

**Forest Carbon Action Team (FCAT)**  
**February 23, 2015, Meeting Minutes**

Final: 5/7/15

**Meeting attendees:**

Janet Barentson – California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CAL FIRE); Jerry Bird – US Forest Service (USFS); Jim Branham – Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC); Edie Chang – Air Resources Board (ARB); JR Delarosa – Natural Resources Agency (NRA); Helge Eng - CAL FIRE; George Gentry – State Board of Forestry and Fire Protection; Keith Gilles – University of California Berkeley; Stacey Heaton – Regional Council of Rural Counties; Russ Henly – NRA; Josh Johnson – CAL FIRE; Chris Keithley – CAL FIRE; Mark Nechodom – Department of Conservation; Mark Rosenberg – CAL FIRE; Klaus Scott – ARB; Duane Shintaku – CAL FIRE; Chris Zimny – CAL FIRE.

**Agenda Items 1-3 Opening remarks and Review agenda**

Janet Barentson greeted the team and introduced the meeting on behalf of Chief Pimlott. She noted that the BOF discussion of forest carbon stocks was the primary topic on the agenda.

**Action/Consent Items**

- Approval received for final December 15, 2014 minutes.

**Agenda Items 4, Governor’s Office Updated View, Post the Governor’s Inaugural Address**

This item was deferred.

**Agenda Items 5 – Recap of January 28, 2015, Board of Forestry and Fire Protection  
Special Report on “Carbon Sequestration and Inventory Issues”.**

The first agenda item was a report by George Gentry, Executive Officer of the Board of Forestry and Fire Protection (BOF).

Mr. Gentry began the presentation by noting the many possible models for estimating carbon stocks in California’s forests. He mentioned the “Canadian model” which includes all forest types and is a very inclusion estimate. The “Battles” model gives estimates for above ground live carbon and was derived by remote sensing. This estimate includes all vegetation types, not just timberlands. . The “BOF analysis” for AB 1504 is focused on 7.5 million acres of timberlands. This land base includes the productive, private forestlands in the State. A handout on the topic was provided by Mr. Gentry. The handout was based information and a presentation by Bill Stewart of University of California.

Mark Rosenberg added that the Battles research was being revised based on evidence from Forest Inventory Analysis (FIA) information that they under represented tree growth. They are also extending the analysis period to 2010. With regard to the categories being tracked, It is important understand that there are many pools of forest carbon, and what is included in the estimate matters. FIA will be the main source of information used for FCAT work on estimating forest carbon trends.

A main point of consensus was the understanding that in making carbon estimates it is important to state what you are intending to measure as there are uncertainties in the data used for the measurements, sampling, model, and model selection error. Mr. Gentry recommends use of field based information.

#### **Action/Consent Items**

- Post BOF document the on the FCAT web site.
- Distinguish and define the difference between the FCAT interests in forest carbon estimation and the BOF carbon estimation and identify desired components for the FCAT inventory.

#### **Agenda Items 6 – Discussion of first Public Stakeholder Workshop held on February 20, 2015, in Sacramento.**

Russ Henly presented information on the public stakeholder meeting. He noted the webcast presentation model for the meeting generally worked well but participation at satellite locations was low with a statewide total of 50 people attending satellite locations. Over 600 persons were notified of the meeting.

Mr. Henly noted that not much public comment was received regarding the vision statement outline for the forest carbon plan and this may be an indication of support of the initial document as presented. The co-benefits approach was particularly well supported by the public. Other public comments include the need for smaller individual/group meetings on the Forest Carbon Plan; connecting funding for needs on the ground (perhaps water bond and Greenhouse Gas Reduction funds); on USFS lands, there is a need for more prescribed fire with the understand of carbon flux issues related fire; concerns for small landowners over costs and challenges to generate revenues from forest carbon management work. There is a handout summarizing the comments.

Two more public meetings (not in web cast) are planned. The February 20<sup>th</sup> webinar is now posted on the FCAT web site.

Jerry Bird mentioned the Sierra Cascade Dialogue may be a place for further presentation of the FCAT Forest Carbon Plan.

#### **Agenda Items 7 – Subcommittee Reports/Updates & Discussion**

##### **Inventory Subcommittee report**

Klaus Scott noted he met with the Science Advisory Team. Feedback from the team included aggregating data, ownerships types, and regions. Some suggested the need to look at other ecoregions as the basis of reporting information.

Jeremy Fried of the USDA PNW Experiment Station, was at the Science team meeting and he stated that a new publication on carbon trends will be nearing completion as part of the FIA 10

year assessment cycle. This information will be used for baseline carbon estimates. Mark Rosenberg noted the information will show high levels of density-induced tree mortality, much higher than tree losses due to wildfire. This may drive policy decisions and actions.

### **Policy Subcommittee report**

Russ Henly provided a report on the Policy subcommittee actions. The committee focused on planning on public meetings. He noted the outline and vision statement will be reviewed again prior to the rest of the public meetings. Also, there is still a need to pull together the time line of FCAT subcommittee accomplishments in order to help coordinate activities.

Regarding broader policy information, Mr. Henly reiterated the challenge from the Governor's office for FCAT to think big. He noted that the policy statement should reflect this and ensure that our forests remain net carbon sinks.

Edie Chang discussed the new timeframes for the Governor's midterm emission reduction goals and recent legislative proposals related to these goals that would strive for 50% reduction in petroleum use, 50% of energy from renewables, and a two-times increase in building efficiency. The legislative proposals also identified other goals. She further noted the desire of the administration for a new Scoping Plan that would be produced prior to 2018.

Discussion ensued regarding the applicable activities for Greenhouse Reduction Fund Projects. Janet Barentson noted that CAL FIRE is carefully ensuring that all its projects using Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds have a measurable GHG emission reduction.

An investment plan was discussed for funding during FY15/16. Included in this investment plan may be more funding for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund Projects. Patrick Wright noted that the investment plan should consider energy benefits.

Mark Nechodom discussed the fee vs. tax issue at stake with Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund funding and the need to have accurate GHG reduction numbers, particularly for rangeland areas where the error bars for carbon estimates is high. Discussion included how industries interested in offsetting GHG emissions can use GGRF projects. This topic was noted as needing to be on the agenda for another FCAT meeting.

#### **Action/Consent Items**

- Complete the subcommittee activity timelines.
- Mark Nechodom will summarize the industry emission offset topic and provide it to FCAT. This topic will be place on the agenda for another FCAT meeting.

### **State/Federal Lands Subcommittee report**

Jerry Bird discussed the committee's work on various state plans. He noted that the new National Forest LMPs are in alignment with the AB 32 Scoping Plan and handed out a table showing various plan alignment with AB 32. Mr. Gillis raised questions regarding BLM plans and lack of assessment or non alignment with AB 32.

#### **Action/Consent Items**

- FCAT members should review the handout and provide further comments to Mr. Bird for discussion at the next FCAT meeting.

### **Co-benefits Subcommittee report**

Helge Eng stated the committee has had four meetings to date. He provided a handout of Co-benefits committee actions items.

### **Agenda Items 8 - Use of Priority Landscapes and a phased approach for the Forest Resources Economics Study**

Mr. Keithley provided a report and handout on a revised approach based on the Science Review Team recommendations. The Science Committee suggested narrowing the scope of the study. It is now a phased approach due to the many issues and timelines.

Phase I would be to identify where investments are needed to enhance carbon storage and co-benefits. Priority areas would be identified from previous FRAP 2010 assessment work (an assessment of assets and threats). As many as fifteen priority areas were identified in the past, and many of these could be used by FCAT in the future. Funding would be provided for the priority areas. First need is to identify which priority areas are most important to forest carbon estimates. An issue was raised by Mr. Gillis regarding FRAP's priority areas and whether carbon implications had been previously considered. FRAP is interested in developing an online viewer of priority areas.

Phase 2 is an economic evaluation of the resources, costs and benefits as defined in Phase 1. It would identify options for priority areas. It would likely be produced after the Forest Carbon Plan is released. University of California will be the lead in conducting the evaluation. However, Mr. Gillis stated that it is likely to involve experts from several colleges and universities. Mr. Keithley and Mr. Gillis noted that it is essential to get the right team and maybe other UCs or CSUS institutions would be involved.

Patrick Wright expressed interest in hosting the investment priority assessment for areas related to the Lake Tahoe area. J.R. Delarosa noted that a new employee at the Natural Resources Agency may be able to assist in the economics evaluation.

### **Agenda Items 9 – Planned use of ListServ for notification and distribution of FCAT work products**

Janet Barentson discussed the webpage noting it was up and documents are being posted to it. Subcommittee meeting notes should be sent to Ms. Barentson or Duane Shintaku.

The ListServ is being use to notify people of upcoming information and new documents. The site will facilitate public questions, and answers will likely be aggregated and posted.

The next meeting is scheduled in the Governor's office on April 20, 2015.

End