

Responses to "Problems, Comments and Concerns with the Content of the Forest Resources and Policies Discussion Paper" - Prepared by "Industrial Timberland Owners" and submitted on November 22, 2006

1. The table and referenced footnote were taken from State reported data, not generated by County Planning.
2. No conclusive statements are made from the Humboldt Watershed Council data. The conclusions are drawn from US Forest Service statistics reported by Shih (2002).
3. The department finds no such implication in the reference bullet.
4. As a relative indication of activity, the timber harvest plan submissions is a useful and readily available indicator.
5. Comment noted. The County does not propose to review every THP for cumulative impacts. However, there is a concern that was noted by the public during the Critical Choices Report process that watershed level impacts are not being addressed in THP review.
6. As stated in the report, timber production on these areas may still be viable, and it is unclear what specific effects this trend has had on the local timber economy.
7. This section relates to national trends in timberland conversion. It would be inappropriate to try to force these national trends to conform to the Humboldt County findings.
8. See the agricultural resource report regarding breakup of family ranches.
9. Again this is a national trend that has been documented by Best and Wayburn (*America's Private Forests*, 2001).
10. As concluded in the report "In reviewing the 40 largest landowners in Humboldt County, it is evident that the largest forest land ownerships remain in the hands of industrial timber operators."
11. Comment noted.
12. There may be some cases where non-profit organizations have paid compensation to counties in other counties such as Del Norte County. The department is not aware of any recent cases in Humboldt County.
13. The certificate of compliance and determination of status process is used to determine if parcels were created in conformance with the Subdivision Map Act. This is the context by which parcels would be considered "legal."
14. The department disagrees with this statement, which is not supported with any facts.
15. Comment noted.
16. Comment noted.
17. This issue will not be researched any further by the department and is not particularly relevant to drafting county policies related to forest resources.
18. Typo corrected.
19. Comment noted.
20. Deleted "pro-harvest."
21. Comment noted.
22. A zero discharge level is essentially a ban.
23. These concerns have been taken into consideration in drafting policies.
24. These concerns have been taken into consideration in drafting policies.
25. Comment noted.

26. Lots as small as 40 acres are allowed with a Joint Timber Management Plan per county zoning regulations.
27. Less than 3 acre conversions usually result in tree removal without replanting.
28. Comment noted. This concern will be taken into consideration in policy review.
29. Comment noted. This concern will be taken into consideration in policy review.
30. Comment noted. This concern will be taken into consideration in policy review.
31. Comment noted. This concern will be taken into consideration in policy review.
32. The authors of the report have reviewed and are aware of current rules and regulations that protect sensitive habitats and species. These are referenced throughout the report and in the other draft chapters of the General Plan Update. The commenters are invited to review the chapters on biological resources and water resources when these become available for public review.
33. Comment noted.
34. Monitoring and updating JTMPs would serve to ensure compliance with these provisions.
35. This issue will not be researched any further by the department. No specific standard of one group or another will be specified.
36. Comment noted.
37. Comment noted.
38. "Encourage certification..." does not imply that it would be mandatory.
39. Comment noted.
40. Disagree with comment.
41. The reference to the Little Hoover Commission was to provide some historical perspective and some of the findings are still relevant.
42. This issue will not be researched any further by the department and is not particularly relevant to drafting county policies related to forest resources.
43. Deleted "pro-harvest."
44. The reference to the Little Hoover Commission was to provide some historical perspective and some of the findings are still relevant.