

**BOARD OF FORESTRY 2024 CALL FOR REGULATORY REVIEW (MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE)**

Topics for Board Consideration	Committee	Priority (scale 1-3)
<p><b>SB 2276: This was bill was mentioned in the CFA Comments as emergency regulations</b>                      This bill would (1) repeal the Small Timberland Owner Exemption, (2) rename the Forest Fire Prevention Exemption the Forest Resilience Exemption, revise the standards and criteria for qualifying for that exemption, and extend that exemption until January 1, 2031, and (3) extend until January 1, 2031, the other exemption described above. The bill would also make conforming changes.</p>	<p>MGMT Oak EX</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Utility ROW Operations 14CCR 1104.1</p>	<p>MGMT</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Review the need for a rule requirement for the public noticing of harvest documents.                      Public noticing requirements have not been reviewed in the context of contemporary technology, and there may be opportunities for greater clarity, efficiency, and consistency across Forest Districts. The Department does not have specific proposed Rule language to consider and would instead prefer a comprehensive review and comparison of the various public noticing requirements in the various Forest Districts and Special Rule Counties.</p>	<p>MGMT</p>	<p>1</p>
<p>Landowner Notification (Noticing Issues) 2 parts                      a) Per 14 CCR 1032.7; RPF preparing the Plan shall furnish to the Department at the time of submission of the Plan, the names and mailing addresses of all property owners within three-hundred (300) feet of the Plan boundary. Either a list compiled from the latest equalized assessment roll or a list provided by a title company doing business in California compiled within sixty (60) days of submission of the Plan.                      There is a discrepancy with the list used by RPFs and between list Review entities utilize causing filling issues.                      b) Timing &amp; Physical posting of the notification requirements (prior to submission and/or concurrently with submission.</p>	<p>MGMT</p>	<p>1</p>

Is it within two days of receipt of the Plan? What if the Plan is returned? Is it truly a Plan until it is filed? Is filing date a better timing for notification?		
Physical posting of the property may need to be done multiple times- which is not only time consuming and costly, by may also be ultimately confusing to the public. In general, if mailed notifications are done, should the physical posting be limited to such time as when the plan is filed, and review is beginning?		
Consider defining the term "plan area" to correspond with either the Logging Area or Harverst Area	MGMT	1
as it applies to conversion of timberland	MGMT	1
LaTour Demonstration State Forest Management Plan Review -- State Forest Management Plan review, when Management Plan is provided	MGMT	1
Jackson Demonstration State Forest Management Plan Review - State Forest Management Plan review, when Management Plan is provided	MGMT	1
Soquel Demonstration State Forest Management Plan Review - State Forest Management Plan review, when Management Plan is provided	MGMT	1
Pacific Forest and Watershed Lands Stewardship Council - State Forest Management Plan review, when Management Plan is provided	MGMT	1
MSP under Options "A" and "B" could be well served by further discussion. The Department and the landowners providing the information would benefit from discussions on the procedures and requirements necessary to facilitate efficient review.	Existing MGMT priority (No current work)	2
Silvicultural rules, Southern Subdistrict		

existing rule results in a high stem count due to retention of smaller trees. As the stem counts increased and fire conditions have worsened, fuel management has become a much greater objective. 2023 priority request; Review of Required Post-Harvest Stocking Standards (14 § CCR 913; 14 CCR § 1071) -- Focus on recovery from large fires in the Southern Subdistrict	Existing MGMT priority (No current work)	2
Consider the inclusion of Silvicultural options Fuelbreak/Defensible Space, Aspen, Meadow and Wet Area Restoration & White and Black Oak Woodland Management in the Southern Subdistrict and Santa Cruz County rules.  In both cases, certain Special Prescriptions under 913.4, which did not exist when those rules were originally adopted, have been developed by the Board which practitioners feel would be useful in the current post-CZU fire environment.	MGMT	2
Evaluation of MSP Requirements under the Rules. Department would like to discuss the limited use of "Option (b)" for Sustained Yield Plans (SYPs), and the lack of Rule specificity guiding the Department's evaluation of MSP "Option (a)" demonstrations as described in § 913.11(a).	Existing MGMT priority (No current work)	2
Board Policy Review	MGMT	2
Oak Retention Considerations -- Preparation of a white paper focusing on maintaining mature tanoak on the landscape	MGMT	2