ACCG Project Development Process:
Proposed Forest Treatments Guidance Tool Comments

#	Date Received	Comment	Notes
1	12/4/19	Draft extremely Forest Service centric. This is not necessarily a criticism, rather a reflection of the historic focus of ACCG. I understand why Rick Hopson considers it a useful tool.	
2	12/4/19	The draft is environmentally-focused, no reference to the two other components of sustainability, social and economic. Again, a reflection of the historic focus of ACCG.	
3	12/4/19	Projects/grants developed by Fire Safe Councils, Resource Conservation Districts, and other non-profits to protect communities from catastrophic fire should fall into Category 1. Each of these projects is tiered to a Community Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP). All CWPPs are required to be developed through a public process and approved by the County Board of Supervisors, the County Fire District, and CAL FIRE. These projects address each of the three pillars of the ACCG.	
4	12/4/19	Grant-makers establish hard and usually short deadlines-- the process does not allow for long negotiations as with Forest Service projects. Grant applications need to be nimble enough to seize opportunities.	
5	1/10/20	If the project support tool helps the Forest Service improve forest and watershed health then it is worthwhile, but as written, it is unlikely to be of any use to groups such as Fire Safe Councils, Resource Conservation Districts, etc. that need to deal with short grant application timeframes.	
6	2/12/20	In category 2, Moderately Controverial under Project Activities: The current wording is: 3. Logging trees 20 to 30" doh especially in HRCAs and fisher den buffers. Recommendation: delete "especially" so that it's clear that logging trees 20-30" outside of HRCAs and fisher den buffers is not shown as something to be viewed as moderately controversial (it's fully consistent with current USFS, BLM, and CAL FIRE policies). Eliminating the work "especially" would no longer make it appear that it is "moderately controversial" for a project to propose to log trees 20-30" doh in forest projects. That one-word change would greatly improve the economics of the tool and projects consistent with the tool.	
7	2/12/20	In category 2, Moderately Controversial under Project Activities: 7. the current wording is: Salvage logging along roadsides, in strategic fuel breaks, and/or to protect property. Cutting dead or dying trees along roadsides or to protect property is a project action that removes "hazard trees" for public safety. Cutting dead or dying trees is necessary for reducing risk to public safety, and it is not controversial to protect lives and property. Similarly, cutting dead trees (salvage logging) in strategic fuel breaks is necessary for the effectiveness of fuel breaks, which is both a public safety benefit and a natural resource protection benefit. I recommend move item 7 from moderately controversial to category 1- non-controversial. Again, cutting dead or dying trees that pose safety risks to cars and people along roads and near private property should not be controversial. Shifting this #7 to non-controversial would also improve economic outcomes by encouraging projects to utukoze the logging of dead trees along roads, on fuel reaks, and near private propety-- areas that usually have economically viable access so that salvage logging projects would reduce fuel levels while producing jobs and valuable wood products from the ACCG area.	
8	2/12/20	Add one items (a new #12) under Category 1: "Thinning of fuel breaks" -- clarifies that thinning logging to create or maintain fuel breaks is not controversial.	
9	2/19/20	Consider changing the category titles from the word controversial to something else.	
10	2/19/20	Consider revisting some of the language in the guidance document to be inclusive of terminology used outside of National Forest lands.	