Western Uintas	UT	Dec	5	3,198		600	North American Weather Con.	Weber Basin Conservatory	Increase Snow	Y	Y	
14-1644	West Central Mountains	ID					424	Idaho Power Company	Idaho Power Company	Precip/Snow	Y		

*Final reports are required for confirmation of project occurrence during the calendar year.

July 6, 2015

California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
OAL Reference Attorney
300 Capitol Mall, Suite 1250
Sacramento, California 95814
E-mail: staff@oal.ca.gov.

Thembi Borrás, Regulations Coordinator
Board of Forestry and Fire Protection
Box 944246
Sacramento, CA 944244-2460

E-Mail: publiccomments@BOF.ca.gov

RE: 1) California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection Emergency Regulations for Removal of Dead & Dying Trees-Proposed Emergency Action Public Comments & Questions

2) Public Comment Deadline: July 6, 2015 - Public Comment #3

3) California Timber Harvest Plans & Lack of Public Hearings

To: The California Board of Forestry & Fire Protection, OAL Reference Attorney & Mr. Borrás, Regulations Coordinator.

It has come to my attention that there are timber harvest plans in California at this time. In addition, some of these plans may be ongoing, in negotiations, and upcoming in the next few months.

This raises many questions about the proposed Emergency Removal of Dead & Dying Trees in California:

- 1) Will ongoing timber harvest plans become invalid with this emergency declaration?
- 2) Will current negotiations of timber harvest plans be put on hold while the emergency is in effect?
- 3) Will this stop all homeowners, counties, loggers, from having to implement timber harvest plans under the old rules as they could now harvest under this emergency plan?
- 4) Why would homeowners and timber harvesters submit a timber harvest plan if one can log or clear cut areas under this emergency plan?

I am concerned that this could completely undermine the incentive for the State to negotiate timber harvest plans in many areas, if not all of California.

- 5) How will this emergency proposal modify this plan? “Modified Timber Harvesting Plan Amendments, 2013” Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR): Division 1.5, Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 2 – Timber Harvesting Plan - January 8, 2013
 - A. There may be other new adopted rules and regulation formulated since 2013. If so, please advise on what impact the proposed emergency plan will have on the new timber harvest rules and regulations.
 - B. What happens when CEQA requirements are no longer met under this proposed emergency plan?
- 6) Does this proposed emergency plan undermine forest protection, soil protection, fish and wildland protections, and the quality of water resources by either polluting or eliminating watersheds that provide water to residents of California?
- 7) What impact will this proposed emergency plan have on riparian areas in California?
- 8) Will this proposed emergency plan undermine current road rules for timber harvesting?
- 9) What impact will this proposed emergency plan have on rivers and streams? Will it increase turbidity in some areas?
- 10) What impact will this proposed emergency plan have on fish?

It is clear from reading this emergency proposal that no environmental protections will be in place during emergency logging. There is no need for this emergency proposal at this time.

In addition, it astounds us that your respective agencies don't have to respond to any public comments, by anyone, submitted at this time. This process whereby the public, other California agencies, and elected officials is not well-served without a public hearing process. And the lack of response to comments means that there is no process whereby various points of view, research and studies, or other ideas can be brought forward to protect California forest lands and stop unnecessary logging and destruction of watersheds from clear cut logging under this proposed emergency plan.

Sincerely,

Ava Peterson
Rosalind Peterson
Post Office Box 499
Redwood Valley, CA 95470
(707) 485-7520

From: [OAL Reference Attorney](#)
To: Borras_Thembj@BOF
Subject: FW: Comments "Drought Mortality Amendments, 2015"
Date: Tuesday, July 07, 2015 1:09:53 PM

From: BC [mailto:omni@mcn.org]
Sent: Monday, July 06, 2015 2:20 PM
To: OAL Reference Attorney; "pubiiccomments(a"@BOF.ca.gov
Cc: Environment List; Announce List; Discussion List
Subject: Comments "Drought Mortality Amendments, 2015"

To: California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection staff@oal.ca.gov

Re: Comments "Drought Mortality Amendments, 2015"

Reference:

Board of Forestry and Fire Protection

"Drought Mortality Amendments, 2015"

Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (14 CCR):

Division 1.5, Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, Article 2 -Timber Harvesting Plan

Amend

§ 1038. Exemption.

§ 1052.1. Emergency Conditions.

<http://www.oal.ca.gov/res/docs/pdf/emergencies/new%20emergencies/2015-0701-02E.pdf>

Comment:

As the intent of this "emergency rule making" is to reduce the forest fire danger and to improve the health of our forests, the following actions are necessary to improve/maintain the health and safety of our forests:

1. Chemically killing undesired trees and leaving them to collapse into the forest floor must be prohibited during the time of drought and replaced with mechanical removal and reduction. Such practices increase fire danger for 7-10 years.
2. Harvesting must be reduced from disruptive majority to healing minority. Current harvest practice leaves "slash" accumulations that dramatically increases fire danger. This fire danger increase is proportional to cut percentage in fuel availability and additionally in water available via condensation from coniferous trees.

General comments:

1. This rule making derives from a technically insufficient basis and appears to be unresponsive to the need for public oversight; it requires open public oversight to avoid a politically cynical attitude to pervade the public consciousness.
2. This rule making offers neither controls nor data management necessary to certify forest or community safety process as in the Forest Practice Act.
3. As this rule making modifies the forestry practice and safety of the entire state of California, a week long comment period is insufficient for public comment and improvement of this epic rule making.
4. Please extend this comment period for at least 30 days to allow a just and publicly involved process.

BC Macdonald Community Activist

Albion, CA 95410-0069

CC: Community/Environmental Media/Lists, Concerned Individuals and Organizations, Mendocino BOS