

Road Rule Task Force Meeting Notes

February 11, 2010

State of California Resources Building
Sacramento, California

The following people attended the meeting: Peter Ribar (CTM), Tom Spittler (CGS), Dave Fowler (NCRWQCB), Chris Browder (CAL FIRE), Chris Zimny (CAL FIRE), and Pete Cafferata (CAL FIRE). Richard Gienger (HWC/SSRC), Curt Babcock (DFG), and Angela Wilson (CVRWQCB) participated by conference line. **[Action items are shown in bold print].**

Tom Spittler began the meeting by summarizing the table of contents he developed for the roads rule package plead. He stated that this is an organizational tool only, allowing people to better understand how the package is constructed, and that it will not be included in the final rule language.

The next agenda item was to rapidly review the changes made to the draft rule package during the meeting held on January 29th in Willows. The group discussed changes to sections 923.4(r), 923.3(s)(1)(A), 923.6(f), 923.6(i)(7)(B), 923.8, 923.10(h), 923.11(k), and 923.10(l) and (m).

Next, suggested changes made by Peter Ribar for the remainder of the road package plead beginning on page 79, Logging Road Watercourse Crossing Rules, were reviewed by the Task Force. Relatively few comments were voiced, allowing this task to be rapidly completed. **Chris Browder stated that he would update the road-related mapping requirements in the new road package plead, including sections 923.3, 923.12, and 1034 road-related requirements.** Chris Zimny stated that he wants to make sure that the revised road rules package are not inconsistent with the existing Road Management Plan rules and the NCRWQCB's Erosion Control Plan (ECP) requirements. Tom Spittler responded that these rules are "supportive" of the ECP regulations.

It was decided that the comments currently in the plead explaining the reasons for rule modification will be moved back to the road rule matrix document, allowing a "clean" version of the plead to be produced for Forest Practice Committee (FPC) review. The version of the plead presented to the FPC will use single strikeout and single underscore to denote changes from the existing rules. The current plan calls for no colored fonts, highlighting, or "balloons" for comments in the margins. **Chris Zimny stated that he would check with FPC Chair Gary Nakamura to insure that this is the most desirable manner to present this plead.** Peter Ribar informed the group that he would have the revised matrix completed by February 19th and that he would send the revised plead sent to Chris Browder sometime during the week of February 15th for insertion of the mapping rule changes.

The Task Force then briefly discussed how the group is going to address terms such as "may" that will present policy issues for the FPC to consider. Currently, the highlighting of these terms has been removed from the rule package plead. It was decided that the Task Force will inform the FPC that these types of words exist in the plead, disclosing to

the Board that policy issues exist in this rule package. **Additionally, Tom Spittler will attempt to make a list of these words and their locations in the document.**

Chris Zimny summarized the handout he developed showing a draft schedule for FPC review of the road package plead. Sections 923, "Intent," and 923.1, "Planning" are scheduled for the March FPC meeting, along with possibly Section 916.3, "General Limitations Near Watercourses." The schedule was generally acceptable to the group, with modifications for the October, November, and December meetings. It was agreed that the definitions and ASP rule requirements (Section 916.9) will be addressed concurrently with the other sections listed on the schedule and not as individual topics. The October meeting will cover "Contents of Plan," "Contents of NTMP," "Notice of Timber Operations Content," and "PTHP Contents." There was general agreement that it is unrealistic to expect that these rules can be approved rapidly enough to allow them to go into effect on January 1, 2011. The Task Force recognized that the schedule for review will need to be flexible and that it will likely be modified over time.

Tom Spittler asked Pete Cafferata to produce a brief history of the Interagency Road Rules Group, including when this earlier effort started and ended.

No further meetings of the Task Force were scheduled at this time.