



The Log

of the

Central Coast Forest Association

Volume 13, Issue 3

February 2014

USING 'SUE AND SETTLE' TO THWART OIL AND GAS DRILLERS, THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT IS BEING EMPLOYED MORE THAN EVER TO BLOCK DEVELOPMENT

By Stephen Moore

Wall Street Journal, October 4, 2013, <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424052702304176904579115234181105684.html>

Last week the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and an environmental advocacy group agreed to a legal settlement that will place nine species—including the Panama City crayfish, Moccasinshell Mussel and Boreal Toad—on the fast track for placement on the endangered species list. It is only the latest of many such listings.

The Center for Biological Diversity has petitioned Fish and Wildlife to designate some 250 species as endangered since 2008. Many of CBD's petitions—and lawsuits—are still in the pipeline. About 97% of the species that are designated as endangered never move off the list.

Next March, Fish and Wildlife will make a determination about whether to add the lesser prairie chicken, found in Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico and Kansas to the list. Harold Hamm, president of Continental Resources, says that the habitat for the prairie chicken overlaps "some of the most promising land for oil and gas leases in the country."

Many Westerners suspect that this environmental activism isn't only or even mostly about saving species and obscure subspecies. Instead, it is about restricting land use on hundreds of thousands of acres of private and state land. The concern is that if these species are listed as endangered, their habitat could be placed off limits for economic development.

In the 1980s, environmentalists successfully used a listing of the Northern Spotted Owl as threatened to cripple the timber industry in Oregon and Washington, throwing many thousands out of jobs. This is the playbook now being used by groups like the CBD—which boasts on its website of its desire to end most oil and gas production in the United States.

Since taking office, the Obama administration and its green allies inside and outside federal agencies have been making expanded use of a tactic called "sue and settle" to issue new and expensive regulations. Groups like CBD and Wild Earth Guardians, for example, petition Fish and Wildlife to list a species as endangered. Other environmental groups use a similar tactic to get new water and air regulations from the Environmental Protection Agency. Then, sometimes the very same day, the environmental groups file a lawsuit against Fish and Wildlife or the EPA to force the government to act—arguing that the regulatory process is too slow.

Amos Eno, a former Fish and Wildlife Service official who worked to save the grizzly bear and the condor, is critical of the

tactic. Mr. Eno, who now runs Resources First, says the money wasted on these lawsuits could be used on conservation efforts to actually save species from extinction.

Because the federal agencies include former employees of green organizations, sue and settle can be a collaborative, not adversarial, process. The agency may be only too happy to sign a consent decree that courts then rubber stamp. Often, state and industry officials directly affected by the settlements have no opportunity to weigh in.

Increasingly, sue and settle is how rules are made in Washington. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce has found that more than 60 times in the last four years the EPA agreed to settlements with environmental groups to pass regulations that in some cases impose tens of billions of dollars of costs on industry and land owners. The feds have even paid green groups millions of dollars in legal fees for the favor of suing the government.

The Obama administration didn't invent sue and settle, but the pace has increased dramatically since 2009—an era that Oklahoma Attorney General Scott Pruitt calls "sue and settle on steroids."

Last September Mr. Pruitt and 11 state attorneys general presented a Freedom of Information Act request to investigate the communications between the Obama administration and environmental litigants. Their suspicion is that the two are secretly working hand in hand to grease the process of regulating industries it doesn't like. A year has passed, but the EPA has refused to fully comply.

This summer Mr. Pruitt has joined with the other attorneys general—including from Texas and Utah—to sue the Obama administration to comply with the Freedom of Information Act. Mr. Pruitt also believes that sue and settle "is an end run around the Administrative Procedures Act." This is the law that governs how regulations are promulgated, and requires among other things transparency and a reliance on science to justify new rules. "An administration which claims to only want to 'follow the science' has exploited a litigation mechanism to enact new rules imposed on us without reviewing the science," Mr. Pruitt says.

The attorneys general also cite new EPA regional haze rules—which came into being because of sue and settle—that could raise electricity costs in their states by as much as 20%. On behalf of his fellow attorneys general, Mr. Pruitt says that "we're very worried that under Obama sue and settle will be used by the EPA to issue new regulations on fracking." This could kneecap the oil and gas boom in Western states.

In its report "Sue and Settle: Regulating Behind Closed Doors," the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has counted more than 100 new major rules "with estimated compliance costs of more than \$100 million annually" that arose from this tactic. The result is a giant tax on the economy brought to you by the Sierra Club

Sue and Settle (Continued on page 2)

Sue and Settle (Continued from page 1)

and the Environmental Defense Fund with little or no input or oversight from Congress.

Sen. Charles Grassley (R., Iowa) and Rep. Doug Collins (R., Ga.) have introduced "Sunshine for Regulatory Decrees and Settlements Act of 2013" that would require all proposed consent decrees to be posted for 60 days for public comment before being filed with a court—and allow affected parties to challenge them. Members of Congress in both parties who are worried about the Obama regulatory assault will need to take corrective action if they have any hope of a true economic turnaround. ■

Mr. Moore is a member of the Wall Street Journal's editorial board

CONSERVATION GROUP EYES DAVENPORT CEMENT PLANT

By Jason Hoppin—Santa Cruz Sentinel
Posted: SantaCruzSentinel.com

DAVENPORT -- A well-regarded nonprofit is exploring whether to acquire Davenport's decommissioned Cemex Corp. cement plant, hoping to remove the hulking structure and use the area as a gateway to thousands of acres of conserved North Coast lands. Los Altos-based Sempervirens Fund, one of several conservation groups to recently secure 8,500 mountainous acres above Davenport formerly owned by Cemex, is interested in acquiring the plant site as part of an ambitious plan to permanently protect the sparsely populated, postcard-beautiful coastal mountains above Santa Cruz.

"Instead of having an industrial use we could have something really nice there that serves the community and serves the area," said Reed Holderman, Sempervirens Fund's executive director.

The idea is in the very early stages, but Sempervirens Fund recently received a \$10,000 grant from the Center for Creative Land Recycling to further explore the pollution problem there.

The plant is still owned by Cemex, which is working on remediation and a closure plan that isn't likely to be approved before 2014.

"It's a process that will tax a bit," said Tim Fillmore, hazardous materials manager for the county.

That plan is likely to address soil and asbestos issues, as well as several above-ground fuel tanks. The plant has been the site of reported spills and cleanups over the years, and there are deposits of cement kiln dust, including an exposed site containing an estimated 850,000 cubic yards of caked dust that fills a small valley.

Sempervirens Fund is in limbo until that plan is completed, and Holderman said one possibility is to take over the land at no cost and continue the cleanup. He said other parties are interested in buying components of the plant itself from Cemex.

While the venerable nonprofit is typically not in the business of repurposing contaminated land, Holderman formerly worked at the Trust for Public Land, which spearheaded an effort to convert a 32-acre brownfield site on the edge of Los Angeles' Chinatown, known as the Cornfields, into a community park.

One possible way to pay for the reuse is a visitor-oriented development, such a small hotel or resort.

Holderman also mentioned a possible community center or farmers market, though any ideas are preliminary at best.

"(Cemex) won't entertain this conversation with us until the county finishes" the closure plan, Holderman said.

In addition to the 8,500-acre property known as the Cemex Redwoods, Sempervirens Fund has been active in conservation efforts throughout the Santa Cruz Mountains. The group envisions piecing together what has been called "The Great Park," a protected expanse of coastal ranges running from Pescadero to Santa Cruz.

Santa Cruz County Board Chairman Neal Coonerty, who represents Davenport, said he was excited about the possibility of Sempervirens Fund's involvement.

"We definitely want to see a reuse of the property. We don't want to put a fence put around it and just watch it rust. We're delighted that Sempervirens Fund has in interest in it," Coonerty said, adding the group's involvement seemed like a natural fit.

"It goes from one of the most polluting plants in the world—a cement plant—to what would be a great environmental asset. That's a huge turnaround," he said. ■

CHINOOK THRIVE IN FLOODED FIELD

By David Periman, October 25, 2013 San Francisco Chronicle

Researchers who fattened young Chinook salmon in flooded fields after the rice harvest last winter reported Thursday that fish grew fast and to record sizes, offering a promising new way to improve survival of the long-threatened salmon.

As youngsters, those rare but delectable fish of the Sacramento River swim to the ocean each spring and reach adulthood there before returning to spawn in the river's tributaries.

But each year, predators kill millions of the young fish as they reach the sea because the fish are too small and helpless to escape.

Now researchers report that an experiment begun in April shows how those juvenile fish can grow faster and fatter in rice fields that are regularly flooded along the river than they do in the open water of the river.

"I can see the potential that millions and millions of young salmon, growing in flooded fields along the Sacramento, could be given a better chance to survive when they reach the ocean," said Jacob Katz, the biologist who led the research.

The experiment's results were detailed in a report to the Bureau of Reclamation by Carson Jeffres, laboratory director of the UC Davis Center for Watershed Science, and Katz, regional manager of CalTrout, a fisheries conservation organization. The two agencies partnered for the experiment in the second year of an effort to reverse the long and devastating population decline of the salmon.

Jeffres said the experiment involved three different plots of farmland totaling 18 acres on the floodplain of the Yolo Bypass near Sacramento that were flooded with water after the rice was harvested.

"It was like a dehydrated food web," Jeffres said of those fields. "you just add water, and all the habitats proved really productive for the fish."

Four thousand young trout were placed in the flooded plots of a rice ranch along the Yolo Bypass, which is used to divert water from the Sacramento River to protect Sacramento from

flooding.

One flooded plot had been left with a bottom of rice stubble after the rice was harvested; another had been turned into bare ground; and the bottom of the third was allowed to hold natural weeds.

The young fish in all three fields grew swiftly, Katz said. But the bottomland that was bare before it was flooded quickly became a much richer source of highly nutritious plankton for the young salmon than the other two fields, he said.

The survival rate for all young salmon was lower than expected, Katz said. Last winter's drought dried land around the fields for miles around and birds searching for the nearest water found the rice fields, he said.

"We really got hammered by birds," Katz said. "They found plenty of food on our fields." Despite that problem, the average growth rate of the surviving Chinook was higher than ever recorded in the river, Katz and Jeffres said.

"It's a win-win model that can be replicated around the state," Katz said.

Next year, another experiment will cover more than 2,500 acres of flooded rice fields after the crop has been harvested.

The Bureau of Reclamation contributed \$150,000 to the research and a combination of other agencies—including CalTrout and the Knaggs ranch where the experiment was conducted—contributed to the \$500,000 total, he said. ■

David Perlman is the San Francisco Chronicle's science editor

COHO SALMON THRIVE IN SCOTTS CREEK LAGOON

The Log editorial

Related to the above article about Chinook salmon in the rice fields is the information from the Coho salmon studies in Scotts Creek, northern Santa Cruz County.

It had been reported that the young Coho thrive in the lagoon and wetlands inland from the estuary where Scotts Creek empties into the sea. The water temperatures rise as high as 80°, and the water has no shading from trees or brush.

The predators of the young Coho hatched in the Monterey Bay Salmon and Trout Project rearing station are primarily seals and seagulls. Tags from the young salmon have been recovered on Año Nuevo Island, several miles north of Scotts Creek, the waterway into which the young salmon were seeded. It seems that the gulls caught the young salmon in the surf and flew northward where they ate the fish and discarded the tags.

Fish live best where there is lots of their favorite food—namely insects and larvae. Old-timers who fished in the Scotts Creek watershed as far back as the 1860s, always knew that trout and salmon didn't like dark streams. Often, the fish would be dark instead of silver, with large heads and skinny bodies, because they reflected the darkness of the stream and the lack of necessary food. ■

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.

BOARD OF FORESTRY UPDATE

From the California Licensed Foresters Association

November 2013 - Newsletter

BOF Sends Final Roads Package to OAL

Tours Butte Sites, Hears Updates on Pre-Fire Management
Chesbro Letter Urges BOF Action on Small Landowners

By Bill Keye, CLFA Government Affairs Specialist

The California Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF) last week slipped out of Sacramento for a third time this year. The BOF toured burned areas and fuel treatment projects in Butte County and held formal meetings in Chico. During the full board session, the BOF heard presentations on the Butte Fire Plan and vegetation management efforts in Plumas County. Please see **Butte/Plumas Pre-Fire Efforts**, below, for more.

Despite strong objections voiced by forest industry representatives, the BOF voted 7-1 (Wade opposed, Britting absent) to give its final blessing to a sweeping rewrite of Forest Practice Rules (FPRs) regulating forest roads. Assuming the package is approved by the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) the new FPRs will take effect on January 1st.

Ed Struffenegger, California Forestry Association, and Ed Murphy, Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI), both cited regulatory costs and uncertainties in asking that the BOF delay action. They contended that the economic analysis in the Final Statement of Reasons fell short of the requirements of SB 617, a 2011 measure that calls for greater consideration of the economic impacts of major regulations estimated to cost greater than \$50 million. Murphy stated that company data suggested that the impacts of the new FPR would exceed that threshold on SPI lands alone. He said that he expected OAL to "do its job" and reject the new package.

Member Richard Wade also voiced concerns, but did not persuade his colleagues to hold off on approving the package. Member Stan Dixon, who opposed the package last month, announced that he would vote affirmatively in the interest of BOF unity.

CAL FIRE's Duane Shintaku cited the requirements of PRC 4583 in guiding how the Department will handle issues regarding implementing the new FPRs on currently approved plans. Shintaku said that each request for relief from the requirements of the new rule would be assessed individually on its own merits.

Mario DeBernardo, Assembly Natural Resources Committee, appeared on behalf of Assembly member Wesley Chesbro (D-Arcata) and read from a Chesbro letter to the BOF. In it, Chesbro cites the Governor's approval of his (Chesbro's) AB 904, and offered to clarify any questions of bill interpretation as the BOF crafts regulations implementing the new Working Forest Management Plan (WFMP).

The Chesbro letter goes on to reference the "SFUMP" – the Small Forest Unevenaged Management Plan, designed for timberland owners of 320 acres or less. The SFUMP was originally included in AB 904 but was deleted before its final passage. Citing discussions with CAL FIRE and BOF staff, Chesbro encouraged the BOF to "use its authority under the NTMP statutes to develop a [SFUMP] program that incentivizes

BOF Update (Continued on page 4)

BOF Update *(Continued from page 3)*

more small forest landowners to engage in long term, sustainable forestry." Noting that he will be termed-out at the end of next year, Chesbro expressed his interest in accomplishing small landowner reform before he leaves the legislature. He indicated his willingness to pursue legislation if the BOF rulemaking effort bogs down.

Earlier in the week, Acting Management Committee (MC) Chair Stu Farber conducted a review of AB 904 and the small landowner issue. Although the WFMP statute gives the BOF two full years to craft its enabling regulations, Farber stated his goal was to have them completed next year in time for WFMP implementation in January, 2015. He also said that his current thinking was to pursue a SFUMP approach for larger (<320 ac.) parcels, but to separately examine differing regulatory approaches for extremely small parcels of less than 20, or 40, acres. This latter approach is on hold pending a legal opinion from the Attorney General's office, advising the BOF of its regulatory options. The full BOF voted to make this formal request during its later session.

During his remarks to the BOF, DeBernardo also announced that Assembly member Chesbro plans to hold a legislative hearing next month looking at the issue of wildland fuel treatments. At press time, no date had been set for this December hearing.

Butte/Plumas Pre-Fire Efforts: The BOF Chico meetings and Butte field trip were designed to showcase the implementation of the State Fire Plan and to inform the BOF on issues related to the Vegetation Treatment Program EIR, currently under review.

Joe Tapia, Butte Unit Pre-Fire Engineer, explained how the Unit works closely with the Butte County Fire Safe Council (BCFSC) in conducting wildfire education, defensible space and fuel reduction projects. The BCFSC oversees the efforts of 8 local Fire Safe Councils, providing key coordination and support. It operates a chipper program that treated 499 properties last year.

Mike DeLasaux, UC Cooperative Extension, and Frank Stewart, Plumas County Forester, updated the BOF on the situation in Plumas County. DeLasaux stated that 42% of acres treated by the Plumas Fire Safe Council have been paid for by fiber harvested, but decried the recent decline of processing infrastructure in the region. Citing biomass power plant closures in Westwood, Burney and Loyalton, DeLasaux said that without this capacity, fewer acres will be treated. He asked the BOF to help get the industry back on track.

2014 BOF Priorities: CLFA presented a letter requesting that the BOF focus on "three important issues that are negatively impacting the state's forestlands, inhibiting RPFs ability to effectively practice forestry and limiting landowners ability to economically manage their lands." The letter requested a 1-year survey protocol for northern spotted owls, more liberal timelines for treating slash, and BOF engagement on the issue of criminal trespass and its negative impacts on woods safety and the environment.

The Mattole Restoration Council presented a letter asking the BOF to create FPRs to foster oak woodland restoration. The letter cited encroachment of conifers into oak woodland habitats. Forest Practice Committee (FPC) Chair Mark Andre said that a potential field trip to the Bald Hills area and Redwood National

Park could highlight the issue.

More News: The FPC continued its discussions on possible FPR changes to Native American noticing requirements under Emergency Notices. The Monitoring Study Group will meet December 10th, including a presentation on effectiveness monitoring by new "Timber Czar" (Assistant Secretary for Forest Resource Management) Russ Henly. CAL FIRE's Janet Barentson said that the Department was conducting interviews to fill 21 Forester I and 20 Forester II positions. Two BOF terms are expiring in early 2014, seats currently held by Stan Dixon and Richard Wade. Dixon's last BOF meeting will be next month and his public member seat will become vacant. Wade could be reappointed to a second term as a forest products industry member. The BOF next meets, in Sacramento, on December 3rd and 4th. ■

SALVAGE LOGGING IN BURNED FORESTS OPPOSED 200 Scientists Urge Congress to Defeat an Expediting Bill

By Scott Sonner, Associated Press, Bay Area News Group, Nov. 3, 2013

More than 200 biologists, ecologists, and other scientists are urging congress to defeat legislation they say would destroy critical wildlife habitat by setting aside U.S. environmental laws to speed logging of burned trees at Yosemite National Park and other national forests and wilderness areas across the west.

The experts say two measures pushed by pro-logging interests ignore a growing scientific consensus that the burned landscape plays a critical roll in forest regeneration and is home to many birds, bats, and other species found nowhere else.

"We urge you to consider what the science is telling us: that post-fire habitat created by fire, including patches of severe fire, are ecological treasures rather than ecological catastrophes, and that post-fire logging does more harm than good to the nation's public lands," they wrote in a letter mailed Friday to members of Congress.

One bill, authored by Rep. Doc Hastings, R-Wash., would make logging a requirement on some public forestland, speed timber sales, and discourage legal challenges.

The House approved the legislation 244-173 in September and sent it to the Senate, where it awaits consideration to the committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The White House has threatened a veto, saying it would jeopardize endangered species, increase lawsuits, and block creation of national monuments.

Hastings, chairman of the House Natural Resources Committee, said wildfires burned 9.3 million acres in the U.S. last year, while the Forest Service harvested timber from about 200,000 acres.

Hastings' bill includes an amendment by Rep. Tom McClintock, R-Granite Bay, that provides for the expedited salvage of fire-killed timber. He also introduced separate legislation specific to lands burned by this year's Rim Fire at Yosemite National Park, neighboring wilderness and national forest in the Sierra Nevada.

"We have no time to waste in the aftermath of the Yosemite Rim fire," McClintock said at a sub-committee hearing in October.

"By the time the formal environmental review of salvage

Salvage *(Continued on page 5)*

Salvage (Continued from page 4)

operations has been completed in a year, what was once forestland will have already begun converting to brushland, and by the following year, reforestation will become infinitely more difficult and expensive."

The Rim Fire started in August and grew to become one of the largest wildfires in California history. It burned 400 square miles and destroyed 11 residences, three commercial properties, and 98 outbuildings. It cost \$127 million to fight.

Members of the House Natural Resources Committee remain optimistic the Senate will take up Hastings' bill before the end of the year, said Malory Micetick, the committee's deputy press secretary.

"We have a lot of hazardous fuel buildup, and it will help alleviate some of the threat of catastrophic wildfires," she said.

The scientists see it differently.

"Just about the worst thing you can do to these forests after a fire is salvage-log them," said Dominic DellaSala, the lead author of the letter. "It's worse than the fire itself because it sets back the recovery that begins the minute the fire is out."

DellaSala, chief scientist at the conservation group Geos Institute in Ashland, Ore., was on a team of scientists that produced the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's final recovery plan for the spotted owl in 2008.

Many who signed the opposition letter have done research in the field and several played roles with the U.S. Forest Service and Fish and Wildlife Service in developing logging policies for the threatened northern spotted owl in the Pacific Northwest.

"Though it may seem at first glance that a post-fire landscape is a catastrophe ecologically," they wrote, "numerous studies tell us that even in patches where forest fires burned most intensely, the resulting post-fire community is one of the most ecologically important and biodiverse habitat types in western conifer forests.

"Moreover, it is the least protected of all forest types and is often as rare, or rarer, than old-growth forest due to damaging forest practices encouraged by post-fire logging policies." ■

VEGETATION AND GROUND WATER - A TWO-WAY RELATIONSHIP

By Cate Moore

It's another perfect day in Paradise; a sunny day with mild temperatures that allow me to work outside in shorts and a T-shirt. The only problem with this is that it's January, and we've been experiencing weather akin to mid-October when we should be collecting our allotment of rain for the year.

As I write this, our weather station has only recorded 2.21 inches of rain for the rain year, and we have not seen truly significant rain since December 2012. It isn't a comfortable feeling, living in a bone-dry forest and waiting to see if our next major event will be the welcome return of the rain or the feared sweep of a fire.

The state of the ground water supply on forest growth is well established. Studies conducted by UC Extension forestry tested forest tracts to see what limitations had the greatest effect on forest growth. The elements tested were sunlight, water, and soil fertility. The most potent limiter to tree growth, hands down, was a lack of water.

The effect of vegetation cover on the ground water supply receives a great deal less attention. We don't directly observe

what's going on under ground in our daily routines and it is easy to forget that there is a lot of activity going on under our feet. Let's explore together how much a tree drinks in a year, then use this information to explore the effects of vegetation on our ground water supplies.

The process of photosynthesis is described in *Is a Tree a Heavy Drinker or Does It Just Pump Water?* The article notes that to generate a pound of cellulose (the main constituent of wood), the tree binds 0.55 pounds of water to the product and releases more than 90 pounds of water into the atmosphere through transpiration. At 8.33 pounds of water per gallon, we calculate that it takes every tree, shrub and flower 10.87 gallons of water to create one pound of wood.

Redwood Empire's website FAQ section (<http://buyredwood.com/faq-page>) answered the question of "How much do Redwood Trees weigh?" by noting that "A ... typical farmed Redwood tree will weigh approximately 50,000 pounds." Local forest management growth predictors use a 3% per year figure for estimating how much our central coast forests grow. This means a typical farmed redwood will put on 1500 pounds of wood in a year, using 135,825 pounds or 16,306 gallons in the process. Most of this water is drawn during the May through August growing season, when the water table is saturated and a generous amount of sunlight is available to power the photosynthesis chemical reaction.

This is just one tree. What happens when we look at this water draw on a landscape scale?

Former CCFA board member and scientist/engineer Robert O. Briggs examined this question in the Waddell Creek watershed in his study *Competition for Limited Dry Season Ground-stored Water Between Forest Use and Stream Flow in the Waddell Valley*. He characterized the Waddell watershed as a system that is entirely fed by rainfall in the rainy season and noted that in the Waddell Creek, the agricultural draw is not a significant part of the observed situation, since the agricultural diversions take place downstream of the flow rate monitoring stations. This leaves reforestation as the driving force of the differences in flow rates observed over time.

In this study, Theodore Hoover remarked that in 1913, Waddell Creek flowed 1800 gallons/minute in September, and the lowest flow he had ever noted was 1200 gallons/minute in a drought. During the drought year 1976-1977, Robert Briggs measured the Waddell Creek flow rate at 76.5 gallons/minute. He did a more systematic set of stream flow measurements between the years 1988-1998. Mid-range data for the years 1933-1942 came from Shapovalov and Taft's anadromous fish study, *The Life Histories of the Steelhead Rainbow Trout (Salmon Gairdneri gairdneri) and Silver Salmon (Oncorhynchus kisutch)*, where part of the data gathered included continuous flow rates for the creek.

Robert Briggs then compared the flow data from the 1933-1942 period with the flow data from the 1988-1998 period and determined that the effect of the re-vegetation of Waddell Creek watershed for the 55 year span was equivalent to losing 18 inches of rainfall in a year. He established a robust relationship between the degree of forestation on a watershed and the watershed's available ground water.

Water supply calculations and water policy decisions seldom reference vegetation loads as a significant factor in the state's

Vegetation (Continued on page 7)

UM, MSU PART OF \$10M EFFORT TO TURN FOREST DEBRIS INTO FUEL

DECEMBER 24, 2013 7:00 AM • BY MARTIN KIDSTON

If 1 ton of woody debris can produce 50 gallons of fuel, how many gallons of fuel could 42 million acres of dead and dying forests produce?

Funded by a \$10 million grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, a consortium of five universities, joined by research labs across the Northern Rockies, is looking for ways to turn that mass of dead timber into a carbon-neutral fuel source.

Known as the Bioenergy Alliance Network of the Rockies, the upstart group includes researchers at Montana's two flagship universities, and those at Wyoming, Idaho and Colorado State.

"This is probably one of the few projects that promises success in turning carbon waste, or organic material, into liquid fuel," said Peter Kolb, the extension project manager for BANR. "But there are a lot of challenges that need to be addressed in order to do that."

Kolb, a professor of forestry at Montana State University, is heading the project for Montana from the University of Montana's College of Forestry and Conservation, which received \$1 million for the effort this month. Kolb said the team also includes the Rocky Mountain Research Station and the National Renewable Energy Lab, along with Cool Planet Energy Systems – a Colorado firm whose investors include General Electric, British Petroleum and Google Ventures. Cool Planet has patented technology that converts non-food biomass into gasoline.

The process is described as a carbon-negative fuel cycle, and the company is looking to establish five trial refineries near potential biomass sources, which include the forests of the Northern Rockies.

"Montana is an ideal state for wood to bioenergy conversion technology," Kolb said. "We have 7.5 million acres of private lands where owners are active in trying to maintain a healthy forest, and we've got 17 million acres of federal land, where mortality rates are phenomenal and nothing is being done with that because of policy issues."

Resolving those policy issues on national forest lands stands high on the list of challenges BANR is working to resolve. While subsidies are available for taking wood off private lands for conversion to biofuels, Kolb said, those subsidies aren't available on federal lands.

But much of the dead-standing wood in Montana sits on federal lands. And without the promise of a long-term supply of biomass coming off those lands, investors aren't likely to bring new technology to the table. "That's something that will have to get looked at very hard for this to work," Kolb said. "If you plan to make a \$30 million investment, you need a long-term supply of the raw product to feed that investment, and it's nearly impossible to get a long-term commitment off federal lands right now."

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.

The team also includes researcher Woodam Chung, a professor of forest operations at UM who is studying cost-effective ways to collect and transport forest products to a biomass refinery. Researchers at UM are also exploring management practices – how much biomass to remove and how much to leave on site for ecological purposes. Others have been assigned to find ways of ensuring any biofuel production remains carbon neutral.

"We're looking at the logistical feasibility of locating refineries near biomass that's not being utilized, or is being poorly utilized," Kolb said. "All of these states have millions and millions of acres of beetle-killed lodgepole and ponderosa pine that doesn't have a terrific market value."

In Montana, that also includes logging debris – slash that gets burned on site. Kolb called it a low-value product and said there aren't many markets for dead-standing trees and slash.

But the recovery rates reported by Cool Planet Energy Systems are promising, standing at roughly 50 gallons of fuel per 1 ton of dry wood. To put that into perspective, Kolb said, a logging truck carries around 20 tons of wood, or the equivalent of 1,000 gallons of fuel once converted.

"It's more complicated than saying there's a bunch of dead trees," Kolb said. "There's logistics and economics that must be dealt with. The transport of low-density biomass makes it economically unfeasible right now. The petroleum you use offsets the carbon neutrality." Using remote sensing technology, MSU is already looking to identify areas of dense beetle-kill, or forests at high risk of dying. Accessing those sources before they decay – and planning refineries in close proximity – could reduce the cost of transportation and keep the effort carbon neutral.

But for the technology to pan out, Kolb said, the end product must also remain affordable to consumers. If biofuels can't compete in the marketplace alongside fossil fuels, he said, the model – no matter how renewable or green it is – has little chance of success.

"When you look at wood or switch grass, the density of energy there is much less than fossil fuels," Kolb said. "You've got to haul wood from difficult places, like mountains, so you have less dollars per volume of energy and it's more expensive, so that's another one of the challenges we're up against."

Others are watching the progress, including Rep. Pat Connell, R-Hamilton, who is serving as a project adviser. Connell said similar efforts are taking place in the Pacific Northwest, where the Northwest Advanced Renewables Alliance, or NARA, is looking to use woody biomass as an alternative to petroleum-based fuels and chemicals.

Based out of Washington State University, NARA aims to develop a new aviation fuel industry using wood and wood waste from across the Northwest, and to grow new wood-based energy crops.

BANR has similar goals, but is currently three years behind NARA in its research.

"What they're (BANR) looking at is trying to deal with the expansion of all this dead standing wood," said Connell. "They're going to try and evaluate the likelihood of being able to produce high-octane fuel from dead-standing wood."

Kolb would like to see Cool Planet build production plants in Montana. He believes the state holds several advantages over its neighbors – advantages that include an existing logging infrastructure and the state's abundance of dead-standing wood.

Potential sites could include the shuttered Smurfit-Stone Container Corp. site in Frenchtown, and the community of Seeley Lake, which has a functional logging mill and sits close to the Blackfoot Challenge. Kolb also named Pablo and Miles City.



Vegetation (Continued from page 5)

overall water management plan. This is a crucial omission. Millions of gallons of water that might otherwise be utilized to keep streams flowing, water crops and provide domestic water are instead being cast uselessly into the air by the state's overstocked vegetation. *Is a Tree a Heavy Drinker or Does It Just Pump Water?* discusses the tradeoffs between water quality and water yield experienced by water management districts that plant trees in the watersheds that feed their reservoirs. Trees stabilize soil and keep water cool, but they also exact a price for their services in reduced water yield.

Due to the extraordinary water costs of photosynthesis, we must also ask the question of which is more important to the welfare of California, carbon sequestration or adequate water supplies? Dry wood is about half carbon, and, since nearly 11 gallons of water is needed to generate each pound of wood, we can calculate that it takes over 21 gallons of water for each pound of sequestered carbon. Once again, a portion of this water is locked into the wood, but the bulk of it is released into the atmosphere by transpiration and is no longer available for other purposes.

Like all real-world situations, choosing the best path will not be easy. The decisions that set the path will require tradeoffs and value decisions at every step of the way, and while we are making these choices, it behooves us to remember how our forests affect our ground water supplies.

BRIGGS, ROBERT O., 1999. *Competition for Limited Dry Season Ground-stored Water Between Forest Use and Stream Flow in the Waddell Valley*. Unpublished manuscript

DECOSTER, LESTER A. AND JOHN HERRINGTON, 1988. *Is a Tree a Heavy Drinker or Does It Just Pump Water?* American Tree Farmer. May-June pp. 17

REDWOOD EMPIRE <http://buyredwood.com/faq-page#n857> ■

THE GREAT BIG LEAF MAPLE SYRUP EXPERIMENT

By Cate Moore

I am an inveterate reader of just about anything that lands in front of me, and I stumble across the most interesting tidbits from the oddest sources. This year, Anchor Brewing Company released their Big Leaf Maple Autumn Red Ale wherein I read that they used Bigleaf Maple sap in the brewing and also related that Bigleaf Maples produce a "delicious syrup."

Whoa! You mean we can make syrup out of our own local maples? I've been participating in the local forestry community for over twenty years, and I've never heard this mentioned. It was obviously time for a little research. I jumped onto the internet and discovered that California is way behind the curve. Oregon, Washington and British Columbia have been doing it for years and they have published articles about Big Leaf Maple sugaring specifically.

In my mind, this calls for a California feasibility experiment. We have Bigleaf Maples on our land, concentrated

along our watercourses, so we gathered up the available information, ordered a starter kit of spiles, a book called "Backyard Sugarin' " and will embark on an experiment to see how much sap we can gather, determine the best way to store sap prior to a sugaring since we don't have the east coast's convenient outdoor winter refrigerator, and see if we come out the other end with anything resembling a tasty maple syrup.

Of course, we have managed to pick the absolute worst year in decades to try out gathering maple sap, so we won't be surprised if our results are less than impressive. We'll be posting our progress on the website.

In the meantime, check out the following for data on Bigleaf Maple syrup. If you are inspired enough to try it yourself, let us know how it went for you. <http://www.blmaple.net> ■

SUCCESSION PLANNING Part One of Many

By Cate Moore

You may remember a couple of years ago when CCFA sent a questionnaire out asking if members were interested in succession planning. We got a very enthusiastic response and have been trying since then to get the UC Extension folks to bring the Ties to the Land road show to Santa Cruz County. We feel two years is long enough to fiddle with that avenue and have decided to tackle the subject head-on ourselves.

We're not claiming to be experts, but CCFA can certainly act as a clearing house for stories, ideas, problems, questions and so forth as we explore the topic together. We think that if we each share the little bit we know, across all of us we can find most of the answers we need.

So, while we will be publishing articles in the newsletter and online, we hope this will be a two-way conversation. Give us your stories, ask us your questions, and by all means, tell us when we're blowing smoke. We'll provide contact information at the end of the article.

[What is succession planning, and how is it different from estate planning?](#)

Estate planning and succession planning both serve to accomplish the same end, namely the orderly transfer of your property to your heirs according to your wishes. I feel the main difference is that normal estate planning is designed to manage the division and transfer of static, easily dividable property like stocks, bonds, and so forth, and succession planning addresses the passing on of a living, working business entity like a farm or small business where breaking up the concern's assets will cause the business to fail.

Every succession plan needs within it an estate plan, so we will start there. Even if your main concern is your farm, you probably still own securities, life insurance policies and bank accounts, you may have minor children to provide for, you have family heirlooms to distribute. All of this is handled under traditional estate planning.

Everyone needs a will. This is the best document for declaring who will care for the minor children and your desires for distributing the family heirlooms. You can put the whole shebang into your will, but it may not be your best option. The problem with wills is that everything gets locked up in probate until the court declares that the will is authentic and all the

Succession (Continued on page 8)

Succession (Continued from page 7)

provisions have been handled correctly. In the meantime, the family and the executor need to pay for the bills and taxes out of their pockets until the estate is released, then get reimbursed by the estate. In a contended will, this can take years, which can cause great financial hardship for everyone involved.

Another common way of handling one's estate is a revocable living trust. In this vehicle, the property owner places all of his major assets into the ownership of the trust. The major advantage of the trust is that it avoids probate. The trustee can manage all of the estate's property, pay bills, pay taxes and generally continue in business-as-usual mode while the property is divided and handed over to the heirs.

Other forms of trusts can be set up to provide for the lifelong care of disabled children, and for other special needs and can be part of your estate plan. If any of our readers want to describe other estate plans they have seen and their benefits and pitfalls, we'd be happy to pass the information along.

We'll keep estate planning at this quick overview unless any of you have questions or stories to share. Also, if you have a financial planner or attorney that you feel provides good service, we will also be happy to pass that along.

Write us at:

CCFA

Attn: Succession Planning
P. O. Box 66868
Scotts Valley, CA 95066

email us at: ccfa@ccfassociation.org

Future articles will address the following topics (In no particular order):

- Scoping the property/ business
- Deciding on the participants
- Apportioning ownership
- How do you add people?
- How do people opt out?
- What are the participants duties and responsibilities?
- Contributing and noncontributing participants and how to fairly reward both
- How do you declare and communicate your ideas and visions?
- How do you factor in your heirs ideas and visions?
- How do you distribute proceeds?
- Do you need an external manager?
- When do you dissolve the business?
- Inheritance taxes
- Ongoing business expenses
- Business forms that encapsulate the succession plan and how they are formed.
- Government reporting requirements

Questions, answers and suggestions from readers

LEGISLATION - JANUARY 15, 2014

It's January, and the California legislation merry-go-round is back in operation.

First, so that everyone knows the legislative schedule for this year, here is the calendar. Keep these dates in mind when commenting on legislation.

Jan. 6 Legislature Reconvenes.

Jan. 10 Budget must be submitted by Governor.

Jan. 17 Last day for policy committees to hear and report to Fiscal committees fiscal bills introduced in their house in 2013.

Jan. 24 Last day for any committee to hear and report to the Floor bills introduced in their house in 2013. Last day to submit bill requests to the Office of Legislative Counsel.

Jan. 31 Last day for each house to pass bills introduced in 2013 in their House.

Feb. 21 Last day for bills to be introduced.

May 2 Last day for policy committees to hear and report to Fiscal Committees fiscal bills introduced in their house.

May 9 Last day for policy committees to hear and report to the floor non-fiscal bills introduced in their house.

May 16 Last day for policy committees to meet prior to June 2.

May 23 Last day for fiscal committees to hear and report to the floor bills introduced in their house. Last day for fiscal committees to meet prior to June 2.

May 27 - 30 Floor Session Only. No committee may meet for any purpose.

May 30 Last day for bills to be passed out of the house of origin.

June 2 Committee meetings may resume.

June 15 Budget must be passed by midnight.

June 26 Last day for a legislative measure to qualify for the November 4 general election ballot.

June 27 Last day for policy committees to meet and report bill.

Aug. 15 Last day for fiscal committees to meet and report bills to the Floor.

Aug. 18 - 31 Floor Session only. No committees, other than conference committees and rules committee, may meet for any purpose.

Aug. 22 Last day to amend bills on the Floor

Aug. 31 Last day for each house to pass bills. Final recess begins at the end of this day's session (J.R. 51(b) (3)).

IMPORTANT DATES OCCURRING DURING FINAL RECESS: 2014

Sept. 30 Last day for Governor to sign or veto bills passed by the Legislature before Sept. 1 and in the Governor's possession on or after Sept. 1.

Nov. 30 Adjournment at midnight.

Dec. 1 12 m. convening of 2015-16 Regular Session.

Now that we have the calendar recorded, we will examine the actions on those bills left dangling at the end of the last legislative session while we wait for the deadline for new legislation to be proposed. We will have the legislation table with links into the legislature for status and text of the bills uploaded on the website.

Here are the currently active bills:

AB-37 Unemployment insurance: reporting requirements: status of funds - this started as a bill about water resources and went

through 2 gut-and-amend procedures in 2013. In its current state, it no longer concerns forest landowners.

AB-468 Non-industrial timber management plans: forest landowners - Chesbro came out of the gate running on this one. Passed Natural Resources 1/13/14, sent to Appropriations. This bill has all the earmarks of a spot bill.

AB-504 Commercial fishing: sea cucumbers - this originally had to do with the Fish and Game Commission and salmon and groundfish rules. Was gutted and amended to a placeholder on 1/6/14

AB-515 Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: writ of mandate - amended and passed Judiciary on 1/13/14, sent to Appropriations

AB-769 Property taxation: valuing property: comparable sales - gutted to a placeholder, passed Revenue and Taxation, on Assembly floor

AB-866 Regulations. - surfaced just long enough to have a hearing scheduled, then canceled

AB-896 Wildlife management areas: mosquito abatement - active again, in Appropriations

AB-976 Coastal resources: California Coastal Act of 1976: enforcement: penalties - in Assembly conference

AB-1331 Clean and Safe Drinking Water Act of 2014: completely gutted and amended, in Senate Natural Resources and Water - unsure if it needs to return to the Assembly before passage.

SB-674 California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: residential infill projects. - bill greatly amended, hearing set for Environmental Quality on 1/15/14

SB-798 Income taxes: credits: contributions to education funds - completely gutted and amended 1/6/14 from a bill about a California Green Infrastructure Bank, passed Governance and Finance, sent to Appropriations

These bills are officially in an Inactive file:

AB-953 California Environmental Quality Act. - in Assembly inactive file

AB-1330 Environmental justice. - Senate inactive file

SB-1 Sustainable Communities Investment Authority - Senate inactive file

SB-617 California Environmental Quality Act - Senate inactive file

The following have probably died in committee, but we are suspicious enough to continue watching them.

AB-1 Water quality: integrated plan: Salinas Valley - no action so far

AB-8 Alternative fuel and vehicle technologies: funding programs - no action so far

AB-23 State responsibility areas: fire prevention fees - no action so far

AB-124 State responsibility areas: fire prevention fees - no action so far

AB-153 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: offsets - no action so far

AB-203 Coastal resources: coastal development permits: penalties - no action so far

AB-245 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: public meetings - no action so far

AB-278 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: Low Carbon Fuel Standard - no action so far

AB-284 Energy: Road to 2050 Board: reporting - no action so far

AB-350 Timber harvesting plans: exempt activities - no action so far

AB-374 Eminent domain: compensation: loss of goodwill - vetoed by Governor, filed in Assembly veto file after consideration by Assembly

AB-416 State Air Resources Board: Local Emission Reduction Program - no action so far

AB-756 California Environmental Quality Act: judicial review: public works projects - no action so far

AB-794 Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act: exemption: use of landfill and organic waste - no action so far

AB-818 Air pollution control: penalties - no action so far

AB-823 Environment: California Farmland Protection Act - no action so far

AB-875 Forest management - no action so far

AB-929 State responsibility areas: structures: fees - no action so far

AB-1051 Housing - no action so far

AB-1188 Fire protection: general obligation bonds - no action so far

AB-1230 Mammals: use of dogs to pursue bears and bobcats - no action so far

AB-1251 Water quality: stormwater - no action so far

AB-1295 Public utilities: renewable energy: community renewables option - no action so far

AB-1375 California Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006: market-based compliance mechanisms: Clean Technology Investment Fund - no action so far

ACA-3 Local government financing: public safety services: voter approval - no action so far

ACA-8 Local government financing: voter approval - no action so far

SB-11 Alternative fuel and vehicle technologies: funding programs. - no action so far

SB-17 State responsibility areas: fire prevention fees - no action so far

SB-34 Greenhouse gas: carbon capture and storage. - no action so far

SB-123 Environmental and land use court. - no action so far

SB-125 State responsibility areas: fire prevention fees. - no action so far

SB-147 State responsibility areas: fire prevention fees. - no action so far

SB-167 Environmental quality: California Environmental Quality Act. - no action so far

SB-273 Farm vehicles: registration exemptions. - no action so far

SB-621 Vehicular air pollution: in-use, diesel-fueled vehicles. - no action so far

SB-633 CEQA - no action so far

SB-731 Environment: California Environmental Quality Act - no action so far

SB-754 California Environmental Quality Act - no action so far

SB-787 Environmental quality: the Sustainable Environmental Protection Act - no action so far

SCA-4 Local government transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval - no action so far

SCA-7 Local government financing: public libraries: voter approval - no action so far

SCA-8 Transportation projects: special taxes: voter approval - no action so far

SCA-11 Local government: special taxes: voter approval - no action so far ■

SEVENTY-NINE YEARS OF MONITORING DEMONSTRATES DRAMATIC FOREST CHANGE

Feather Publishing
1/31/2014

Long-term changes to forests affect biodiversity and how future fires burn. A team of scientists led by Research Ecologist Dr. Eric Knapp, from the U.S. Forest Service's Pacific Southwest Research Station, found dramatic differences in forests today compared to historic conditions prior to logging and fire suppression.

The team conducted their research in the Forest Service's Stanislaus-Tuolumne Experimental Forest on the Stanislaus National Forest in the central Sierra Nevada, re-measuring three large historical plots originally established in 1929 to evaluate the effects of different logging methods.

Trees were counted and their diameters measured across entire plots and in neighboring unlogged areas with the same fire history.

Understory vegetation (tree seedlings, shrubs and leafy plants) was quantified to determine changes over a 79-year period. They also collected fire scar samples from nearby stumps and dead trees to pinpoint dates of previous forest fires.

As in many forested areas in the western U.S., fire is much less frequent than it once was. Results showed that the study area had not burned since 1889. Prior to 1889, the forest burned on average every six years.

The forest currently contains 2.4 times more trees than it did in 1929 — mostly in the small and intermediate size classes. The excess density was nearly identical in the plots logged in 1929 and plots without a history of logging, suggesting that over the long term other factors, including fire suppression, may be exerting more influence than past logging on forest density and the current susceptibility to uncharacteristically severe fire.

Historical logging removed many of the largest trees and often targeted the most fire-resistant pines. Very large trees were still less abundant than in the old-growth condition in 1929. The forest today also contains more fir and cedar and fewer pines than it once did.

Shrubs, which provide food and cover for wildlife, covered 29 percent of the forest floor in 1929. Currently, the same shrubs cover only 2 percent of the forest floor — a decline that appears to be the result of higher tree density.

"The forest changes we found in this study are emblematic of similar changes that have occurred in the absence of fire throughout the western U.S., and help to explain why fires such as the nearby Rim Fire burn as intensely as they now do," said Knapp.

The plots measured in this study are among the oldest known to still exist on Forest Service lands in California, and the historical data showing what the forest once looked like provide valuable information about how to restore greater fire resilience and improve biodiversity in forests today.

The full report can be found at <http://1.usa.gov/1g9XWQY>.

Headquartered in Albany, the Pacific Southwest Research Station develops and communicates science needed to sustain forest ecosystems and other benefits to society. It has research facilities in California, Hawaii and the U.S.-affiliated Pacific Islands. For more information, visit fs.fed.us/psw. ■

DO WE NEED A BOND TO FIX FORESTS?

By Bruce Ross, Redding Searchlight
December 4, 2013 6:00 PM

A very interesting and lively discussion at today's Assembly hearing on water in Redding, where a handful of Democratic members from out of the area learned just how passionate North State residents are about the issue. There were also productive ideas about what would be good investments in the North State -- including Sites Reservoir, a project long on the drawing board in Colusa County, and the excellent idea of more carefully managing watershed forests to prevent a cycle of overgrowth, destructive fire, and sediment filling reservoirs.

Restoring more fire-resilient forests is a widely shared goal— not just by cranky old loggers in the hills but by Regional Forester Randy Moore, who last year told the California Energy Commission this in writing: I have established a goal of restoring 400,000 to 500,000 acres on the National Forests in California annually. Our restoration plans represent an increase of 200-300% over the rate we are currently accomplishing.

Thinning forests would likely increase water runoff, decrease fire risk, provide work for rural communities and produce useful resources. Unfortunately, laws and federal processes being what they are, this stuff doesn't happen quickly or cheaply. You'd like to think wood products would pay the bill—but it's just not always so. I'm 100 percent in favor of increasing spending on forest restoration one way or another, but I've just got one question: Why is a bond the right way? Bonds make perfect sense for building a highway, a dam or a new school building.

It's a major up-front investment, whose benefits will be enjoyed for many years. Spread the cost out of time, sure. But forest management is not a major capital investment. It is gardening. You don't get to do it once, but have to keep up over time, as plants have a pesky habit of growing. Forest maintenance costs need to be covered -- somehow -- but issuing bonds to thin brush that will grow back in 10 years? Isn't that like taking out a home-equity loan to pay for a trip to Hawaii? -- UPDATE—It doesn't really address the mechanism, but the background information supplied for the hearing has some strong statements about the value of fixing forests.

Need for Increased Investment in Forest Management, the importance of north state forests to California's supply and quality of water cannot be overstated. As those who live in the Sierra Nevada and Cascade Ranges are fond of pointing out, water does not come "from the Delta," it originates in the mountains where the snowpack serves as the State's largest reservoir. Yet, there is a growing body of evidence that poor management has impaired the forest's ecosystem role, including in filtering and retaining water. Many decades ago, before fire's critical role was fully understood, the general reaction to all fires was to snuff them out. However, that eliminated the kind of frequent, low-intensity fires that kept the forest healthy. Now,

Fix Forests (Continued on page 11)

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



Fix Forests (Continued from page 10)

overcrowded forests sporting an unhealthy mix of tree types and ages are experiencing steadily increasing temperatures due to climate change, which has in turn led to an unprecedented run of mega-fires like the Rim Fire and the Moonlight Fire.

The Rim Fire was the largest in the history of the Sierra Nevada and burned at an extremely high intensity. Besides the serious threat to life and property such fires pose, they destroy critical habitat and cascade into a series of other negative impacts including, but not limited to, a decline in the natural water storage capacity provided by forest meadows, increased sedimentation (and therefore loss of storage capacity) in reservoirs, and massive releases of greenhouse gasses (GHG). For example, it is estimated that the Moonlight fire emitted a level of GHG equivalent to the entire City of Los Angeles for a year. ■

We're on the web!
www.ccfassociation.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.ccfassociation.org or by e-mail to: ccfa@ccfassociation.org. We will keep it strictly confidential at all times.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE:

Sue and Settle	1
Davenport Cement Plant Chinook Thrive in Rice Field	2
Coho Thrive in Warm Lagoon Board of Forestry Update	3
Salvage Logging Opposed	4
Vegetation and Ground Water	5
Forest Debris Into Fuel	6
Big Leaf Maple Experiment Succession Planning	7
January 2014 Legislation	8-9
Dramatic Forest Change	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.*