



The Log of the Central Coast Forest Association

Volume 13, Issue 2

October 2013

CCFA INTERVIEWS TWO NEW SUPERVISORS

By Cate Moore

Santa Cruz County has two freshman supervisors for the first time in many years. CCFA interviewed Bruce McPherson and Zach Friend to ask how they were settling in and get a feel for their views of what the County's most pressing problems are.

CCFA talked to Bruce McPherson first, after the election was finally settled and he had had a chance to get his feet wet. One of the first things he did was to get to know his fellow supervisors. He invited Greg Caput of Watsonville for a tour of the San Lorenzo Valley. They took a day to travel up and down the Fifth District, where Bruce pointed out the local problems and shared local history. Greg Caput found the trip very enlightening, and he returned the favor, taking Bruce on a field trip of the south of the County. Bruce also found his tour very informative.



Bruce McPherson

Bruce has also been attending town meetings up and down the San Lorenzo Valley, where the twenty-year-old town plans are getting dusted off and revamped. He reports the local residents are very enthusiastic about getting these plans back on track and he sees his role as an expediter who gets the right people connected to each other and talking.

He would like to use the large number of tourists who pass through the valley to visit the state parks and attractions like Roaring Camp as a springboard for new businesses. He feels if the infrastructure is improved between the parks and the town centers, there will be an increase in visitors using our restaurants and coffee shops and shopping for regional goods.

We caught up with Zach Friend in July. He has been cautiously getting into the swing of things, spending his first few months primarily observing how things work. He remarks that the hardest part of his job is voting yes or no on a motion that has a large number of shades of gray.

He finds that the financial situation in the County is its biggest challenge. He reports that Santa Cruz County gets back only 13 cents of every dollar of property tax collected from the State, and with this money they must fund all the state



Zach Friend

mandates. He also says that opting out any of the mandates due to lack of funds is not an option. Any money coming from the state is contingent upon ALL mandates being done, so the counties are over a barrel. He says one of the biggest financial burdens facing the County is the large increases in the cost of medical insurance for their employees.

He also wants to see economic development in the County and is backing a thrust to upgrade the County's high-tech infrastructure to attract the sort of businesses that typically reside in Silicon Valley.

Other Santa Cruz County needs include water and solid waste disposal. Santa Cruz County residents have done an excellent job conserving water; the water use is less than that recorded in 1976, but there have been no new water supplies developed in decades and the population is growing. A large part of Santa Cruz waste gets recycled, but some things just can't be, so we will always need a dump. Current estimates say there are fifteen to twenty years left in the Buena Vista Dump. ■

CCFA MEMBERS ATTEND CALIFORNIA FORESTERS ASSN. CONVENTION

By Barbara McCrary

On Friday, August 23, the California Society of American Foresters met at the Swanton Pacific Ranch, north of Davenport, CA for an executive meeting. That evening, the social featuring a tri-tip BBQ was held at the Al Smith house on part of the 3,300 acre ranch given to Cal Poly State University Foundation by the late Al Smith.

CCFA members seen there were Don and Brian Campbell, Walt Haines, Ron DeBenedetti, Marty McCormick, Lud McCrary, Ellen Rinde, Nadia Hamey, and perhaps some I didn't chance to talk to.

Keynote speaker, local historian and professor emeritus of Cabrillo College, Sandy Lydon, gave the audience an extensive history of Pescadero, San Mateo County, Mexican Land grants, statehood, the readjustment of the boundaries of Santa Cruz and San Mateo Counties due to their geography, the history of sawmills, tourism, and the creation of the Butano Canyon "subdivision." Sandy had spent his summers in the canyon as a

CSAF (Continued on page 2)

CSAF (Continued from page 1)

youth and is intimately acquainted with the area. At one time, some 11,000 acres of untouched timber stood there and the State had an opportunity to buy it for a park. This did not materialize, so the owners proceeded to log it extensively in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Since the current logging practices of the southern sub-district were not yet devised and in place, the steep land was heavily harvested and the land badly scarred by skid roads. This came as a horrible shock to Sandy and his friend, Marty McCormick, whose grandfather had created the Butano summer home lots. Sandy and Marty spent the summers of their youth in the Butano Canyon, fishing, swimming, and building tree houses.

In the following years, another, more thoughtful company, leased the harvesting rights from the property owner, and did periodic harvesting that left the land able to recover rapidly and grow trees quickly. The land is now in newer private ownership and 300 some-odd acres of the lower Butano Canyon, with its several waterfalls (at least six impressive ones and some smaller ones) have been made a conservation area to retain the beauty and integrity of the trees and waterfalls for the Butano residents.

On Saturday, The group attended several talks by experts in their individual fields: Brian Dietherick, manager of the Swanton Pacific Ranch, on introducing the purpose and function of the ranch, highlighting its timber production; Dale Holderman, RPF, on the History of Working Forests and Selection Silviculture; Rich Sampson, Calfire, on Forest Practice Regulation in the Southern Subdistrict. The attendees were then loaded into vans and driven into SP Ranch's forest area, with talks by Doug Piirto, Cal Poly-SLO forestry department, on Silviculture at Swanton, NTMP Review, and Big Tree Management; Paul Ringgold, Peninsula Open Space Trust, on the Cemex Property and Forest Management Planning, and Terry Corwin, Santa Cruz County Land Trust, on its involvement on decisions for the future of Cemex property, including its timber property. The Cemex property adjoins Swanton Pacific Ranch, sharing a lengthy boundary.

The attendees had a lovely 3/4 mile hike on a wooded trail to the confluence of the North and South branches of Little Creek, where resource persons Doug Piirto, Brian Dietherick, RPF Nadia Hamey, and RPF Steve Auten spoke on watershed studies done there and various aspects of the SPR forest's recovery from the 2009 Lockheed fire. Helge Eng, Calfire, led a discussion of the Soquel Demonstration Forest. All boarded the vans for transport to College Station, where box lunches were served and attendees rode on the SPRR 3/4 scale train. Ed Carnegie, Cal Poly Engineering Dept. and manager of the SPRR, had the train stop on the bridge over Scotts Creek and he told us about the issues with the tracks—the washouts during high water, the restoration of the rails, and the extensive efforts to stabilize the creek banks to prevent further erosion during flood years.

The train ride was cut short by the discovery of a large bay laurel tree that had fallen across the tracks, and no one aboard had a chainsaw. The train returned to College Station for the next event: transport to the Purdy Ranch up Scotts Creek, where RPFs Janet Webb and Nadia Hamey discussed Selection Forest Management Strategies. Yiwei Wang, a Phd candidate at UC Santa Cruz, presented information of Wildlife and Habitat Fragmentation, gathered from her studies of local mountain lion

populations.

This concluded the event, and all were transported back to the Swanton Pacific Ranch for adjournment.

From this editor's viewpoint, and as a 63-year resident of Swanton, I found there was still much to learn. It was a weekend well spent. ■



FIRE TAX HEARING SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER 21ST

At the same time over 800,000 Californians are now receiving their second round of fire tax bills, the State's lawyers are delaying resolution of our lawsuit, which argues the fire "fee" is really an unconstitutional tax.

In July, a judge ruled our lawsuit could proceed despite the State's objections and allowed us to file an amended complaint. Now, rather than answering our complaint, the State has instead filed another demurrer, a type of motion that asks the court to dismiss the case without even hearing any evidence.

In fact, in a move that could draw out litigation even longer, the State is raising new objections not put forward in their previous demurrer.

The hearing is open to the public. If you plan to attend, please arrive a little early, dress appropriately, be quiet and respectful in the courtroom, and turn your cell phone off. If you have a "Burned by the Fire Tax" tee shirt, feel free to wear it. If you want a tee shirt, you can pick one up from our office at 921 Eleventh Street, Suite 1201, Sacramento. Here are the details for the hearing:

Date: Thursday, November 21, 2013

Time: 9:00 a.m.

Place: Dept. 14, Sacramento Superior Court, 720 Ninth St., Sacramento

Remember, a lawsuit is a slow process, and a full resolution can sometimes take years. However, we are making important progress in our fight to protect the rights of taxpayers against this unfair fire tax.

We've added the latest news about the fire tax to our website! Visit the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association's special site <http://firetaxprotest.org/> dedicated to keeping you informed with the fire tax information you need to know. ■

Update from the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association:

As you know, the Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association is in the process of suing the state, asking the court to order refunds of what we believe to be an illegal tax.

We have been urging those paying the tax (the state calls it a "fee") to appeal the fee by filing a Petition for Redetermination. If HJTA is victorious in court, it will be easier to secure refunds for those who have filed the Petition for Redetermination.

Until now, we have been advising those who filed the Petition after receiving last year's bill that it would not be necessary to file again when paying this year's bill.

While we believe our recommendation to be correct, a Cal Fire Public Relations Representative is saying that people should

send in a Petition for Redetermination for this year's bill, even if they filed previously. ■

NEW INVASIVE MOSQUITOS IN CALIFORNIA

An article in the Santa Cruz Farm Bureau's newsletter, *Between the Furrows* - August 2013, alerted us that there are two recently discovered varieties of exotic mosquitos in the state. So far, *Aedes aegypti* and *Aedes albopictus* have only been found in southern California. *Aedes aegypti* has settled in Los Angeles County and *Aedes albopictus* has been detected in Fresno County, and Madera County. They have not yet been detected in Santa Cruz County.

Most of our native mosquitos bite from dusk to dawn, but these new invaders are aggressive daytime biters. They are small black and white insects with white banding on their legs. They can breed in even tiny amounts of water, such as the water held in a paper cup, and the eggs will remain viable for a long time after their reservoir has dried, waiting until it is re-flooded to hatch.

What can you do?

Report any mosquito bites received in daylight hours to the Vector Control District

Use repellents

Eliminate standing water and potential containers

For more information, visit www.agdept.com

PLF CHALLENGES CAP AND TRADE IN COURT

By Cate Moore

For the last few years, the California Air Resources Board has been making rural lives miserable with the diesel regulations that have been threatening to make most of our equipment fleets illegal. They have been busy bees in other areas, too. One of the biggest business-suppressing schemes they have going is carbon credits, or "cap and trade" scheme. Forestry has mostly been involved with the "carbon source" side of the picture; some of the state's biggest employers, including our largest energy producers, dairies, produce packagers and loggers are stuck on the other side, being forced to either purchase carbon credits or pull out of the state.

Pacific Legal Foundation is challenging the legality of the California "cap and trade" carbon market scheme on the basis that it is a tax, not a regulatory fee.

Regulatory fees must reflect the actual costs of the regulatory agencies in processing permits and doing inspections. These funds remain within the jurisdiction of the agency as the funds supporting its cost of doing business.

Cap and Trade accounting does not reflect this. Instead, the money goes to the general fund and the fees are not matched to CARB expenses or any other costs in administration. These are the attributes of a tax.

To be legal, taxes in California must:

- 1) originate within the legislature
- 2) pass both houses with a 2/3 majority

Cap and trade does not meet these criteria. It was developed within the California Air Resources Board. CARB claims they are merely implementing a greenhouse gas reduction under AB 32, but AB 32 does not authorize an auction whose proceeds go to the general fund, and even if it did, AB 32 did not pass by 2/3.

Find out more at <http://www.pacificlegal.org> ■

SEEING THE FOREST THROUGH THE TREES

By Greg Walcher, Guest Commentary, Denver Post, Sept 9, 2013

http://www.denverpost.com/opinion/ci_24053714/seeing-forest-through-trees

Voltaire once wrote that "men argue; nature acts." We are seeing that action in catastrophic forest fires across the western United States, while land managers, politicians, lobbyists, foresters and environmentalists continue to argue.

We watch the news about these unprecedented wildfires burning forests and destroying homes, but a central fact is rarely mentioned: These fires are not natural. They are caused by mismanagement of the forests. In fact, our generation has all but stopped the professional management of our national forests, and we are witnessing the disease, death, collapse and burning of billions of trees covering millions of acres of previously healthy forest lands.

Some of these devastated landscapes will not recover their former beauty in our lifetimes, and some will never again provide the same habitat for wildlife, or the same high-quality water supply they once did.

For centuries, the forests of North America enjoyed a state of natural balance, which is easily upset when people and cities also inhabit the land. So our job as good stewards is to mimic the role of nature as closely as possible, to maintain the most "natural" conditions possible. We have failed miserably. In a nutshell, here is what has happened:

- Nature had always kept the growth of forests in check with periodic fires, sparked by lightning. Natural fires burn the brush and grasses, also destroying saplings and small trees so the forest does not grow too dense, but mostly leaving older and larger trees undamaged.

- After Americans began to settle the West, depending on the forests for the wood they needed, they understandably viewed forest fires as crises. Vast resources were spent putting out forest fires, and for more than 100 years, fire suppression was the primary goal of forest management.

- In spite of that activity, national forests still did not grow overly dense because the natural role of fire was replaced with a steady program of forest thinning. National forests were logged to provide lumber, to promote recreation, healthy watersheds, species protection, and to prevent fires.

- Then, in the late 20th century, logging became unpopular, and timber sales were all but banned. Logging in the national forests plummeted by 84 percent, from 12 billion board feet per year in the 1980s to about half that amount in the 1990s, to about 2 billion board feet since 2007. And we replaced that management tool with ... nothing.

The result is a massive unnatural overgrowth, a tinderbox that, when ignited, obliterates the landscape. Politicians react with money, committees, planning, studies and meetings.

All plants either grow or die. Some activists seem to think if we stop all activity in our national forests, they will be there forever in the same condition. They could not be more wrong. Leaving the forests alone is a death sentence. Forests are not static snapshots; the trees keep growing. Our national forests produce eight times more new growth than managers remove every year. If the amount grown and the amount removed are not

Walcher (Continued on page 6)

CALIFORNIA 2013 LEGISLATION SYNOPSIS

Submitted by Cate Moore

The California Legislature has adjourned for the year. As we discovered last year, the California legislation process is a frustrating and unpredictable affair, often governed by unbridled emotionalism and subject to strange twists at the eleventh hour when one thinks the matter at hand has been settled.

The gut-and-amend procedure is especially unpredictable; one bill that CCFA tracked this year changed completely at least four times through this method. It's a very poor way to create a law, even if we sometimes profit by it. Typically, a gut-and-amend happens at the very end of the legislative session, when deals are being cut for votes, and it results in a bill that has not been properly vetted. It's also very hard to detect these bills if you don't happen to have someone on the inside, so you have no idea what is even in the bill much less time to analyze its probable impacts before it has been voted on and passed along the chain.

That said, the year wasn't as damaging as it might have been considering the supermajorities in each house that might have led to over-exuberance on the part of the Democrats. Here are the particulars:

Sent to Governor

You may weigh in with the governor's office on these bills at:

Governor Jerry Brown
c/o State Capitol, Suite 1173
Sacramento, CA 95814
Phone: (916) 445-2841
Fax: (916) 558-3160

We recommend using fax or phone; physical mail can get hung up in security checks at the capitol mail room and we are currently having difficulties bringing up the email form.

AB-8 - Alternative fuel and vehicle technologies funding plan. It funds programs to enhance hydrogen fuel networks for vehicles and **programs to repower "high-emitting engines" to approved engines.** The bill involves a surcharge on vehicle registration fees and changes the parameters of the vehicle buy-back program to remove high-emitting vehicles from the roads. This bill provides an awful lot of funding for a technology (hydrogen fuel) that is not ready for prime time.

Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
*Beall - No vote recorded **Signed by the Governor***

AB-502 - Commercial Law: secured transactions sets rules for securing property in financial transactions. We are interested in this bill because timber is one of the categories of property mentioned.

Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - NO, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
Beall - YES

AB-744 - Timber Harvesting Plans: Exempt Activities

This is a last-minute gut-and-amend that took a dead recycling bill and resurrected it as a pilot project for testing whether increasing the diameter of the trees one may take in the forest fire prevention exemption can result in reduced risk of catastrophic wildfires. This bill only applies to Modoc, Siskiyou or Trinity Counties and sunsets three years after the regulations have been put in place. It allows the taking of trees up to 24" in diameter measured from 8" from the ground (which is not standard measuring practice) within areas determined to be moderate, high and very high fire hazard zones. It will be difficult to determine in a three year span just how effective the new practice is; fires cannot be guaranteed to happen in the right zone to test the effectiveness of the treatment. That said, it is still a **WIN for forestry**, since we need to start somewhere to get effective wildfire hazard reduction management tools in place in the public consciousness.

Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - NO (the only Assembly NO recorded), Monning - No vote recorded
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
*Beall - YES **Signed by the Governor***

AB-763 - Aquatic invasive plants: control and eradication Requires all involved agencies to coordinate in the control and eradication of aquatic invasive plants. We hope this sets a trend for requiring interagency coordination and cooperation, making this a **WIN for forestry**.

Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
*Beall - YES **Signed by the Governor***

AB-904 - Working Forest Management Plan. This bill became irrelevant to CCFA territory when a last-minute amendment excluded the southern subdistrict from the law. This bill extends the NTMP model to larger properties, allowing them to gain regulatory relief in exchange for sustainable forestry practices. Our exclusion from this bill is going to affect primarily the Santa Cruz Land Trust, which already has land in NTMP and was hoping to use the WFMP for lands they have recently acquired or will acquire in the future. This is very disappointing for those of us in southern redwoods, but is a **WIN for forestry the rest of the state.**

Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - No Vote Recorded, now that the southern subdistrict is excluded. While the southern subdistrict was in the bill, the vote was Stone - NO (there were only 2 NOs in the Assembly) and Monning - No Vote Recorded
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - No Vote Recorded
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
*Beall - YES **Signed by the Governor***

AB-1213 - Bobcat Protection Act - regulates trapping bobcats. CCFA is not sure why this needs to be a law; Fish and Wildlife policy should have been sufficient. This appears to be another overly emotional response to an increase in fur trapping near Joshua Monument. **Our objections** to this bill include adding a protected status onto a non-endangered species to the

Legislation (Continued on page 5)

Legislation *(Continued from page 4)*

possible detriment of endangered prey or competitor species and to a lack of clarity for the legality of trapping for eliminating bobcats that have been damaging livestock.

*Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
Beall - YES **Still sits on the Governor's desk***

SB-749 - Habitat protection: endangered species

Authorizes Fish and Wildlife to lease department managed lands for agricultural purposes with the lease proceeds to be used for managing, restoring or maintaining department land. provides for legal accidental take for normal, lawful agricultural operations until 2020. extends funding for developing a pilot coho recovery program. This is an overall **WIN for agriculture and forestry**, although the continuation of a coho recovery plan which is independent of the NMFS plan will continue to add complexity and confusion to the coho arena.

*Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
Beall - YES*

Already Signed by Governor

AB-374 - Eminent Domain: Compensation: Loss of goodwill tightens the rules concerning the compensation due to a property owner who is forced to move by eminent domain and loses the value of the good will of his customers by virtue of this forced move. This law now requires, for the owner of a business to be compensated for loss of goodwill, that the business owner adduce sufficient evidence to permit a jury to find that goodwill existed prior to the taking.

*Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
Beall - YES **Vetoed***

AB-497 - Fish and Wildlife changes meeting rules and notification rules for California Fish and Game Commission meetings from 10/year to 8/year and deletes requirement that no more than 3/year be held in Sacramento and removes explicit list of public notification methods required to be used to announce these meetings; enables the commission to adopt to salmon and groundfish regulations; requires sport fishing regulations to conform with federal regulations and requires public notification of regulation changes and at least one public hearing before enacting changes.

*Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES
San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES
Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
Beall - YES **Signed by the Governor***

SB-132 - Mountain Lions requires non-lethal methods of taking mountain lions that are not actively threatening human life. This is a purely emotional bill that responds to the incident where two mountain lion cubs found under a house were shot. We feel this law is a major over-reaction to the circumstances and is setting up rural residents for unfortunate incidents in the future, including a continuing loss of pets and

livestock. This issue did NOT need a law; the entire issue could have been resolved with a policy change within Fish and Wildlife, which DID get enacted while this law was working its way through the legislature. The legislature chose to ignore this and to give no credit to the professionalism of Fish and Wildlife personnel. Now that this is a law, "*The California Wildlife Protection Act of 1990 prohibits the Legislature from changing the act, with specified exceptions, except by a 4/5 vote of the membership of both houses of the Legislature and then only if consistent with, and in furtherance of, the purposes of the act.*" Unfortunately, it's going to take some small child getting killed in his or her backyard to bring mountain lion management back into the rational realm.

Votes: Santa Cruz: Alejo - YES, Stone - YES, Monning - YES

San Mateo: Mullin - YES, Hill - YES, Yee - YES

*Santa Clara: Campos - YES, Gordon - YES, Fong - YES,
Beall - YES **Signed by the Governor***

Gut-and-amended into irrelevance

SB-436 - started out as EIR reporting and notification changes; it now refers to shoreline protection of a specific beach

Deferred until Next Year or Dead

AB-37 - started as funding for water management for disadvantaged communities; now refers to unemployment insurance. It died in committee

AB-278 - low carbon fuel standard

AB-976 - Permits Coastal Commission to charge fines without going through court. This bill failed on the Assembly floor during the concurrence phase. We are heartily relieved because the Coastal Commission has a long-standing history of overstepping its bounds, making arbitrary decisions, and seeking penalties far in excess of the nature of the violation which was brought up in the hearings as it progressed through the legislature. This was co-authored by Mark Stone, who has served on the Coastal Commission.

Votes: Stone - YES, Monning - YES

AB-1295 - Public utilities and renewable energy. This bill started with references to biomass that got dropped in a later amendment.

AB-1330 - Environmental Justice bill which was gutted and amended to identify and support those communities most adversely affected by toxic leaks and emissions.

AB-1331 - after multiple gut-and-amends, this bill became a Climate Change Response to Clean and Safe Drinking Water, then died in committee

SB-1 - Sustainable Communities Investment Authority

SB-11 - Alternative fuel and vehicle technologies funding program

SB-633 - CEQA reform - changes to environmental impact report revisits

SB-731 - CEQA reform. This bill lost CCFA's interest when the section providing measurable standards was deleted.

Synopsis (Continued from page 5)

All of the Proposition 13 override bills stalled in committee. These included:

ACA-3 - 55% approval for bonds for fire, sheriff, public safety, emergency response, police buildings facilities or equipment.

ACA-8 - 55% vote for an array of infrastructure improvement bonds and to allow ad valorem tax of more than 1% of the value of the property for facilities for emergency services, transit systems, transportation infrastructure, sewer, water, waste.

SCA-4 - 55% approval for bonds for local transportation projects.

SCA-7 - 55% approval for bonds for public libraries.

SCA-8 - 55% approval for bonds for transportation projects.

SCA-11 - 55% approval needed for special taxes for local government. ■

GOVERNOR APPOINTS HENLY TO NEWLY CREATED POST AS ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF FOREST RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

By David Bischel
California forestry Association

Russell Henly, 55, of Sacramento, has been appointed assistant secretary of forest resources management at the California Natural Resources Agency. This is the newly created position at the Natural Resources Agency that will be tasked with leading/coordinating efforts to improve the inter-agency effectiveness and efficiency of forest regulation and permitting activities that are conducted by the various departments and boards at both the Resources Agency and Cal EPA. Congratulations to Russ, and we look forward to rolling up our sleeves and working closely with him on these important tasks.

Russ has held multiple positions at CAL FIRE since 1992, including assistant deputy director for resource protection and improvement, watershed assessment manager and policy and economics analyst. He was a research specialist at the University of Minnesota Department of Forest Resources from 1985 to 1987. Henly is a member of the Society of American Foresters. He earned a Doctor of Philosophy degree in wildland resource science from the University of California, Berkeley and a Master of Science degree in forest policy and economics from the University of Minnesota. This position does not require Senate confirmation and the compensation is \$144,000. Henly is a Democrat. ■

OUR WEBSITE

While CCFA has had a website for many years, technology has advanced to the point where we needed improvement in order to keep the public informed. Our new site is now up and running. The address will be the same: www.ccfassociation.org.

Walcher (Continued from page 3)

similar, no snapshot can be maintained; instead, the situation will worsen every year. That is exactly what is happening across the American West, where wildfires have ravaged 68 million acres of our prized forests in the last 10 years.

In response, we spend billions on fire suppression, fuel-load removal, and other actions required by the death and decay of our forests. It would be far more efficient to treat the forests (thin the overload and restore healthy trees) than to put out fires and deal with the dead landscapes left in their wake.

Because trees live, grow and die, forests cannot be preserved in their current condition forever. So we face a clear and simple choice that is never presented to the public, much less to elected officials: Forests must be thinned, or allowed to die, fall down or burn. Do we want logging, or do we want catastrophic forest fires? We must get our act together while there are still great forests to be preserved and protected. ■

Greg Walcher is a former director of the Colorado Department of Natural Resources.

MANAGING WILDFIRES

By Stephen Pyne, Published: September 13, 2013 in the Washington Post

To grab the attention of politicians or the public, a fire has to do at least one of three things: It must burn lots of houses, kill people or involve celebrities (a celebrity landscape will do).

This year's big fires have done all three.

The Black Forest fire in Colorado killed two people and wiped out 511 houses. Arizona's Yarnell Hill fire immolated a crew of 19 firefighters. California's Rim fire in and around Yosemite National Park has become the third-largest blaze in state history. And now, new wildfires are relocating the threats from San Francisco's Sierra Nevada reservoir to its exurbs at Mount Diablo.

These blazes illustrate the major challenges of the American fire scene: Black Forest is a textbook example of fires that burn where houses and natural fuels intermingle dangerously. Yarnell Hill tragically highlights the limits of fighting fires and the costs of doing so. And the Rim fire is an unhinged wildland scene, where landscapes with once-manageable fires have turned feral.

These are not new problems. The vulnerability of its workforce has haunted the fire community since the Big Blowup of 1910 overran the northern Rockies and killed 78 firefighters. Concern over fire's removal—from wildlands and agricultural areas that traditionally relied on routine burning—inspired an intellectual revolution that sought to replace fire repression with fire management, even restoration. Policy reforms came to the National Park Service in 1968 and the Forest Service 10 years later. Still, this was a revolution from above; the hard slog of translating ideas into programs came fitfully. The Yellowstone fires that mesmerized the media for much of the summer of 1988 revealed the difficulties of translating policy into practice.

By then the campaign to create a pluralism of fire programs had stalled. By the time it rebooted after the 1994 season, the climate had flipped from soggy to droughty, the politics had switched from bipartisan reforms to partisan attempts to roll them back, the workforce had shrunk and begun privatizing, and

Wildfires (Continued on page 7)

Wildfires *(Continued from page 6)*

sprawl had sparked a new kind of fire and revived suppression as a politically safe stance. As a result, we've been chasing flames ever since—at greater costs and with less effect. There is no reason to believe we will, in the near future, get ahead of the problems.

Take those burning houses. As early as 1986, the U.S. Forest Service and the National Fire Protection Association launched an initiative to protect homes in fire-prone areas. Today, the issue is no longer just ill-sited McMansions but a giant retrofit for 30 years of irrationally exuberant sprawl. The National Association of State Foresters estimates that more than 72,000 communities are at risk and only 20 percent have a plan for protection.

Retrofitting up to a third of America's housing is a challenge as daunting as rebuilding its crumbling bridges. It means not only replacing combustible roofs but enacting building codes, zoning reform, fire taxes and other infringements on private property. Meanwhile, climate change may flip the script of people constructing houses where fires are, with fires instead coming to where houses are. Some 83 percent of the communities at risk are in the Southeast; the 2011 blowup in Bastrop, Tex., may show what will happen if the Western fire scene moves east.

More basically, we have long misdiagnosed the problem. The emphasis has been on the wildland half of the equation, not the urban one. But it makes more sense to think of homes in hazardous settings as fragments of cities—exurban enclaves and suburban fringes with forested landscaping—rather than as wildlands cluttered with two-by-fours. We know how to keep houses from burning. And we should know that if we build houses in the fire equivalent of a flood plain or a barrier island, the primary responsibility for protecting them is ours.

Regime change when it comes to wildland fire is even trickier. Prescribed, or controlled, fire is a foundational principle in the Southeast, where places such as Florida are succeeding in replacing wild fire with tame fire, but it has foundered in the West. Efforts to get ahead of the flames are meager. The largest, the Four Forest Restoration Initiative in Arizona, proposes to treat up to 50,000 acres a year for 10 years by thinning and burning. As a point of comparison, the nearby 2011 Wallow fire burned 538,000 acres in one savage swipe.

America's firescapes also have a dangerous backlog; every wildland fire put out becomes a fire put off. The land eventually combusts as it must. Some burns are severe, some benign. For reasons of cost, firefighter safety and ecological integrity, fire officers will have to work with the handful of fires—the 1 percent or so—that are doing the burning for all. Such mega-fires now account for more than 85 percent of costs and burned area.

Out of the legacy of such monsters, we must reconstruct more fire-resilient landscapes. But our institutional landscapes demand preparation as much as our natural ones. We need the ability to move quickly when breaks in the weather occur. We can't rely on single-site projects or approval processes tied to the lottery of bad fire years. We need torch-ready projects with approvals and funding on hand.

Yet, we have underinvested in fire for so long that the catch-up costs seem staggering. The traditional inclination is to rely on emergency interventions rather than systemic reforms; in this way, fire management resembles public health. There is ample money and will for a response when a crisis is at hand, but little for the patient labor of prevention, inoculations and general

wellness. Worse, the cost of emergencies is stripping away everything else. For example, the Forest Service just took \$600 million from elsewhere in its budget to pay for fighting fires this summer.

And finally, the workforce. Our attempt to suppress fire in a paramilitary fashion has unhinged landscapes and provoked fires that firefights alone cannot contain. The fire community is growing weary of throwing crews at flames in a vain and sometimes lethal attempt to battle what, under extreme conditions, cannot be controlled. It may instead opt for a hurricane model in which warnings are issued, people board up windows and clean gutters, and then leave or stay as they choose, while crews wait for the flames to blow through before returning. The fact is, you control wildland fires by controlling the countryside.

What we need as much as money is consensus about how we live in that countryside, or at least agreement about how to decide. This year's blazes also show why the National Cohesive Strategy for fighting fires—a project set in motion by Congress to protect against bad fires, promote good ones, and assemble a workforce and the resources to do so—is both necessary and tricky. The strategy is a bold attempt to gather the federal government and volunteer fire departments, states and counties, public agencies and private landowners around the fire they all share. But they need to face one another across that fire, not stand with their backs to the flames and use them to animate some other message to special interest audiences. And then Congress needs to join them. The legislation that mandated the national strategy has already stumbled because of underfunding.

It's probably too late to do more than flee skillfully from the fires we face today. But we can begin positioning ourselves for the ones to come. ■

stephen.pyne@asu.edu

*Stephen Pyne is a life sciences professor at Arizona State University and the author of the forthcoming *Between Two Fires: A Fire History of the U.S., 1960 to 2012.**

From the "You Can't Make This Stuff Up" Department:

ANIMAL RIGHTS GROUP FILES LAWSUIT TO STOP BARRED OWL SHOOTING

By The Associated Press Oregon Live, October 02, 2013, <http://www.oregonlive.com/pacific-northwest-news/index.ssf/2013/10/animal-rights-group-files-laws.html>

GRANTS PASS — An animal rights group has sued to stop the federal government from killing thousands of barred owls in the Northwest to see if that will help the threatened northern spotted owl turn around its population declines.

The lawsuit was filed Monday in U.S. District Court in Sacramento, Calif., by Friends of Animals.

It claims the plan by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to kill 3,600 barred owls violates the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

The group's attorney, Michael Harris, says the act requires that any killing of birds for research must benefit the bird that is killed, and in this case the experiment benefits another bird, the spotted owl.

The agency did not respond to a call for comment due to the government shutdown. ■

A NEW WAY TO PROTECT OUR FORESTS

By Terry Corwin

We all agree on the importance of protecting the Santa Cruz Mountains. These mountain forests make up two-thirds of our county and are the natural greenbelt that protects the county from the urban growth "over the hill."

The Land Trust of Santa Cruz County's view on how to protect this greenbelt is built upon our *Conservation Blueprint*, which was developed over a two-year period with the input from 130 experts and hundreds of interested citizens in community forums and smaller meetings. The full Blueprint, a summary, and an array of maps are on the Land Trust's website www.LandTrustSantaCruz.org

The innovative *Blueprint* strategy for the protection of our mountain forests includes supporting sustainable timber harvesting. This may surprise those who think that the only way to protect wildlife habitat, water quality and biodiversity is for the government to buy land and turn it into parks. The Land Trust comes to this conclusion partly because we have more than thirty years of experience sustainably logging our own Byrne-Milliron Forest outside Corralitos. Our forest, and any sustainably harvested forest, protects water quality and provides large tracts of habitat for wildlife. If you visit this beautiful forest, which is open to the public, you'll see why we believe timber harvest and a healthy forest can go hand in hand.

We also support sustainable timber harvesting as a conservation tool because we recognize that funding for buying land and taking care of it is scarce. We use the revenues from our own harvests to care for the Byrne-Milliron Forest and have advocated a similar approach to the 8,500-acre former CEMEX Redwoods Forest above Davenport. It is, in fact, the same approach we use at our Watsonville Slough Farm, which uses revenues from leased farmland to protect and enhance the heart of the county's largest wetlands and its abundant wildlife.

The benefits of these land uses go beyond providing the funds necessary to care for the land. The Land Trust's Byrne-Milliron Forest is a much loved place where people can hike. In the next few years we will use revenues from our farm leases to allow access to the beauty of the Watsonville Slough. We are working now to provide access to the former CEMEX Redwood Forest and would like to see timber revenues help pay for such access.

Even when the farmland and timberland is privately held, its use provides important public benefits. Farmland produces healthy food and timberland produces renewable building materials, a key component in green building. Both of them generate jobs and local tax revenues that support local services. The conservation values being protected on the former CEMEX Redwoods Forest—wildlife habitat, water supplies and quality, biodiversity—exist after a century of logging under weaker restrictions than we now impose.

Perhaps the most important benefit of farming and timber harvests in our county is that they provide the owners of these lands—that make up most of our county—with an economic alternative to development. We are within commuting distance of the nation's fourth largest metropolitan area and the inevitable development pressures that brings. We don't want the Pajaro Valley paved over and we don't want the Santa Cruz Mountains dotted with the houses and vacation homes of the Bay Area's wealthier citizens.

Government regulations can and do limit what can be built now, but government regulations can be changed. Regulatory protection is ultimately built on election results and time and money can change elections. The Land Trust seeks permanent protection of our natural environment in a time of dwindling public resources and competing—and valid—demands for those resources. Our *Conservation Blueprint* offers a new way of protecting what we hold dear—one that, we think, fits our times and serves our community. ■

Terry Corwin is Executive Director of the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County

SPECIAL RULES ON LOGGING

By Sentinel Editorial Board

Santa Cruz Sentinel, 09/24/2013, http://www.santacruzsentinel.com/opinion/ci_24169524/editorial-special-rules-logging?source=email

Apparently, Santa Cruz County is a special interest.

What else can one make of the end run state legislators have given environmental interests here who sought an exemption to a new law giving a break for small landowners who want to allow timber harvesting on their properties.

The logging bill, AB 904, allows smaller landowners, up to 15,000 acres, to pursue timber plans in perpetuity as long as they comply with stricter environmental standards. The standards include a ban on clear cutting, a practice already prohibited in Santa Cruz County, while maintaining existing species protections and clean water rules -- but would allow landowners to log their properties without submitting new harvest plans or bringing them before the public.

Many local environmentalists, not surprisingly, objected to the bill, which they believed would allow unwanted logging in residential areas that differ from the unpopulated forest tracts found in the district represented by the legislation's sponsor, Arcata Democratic Assemblyman Wes Chesbro.

This marks a reversal of a decision earlier this year, when the Santa Cruz County Board of Supervisors decided by a 4-1 vote to not take a stand on the pending legislation—viewed at the time as a major shift in how the county viewed timber harvesting. But Live Oak Supervisor John Leopold, on the short end of the saw in the vote, said he wanted to see the Santa Cruz Mountains exempted, reasoning the bill was aimed more at rural coastal areas in Northern California than the more developed mountains in this county.

Opponents turned to former state legislator and longtime Santa Cruz County environmental champion Fred Keeley to use his contacts in the Legislature to modify the bill—and this paid off, with Santa Cruz, San Mateo and Santa Clara counties excluded and maintaining their status quo on local timber rules.

As Keeley told the Sentinel, "In our community this was a solution in search of a problem. We like the playing field the way it is."

Well, not everyone might agree.

For instance, the Nature Conservancy and the Land Trust of Santa Cruz County supported the bill as originally written. And so did the North Coast's Big Creek Lumber, where one representative said opponents just want to end most logging in the county. What will happen, said the Big Creek representative, is that the logging will just occur somewhere else—which is probably fine with opponents.

Supporters of the original bill maintained that property owners might look to develop their properties if unable to practice sustainable timber harvesting. By filing a standing timber management plan, owners would only have to file less complicated notices of intent rather than being forced to prepare expensive formal plans each time they wanted to cut trees. Conservation groups increasingly have voiced support for regulated timber harvests as a way to generate funds to protect valuable lands, evident with Sempervirens Fund's proposal to log 8,000 acres of the Cemex property along Santa Cruz County's North Coast.

Santa Cruz County elected officials in the past have attempted to put strict limits on timber harvests, even though the state Supreme Court found that the state has the rightful authority to make decisions about forest practices. These limits often don't mesh with responsible fire safety and forest management practices since the Santa Cruz Mountains in many places are overgrown with second- and third-growth trees. Thinning trees is part of responsible forest management. Yes, timber companies make money on harvesting trees on private properties, but so what?

Most of the parcels in Santa Cruz County zoned for timber production are small—but the cost of producing a harvest plan has been prohibitively large. Based on this special interest exemption, and the expectation Gov. Jerry Brown will sign the bill into law, nothing much will change, which is not good news for companies such as Big Creek that practice responsible harvesting and conservation. ■

STOP WASTING FOREST WASTE

By Roderick D. Wright, State Senator (D-Inglewood)
Article in "California Forests"

Southern Californians can no longer afford to take an "out of sight, out of mind" approach to the state's forestlands.

Severe wildfire is on the rise, firefighting costs are skyrocketing, and people in rural communities are out of work in staggering numbers.

Our forests seldom look how urban Californians often envision. More than half the trees on Southern California's national forestlands are dead or dying. Aggressive fire-suppression policies and timber harvest restrictions have led to overgrown forests and dangerous fuel loads on more than 8 million acres. Meanwhile, Californians import about 80% of our wood from places where we have no say over environmental practices and willingly spend more than a billion tax dollars fighting wildfire each year.

Studies show that one of the most efficient ways to create jobs in this state can also reduce wildfire severity, lower firefighting expenditures, provide clean energy, and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. All we need to do is create an environment that encourages investment in sustainable forest management.

Waste (Continued on page 10)

DECINZO



Cartoon by Decinzo from the 10-5-13 Santa Cruz Sentinel News

GOT CARBON?

By David Bischel, President, California Forestry Assn.
Article in "California Forests"

While climate change has been grabbing headlines for a few years, California forestry companies have been addressing greenhouse gas emissions for decades.

If there's one thing forestry excels at, it's taking carbon dioxide out of the air. Forestry companies have been conserving soils, investing in science, and managing landscapes to grow trees better for generations. The faster trees grow, the more photosynthesis occurs and the more carbon dioxide they remove from the atmosphere.

There's really no debate over the issue. The California Air Resources Board evaluated 165 business sectors in the state and only one, the forestry sector, has been shown to be a net sequesterer of carbon. When all aspects of business operations are considered, forestry alone removes more carbon than it emits.

There's also no doubt that well managed forests remove more carbon dioxide than forests that are left on their own. Studies show carbon sequestration increase of up to 400 percent in well managed forests compared to unmanaged forests. Yet forest management faces more challenges today than ever. Why?

Perhaps the issue is what constitutes "well managed." We've reached universal agreement that well managed starts with sustainability, which inherently includes conservation measure for soils, air, wildlife, and water quality. Beyond that, the term is open to interpretation.

California has arguably the most powerful environmental protections of any state in the nation, even the world. Recent studies by Cal Poly—San Luis Obispo comparing California's Forest Practice Act protections to the two most subscribed-to third-party forest certification systems support that conclusion. So in a state that is one-third forestland and sets the highest standards for sustainable forestry, forestry faces greater challenges than anywhere else forestry is practiced.

Mary Nichols, chairman of the California Air Resources Board, is right when she notes that wildlife and recreation have value, but tend to get the short shrift. Forestry on private lands provides values across the landscape but largely derives its investment return basis on a single commodity. Perhaps it's time to recognize the value of clean water, clean air, recreation, wildlife habitat, and open spaces that forestry provides, and create a regulatory system that allows families that invest in private forestlands zoned for timber production to realize some monetary benefit for values beyond the carbon-friendly wood products they deliver.

California used to provide 80 percent of the wood consumed in the state, and now imports that much from places where Californians have no say in environmental practices. Perhaps Californians flocking to support locally grown food will support locally sourced wood and clean, renewable energy. Rural economies are suffering and according to a University of Massachusetts report, investments in forestry create jobs more efficiently than investing in any other sector's infrastructure.

Forestry can remove more carbon and provide more wood, clean energy, and jobs than it does now, but not in today's regulatory climate where costs to our family businesses and taxpayers keep going up. Food for thought as our next fire season approaches. ■

Waste (Continued from page 9)

Creating jobs in forests leads to jobs in transportation, lumberyards, and elsewhere. Investing in sustainable forest management can create about twice as many jobs per dollar as investing in mass transit, school construction, or new roads, and five times more jobs per dollar than investments in coal or oil and gas infrastructure.

Forestry also offers a unique way to recycle forest waste into renewable energy while decreasing the amount of fuel available to drive catastrophic wildfires. In a report for the California Energy Commission, the USDA Forest Service found that managing forests to reduce fuels can tap a new energy source and result in a "dramatic drop" in wildfire severity, a 65% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions, and millions of dollars of savings in firefighting costs.

Biomass energy, a by-product of sustainable forest management, takes the dead trees, accumulated overgrowth, and forest residues that might otherwise go up in smoke and instead uses them to produce electricity. Using forest residues to produce energy reduces emissions from wildfire and from burning fossil fuels for energy while helping to keep firefighters and communities safe.

But according to the Forest Service, "the economics of private forestland management historically have constrained opportunities for sustainable management." The potential energy, budget, and emissions savings make now the time to change that.

California's current regulatory climate has escalated a forest health and wildfire crisis and left the state's forestry infrastructure in shambles. More than 40% of the state's sawmills have closed in the past decade, taking with them the family wage jobs that for years have been the cornerstone of rural communities.

While California boasts the highest environmental standards in the world, our forestry regulations have become overwhelmingly complex and counterproductive. Operating costs often run 10 times higher for California forestry companies than forestry companies in neighboring states, and costs to taxpayers have more than doubled in recent years even though the amount of forestry being regulated has dropped roughly 40 percent.

Rather than continue a trend of increasing wildfire severity, firefighting costs, and greenhouse gas emissions, reduce our dependency on imported wood and energy, and restore vibrant forests to the landscape.

Our greatest challenge is putting California back to work and our greatest responsibility may be sustaining healthy forestlands for future generations. We must seize the opportunity to do both and create policy to encourage long-term investment in sustainable forest management. ■

THANK YOU !

We take this opportunity to thank all of our renewing members and those who donated generously to the legal fund. The legal fund is not used for general expenses but is saved in case we have to take an issue to court to uphold our members' private property rights and the right to use our lands as we see fit—with care.

Central Coast Forest Association
Membership / Renewal / Contribution

Name _____ Date _____

Enclosed is \$ _____ for: New Membership Membership Renewal Legal Fund

Home phone _____ Work phone _____

Address _____ City _____ ST _____ Zip _____

Signature _____ E-mail _____

Please make checks payable to:

Central Coast Forest Association P.O. Box 66868 Scotts Valley, CA 95066

<u>Membership Category</u>	<u>Dues</u>
Individual - - - - -	\$50
Business - - - - -	\$500

CCFA appreciates your support

CCFA is a 501-(c) 4 tax-exempt organization. Donations may be tax-deductible as a business expense.



Notes From the Nut-House



We're on the web!
www.cfassociation.org

Central Coast Forest Association
 P.O. Box 66868
 Scotts Valley, CA 95066



IMPORTANT NOTICE: HELP US COMMUNICATE!

Occasionally we need to rally the membership to respond to abrupt government actions. We must be able to contact you in a hurry in such circumstances. Please submit your current e-mail address to us via our website, www.cfassociation.org or by e-mail to: ccfa@cfassociation.org. We will keep it strictly confidential at all times.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

CCFA Interviews Two New Supervisors CCFA Members Attend CFA Convention	1
Fire Tax Hearing	2
New Invasive Mosquitos in California PLF Challenges Cap and Trade Seeing the Forest Through the Trees	3
California 2013 Legislation Synopsis Governor Appoints Henly to Newly Created Post Managing Wildfires	4-7
A New Way to Protect Our Forests AB 904—Special Rules on Logging Stop Wasting Forest Waste	8-9
Got Carbon?	10
Notes From the Nuthouse	11
CCFA's Mission Statement	12

The forests must be, and will be, not only preserved but used, and the experience of all civilized countries that have faced and solved the question show that the forests, like perennial fountains, may be made to yield a sure harvest of timber while at the same time all their far-reaching beneficent uses may be maintained unimpaired.

John Muir

Founder of the Sierra Club in 1895

CCFA's Mission

The Central Coast Forest Association is a non-profit alliance of small forestland owners, forestry professionals and forest-oriented businesses with close affinity to the woods, mountains, streams and wildlife of the Central Coast. Our purpose is to uphold and preserve our values, our property rights and our way of life. To advance this objective, CCFA will:

- *Interact with community, political and environmental interests as a voice for forestland owners.*
- *Understand the news, law and technology of forestry and apply this knowledge for the benefit and protection of forestland owners.*
- *Inform members of matters affecting their lands and forests.*
- *Take political and legal action to defend the rights and property of all Central Coast forestland owners.*