



work closely with fishermen and members of the recreational fishing industry, such as charter boat operators, to conserve and develop recreational fishing. Moreover, the bill also directs the Commission and the DFG to restore and enhance California's recreational fisheries and the habitat on which they depend; redirect fishing pressure from overexploited fisheries to areas which can support additional fishing; maintain a high quality and diversity of recreational opportunities; reduce limits and promote conservation measures such as catch and release regulations; encourage a viable recreational fishing industry; and promote tourism. The bill is currently in the Committee on Water, Parks and Wildlife.

SB 4 (Presley), the Wildlife and Natural Areas Conservation Act of 1988, is an urgency statute which would provide for the submission of an \$85 million bond sale to the voters at the June 7, 1988 primary election. If the voters approve the bond sale, the proceeds of the sale would be available for appropriation to the Wildlife Appropriations Board for the acquisition, enhancement, restoration, or protection of lands supporting endangered plants or animals.

SB 496 (Davis), introduced February 23, would permit the Fish and Game Commission to authorize the taking of tule elk if the total statewide population exceeds 2,000 or if the Commission makes a specified determination regarding habitat based on a specified biennial report from the Director of the DFG to the Governor and legislature.

AB 345 (Allen), as amended February 24, would require the DFG to develop and maintain an automated information system containing the name and current address of each person who purchases a sport fishing, hunting, or trapping license, license stamp, or license tag, and to make information from the system available to law enforcement agencies and legislators upon written request. The bill would also appropriate \$750,000 from the Fish and Game Preservation Fund for expenditure during the 1987-88 fiscal year for the automated information system.

SB 40 (Marks), as amended February 17, would change existing law regarding the use of gill nets in several northern California counties.

AB 467 (Bates) would repeal existing law which authorizes the licensed taking of mountain lions, and would restore the lions to their prior status as a specially protected mammal.

AB 512 (Allen) would require the

Fish and Game Commission to establish guidelines for determining the value of each fish, reptile, bird, or mammal which is unlawfully killed, caught, taken, possessed, wasted, or injured; and would authorize courts, after July 1, 1988, to levy a penalty assessment not to exceed \$10,000 on each conviction or forfeiture of bail for such a violation of the Fish and Game Code.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

To be announced.

BOARD OF FORESTRY

Executive Officer: Dean Cromwell (916) 445-2921

The Board of Forestry is a nine-member Board appointed to administer the Z'berg-Nejedly Forest Practice Act of 1973. The Board serves to protect California's timber resources and to promote responsible timber harvesting. Also, the Board writes forest practice rules and provides the Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF)-with policymaking guidance. Additionally, the Board oversees the administration of California's forest system and wildland fire protection system. The Board members are:

Public: Jean Atkisson, Harold Walt (chair), Carlton Yee, Clyde Small, and Franklin L. "Woody" Barnes.

Forest Products Industry: Roy D. Barridge, Clarence Rose and Joseph Russ, IV.

Range Livestock Industry: Jack Shannon.

The Forest Practice Act requires careful planning of every timber harvesting operation by a registered professional forester (RPF). Before logging operations begin, each logging company must retain an RPF to prepare a timber harvesting plan (THP). Each THP must describe the land upon which work is proposed, silvicultural methods to be applied, erosion controls to be used and other environmental protections required by the Forest Practice Rules. All THPs must be inspected by a forester on the staff of the Department of Forestry and, where appropriate, by experts from the Department of Fish and Game and/or the Regional Water Quality Control Boards.

For the purpose of promulgating Forest Practice Rules, the state is divided into three geographic districts—southern, northern and coastal. In each of these districts, a District Technical

Advisory Committee (DTAC) is appointed. The various DTACs consult with the Board in the establishment and revision of district forest practice rules. Each DTAC is in turn required to consult with and evaluate the recommendations of the Department of Forestry, federal, state and local agencies, educational institutions, public interest organizations and private individuals. DTAC members are appointed by the Board and receive no compensation for their service.

MAJOR PROJECTS:

Hardwoods. At its February meeting, the Board heard final recommendations from interested parties on the hardwood regulation issue and the two Board-commissioned reports recently presented to the Board. (See CRLR Vol. 7, No. 1 (Winter 1987) pp. 85-86 for background information.) Comments received are as follows:

-The Department of Forestry and Fire Protection (CDF) recommended non-regulation except for hardwoods on conifer lands, where the Forest Practice Act already applies. CDF supports the recommendations set forth in the Board's staff-prepared *Policy Options for California's Hardwoods* paper, believing that a program of regulation would be slower and less effective than the actions proposed by staff. CDF plans an internal education program to make its personnel aware of the importance of the hardwood issue.

-The Range Management Advisory Committee (RMAC), designated by the Board as an advisory committee representing range industry interests, suggested that the impact of regulation has not been adequately assessed. Therefore, RMAC does not recommend regulation at this time. Alternative methods of addressing the issue proposed by RMAC include leaving the issue to local government intervention when necessary and educating landowners on hardwood conservation.

-The Department of Fish and Game (DFG) recommended establishing a reliable system for monitoring hardwood removal, citing specific areas as most valuable to the protection of hardwood habitat, and suggested that the Board set interim stocking standards. Once sufficient information is gathered to indicate desirable stocking requirements, the Board should implement more permanent standards. The standards, both interim and permanent, should serve as guidelines for local governments and not as regulations per



se. DFG has already provided local governments with maps locating critical habitat areas for the winter migration of deer to make them aware, for planning purposes, of the importance of the hardwood issue.

-The University of California Extension Services, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources, also advised the Board against regulation. Reminding the Board that UC Extension has an office in almost every county, Mr. Staniford related that it plans to use those offices to work hard at the local level to educate landowners and government officials about hardwoods. UC Extension will aggressively seek out smaller groups to educate, such as firewood dealers and small landowners. UC Extension has signed twelve contracts to conduct research on the issue and is planning more projects. Mr. Staniford assured the Board that systematic analysis of the effect of its programs is a part of each program, and the Extension intends to report frequently to the Board on its progress.

After hearing these final comments, industry member Jack Shannon moved that the Board adopt a resolution declaring it premature to set up a system of statewide regulation for hardwoods. The Board unanimously approved the resolution, which includes a proposed intensive education program along the lines suggested by CDF and RMAC. The resolution reserves the Board's right to regulate hardwoods in the future.

California-Oregon Transmission Project. In January, the Board sent to the California Energy Commission its comments regarding the Commission's draft 1986 Electricity Report, specifically addressing the environmental impacts of the proposed California-Oregon transmission lines. (See CRLR Vol. 6, No. 4 (Fall 1986) p. 80.) The project is currently the subject of an environmental review.

The Board addressed two areas of concern: the impact on the state's timberland resources, and its doubts as to the economic efficiency of importing power from the Pacific Northwest. The Board is particularly concerned that the Report does not accurately reflect the net social value of the project to the people of California. The Commission's analysis addressed only the economies of electrical production and project building costs, and does not take into account such associated costs as lost timber production and the impact of the project on wildlife. Board Chair Walt stated in his letter accompanying the Board comments that "[i]f providing less

expensive electricity results in corresponding cost increases in affected goods or services, or in an adverse impact on the productivity of resource lands, there may be less or even no net gain."

Finally, recognizing that Commission's Report serves as the basis for the Governor's energy policy, the Board requested that the Commission look into these questions and consider them in evaluating the need and timing of all power projects.

LEGISLATION:

SB 4 (Presley) would enact the Wildlife and Natural Areas Conservation Act of 1988. If adopted, the bill would authorize the issuance of bonds in the amount of \$85,000,000. The funds generated from the bond sale would be made available to the Wildlife Conservation Board and the Department of Fish and Game for the acquisition, enhancement, restoration, or protection of lands supporting unique, fragile, or endangered plants, animals, or natural communities, and for other wildlife habitat as specified.

Board staff believe it may have an opportunity to include the lack of regeneration in certain hardwood species and associated wildlife habitat as justification for acquisition under the bill. However, the bill as written does not apply to hardwoods.

SB 4 is currently pending in the Appropriations suspense calendar file.

AB 713 (N. Waters) was introduced February 18. Under existing law, CDF (in accordance with a plan approved by the Board) is required to classify areas within the state in which the state has the primary responsibility for preventing and suppressing fires. *AB 713* would also require CDF to provide, when available, rescue, first aid, and other emergency services to the public in state responsibility areas.

RECENT MEETINGS:

At its January 7 meeting in Sacramento, the Board was briefed by CDF on its review of U.S. Forest Service Forest Plans. CDF suggested that any Board recommendations on the Plans be coordinated with the Department of Fish and Game to provide proposals which have the joint support of both entities. Executive Director Cromwell has been working with DFG staff, and suggested three areas of common concern: (1) protection of endangered species; (2) stream management systems; and (3) fire protection, fire management plans, and fire prevention. The Board referred the matter to its Legislation

and Policy Development Committee and RMAC for further study because of objections raised by grazing and timber industry members.

The February 3 Board meeting, held in Sacramento, was largely devoted to the hardwood issue (see MAJOR PROJECTS, *supra*). In addition, the Board heard a suggestion from the California Forest Pest Council that it be named a designated advisory committee to the Board. The Council is an organization of private and public forest managers, foresters, entomologists, pathologists, zoologists, biologists, and others interested in the protection of forests from the damaging effects of animals, insects, diseases, and weeds.

FUTURE MEETINGS:

To be announced.

WATER RESOURCES CONTROL BOARD

Executive Director: James L. Easton
Chairperson: W. Don Maughan
(916) 445-3085

The Water Resources Control Board, established in 1967 by the Porter-Cologne Water Quality Control Act, implements and coordinates regulatory action concerning California water quality and water rights. The Board consists of five full-time members appointed for four-year terms. The statutory appointment categories for the five positions ensure that the Board collectively has experience in fields which include water quality and rights, civil and sanitary engineering, agricultural irrigation and law.

Board activity in California operates at regional and state levels. The state is divided into nine regions, each with a regional board composed of nine members appointed for four-year terms. Each regional board adopts Water Quality Control Plans (Basin Plans) for its area and performs any other function concerning the water resources of its respective region. All regional board action is subject to state Board review or approval.

Water quality regulatory activity includes issuance of waste discharge orders, surveillance and monitoring of discharges and enforcement of effluent limitations. The Board and its staff of approximately 450 provide technical assistance ranging from agricultural pollution control and waste water reclamation to discharge impacts on the