

MINUTE ITEM

This Calendar Item No. 31  
was approved as Minute Item  
No. 31 by the State Lands  
Commission by a vote of 3  
to 0 at its 5/29/80  
meeting.

CALENDAR ITEM

31.

5/80  
W 21630  
Shimer

TIMBER HARVEST ON STATE SCHOOL LANDS

At the August 1978 Commission Meeting, Calendar Item No. 32 was submitted with a staff recommendation that the Commission endorse an expansion of timber harvest activity on State school lands. Although the item was approved by the Commission, Mr. McCausland requested additional information from the staff to support such a program. On December 1, 1978, a report with background and alternatives for management of the forested school lands was provided to each Commissioner. At the February 1979 Meeting, Calendar Item No. 19 was presented with a staff recommendation that the Commission endorse harvest of timber from the school lands. Chairman Cory requested that the proposal be circulated so that those with environmental concerns would have a chance to comment.

In July 1979, an informational paper describing forested State school lands and alternatives for their management was sent to a mailing list of 70, including the Sierra Club and Friends of the Earth. There were 23 responses: 3 counties, 1 legislator, 7 companies, 7 governmental agencies and 5 consultants. There was no response from the Sierra Club or Friends of the Earth. A summary of the responses is shown in Exhibit "B" attached hereto.

Most of the responses were fairly consistent in favoring consolidation of State holdings and management by Forestry, Parks, or Fish and Game agencies. There were a few exceptions, i.e. six responses favored disposal of all parcels to the private sector. Most responses suggested selling off the parcels that couldn't be used for exchange, but the Resources Agency response was definitely opposed to selling any parcels to the private sector.

There were no responses that were opposed to timber harvest on these lands although there was some divergence of opinion on how to cope with the problem of managing parcels that are so widely scattered. The responses ranged from total disposal to the private sector, to exchanging the parcels in order to block-up existing State holdings, to management (including harvest) on the lands as they are.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 31. (CONTD)

After considerable study and additional consultation with others, the staff favors a combination of these ownership and management choices. Negotiations are actively progressing for a land exchange that will help consolidate holdings at Mountain Home State Forest. Also the Staff has been negotiating with the California Department of Forestry (CDF) looking towards a management agreement wherein CDF would utilize several forested parcels for Demonstration Forests as provided for in Public Resource Code, Section 4631(c). Also, it is anticipated that over 60,000 acres of intermingled forested BLM lands may be acquired through indemnity selection in partial satisfaction of the school land grant. This will provide for larger blocks of State ownership to facilitate management.

Irrespective of the scope and direction of these land ownership adjustments, the fact is, there is a large quantity of mature and overmature timber standing on lands under the Commission's jurisdiction. Where environmentally and economically appropriate and in accordance with the provisions of CEQA and the Forest Practice Act, the staff proposes to harvest timber, provide for erosion control, maintenance of wildlife habitat, reforestation and improved growth on younger trees.

The Commission's endorsement of such a timber harvest program and authority for the Executive Officer to solicit bids for the sale of timber is sought. It is proposed that the Executive Officer would solicit bids on selected parcels during favorable market conditions that would provide optimum revenue consistent with environmental protection. The parcels listed in Exhibit "A" have timber stands that have been preliminarily identified as suitable for harvest.

The requirements of CEQA would be met prior to seeking the Commission's approval of a timber sale contract on each proposed harvest area.

- EXHIBITS:
- A. Forested school lands with timber harvest Potential.
  - B. Summary of Responses to Informational Paper.

IT IS RECOMMENDED THAT THE COMMISSION:

1. ENDORSE MANAGEMENT OF FOREST RESOURCES ON STATE SCHOOL LANDS THAT WOULD INCLUDE HARVEST OF MATURE TIMBER AND PRACTICES TO IMPROVE GROWTH AND QUALITY OF RESIDUAL TREES.

CALENDAR ITEM NO. 31. (CONTD)

2. AUTHORIZE THE EXECUTIVE OFFICER TO SOLICIT BIDS FOR THE SALE OF TIMBER ON SELECTED PARCELS SUBJECT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF CEQA AND THE FOREST PRACTICE ACT UNDER MARKET CONDITIONS THAT WILL PROVIDE FOR OPTIMUM REVENUE CONSISTENT WITH ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION.

## EXHIBIT "A"

## FORESTED SCHOOL LANDS WITH TIMBER HARVEST POTENTIAL

Parcel Description	USGS Quad	Estimated Harvest Volume	Within National Forests
<u>El Dorado County</u>			
Section 4, T6N R13E, MDM Lots 12, 17; 25 acres	Omo Ranch	250 MBF	No
<u>Glenn County</u>			
Section 16, T20N R9W, MDM W1/2 SW1/4; 80 acres	Hull Mtn	200 MBF	Yes
<u>Humboldt County</u>			
Section 27, T1S R1W, HM SE1/4; SE1/4; 40 acres	Buckeye Mtn	250 MBF	No
Section 27, T3N R4E, HM SW1/4 NE1/4; 40 acres	Pilot Creek	200 MBF	NO
Section 35, T3N R4E, HM NW1/4 SW1/4; 40 acres	Pilot Creek	250 MBF	No
Section 19, T3S R2E, HM Lot 3 SE1/4 NE1/4, N1/2 NE1/4; 160 acres	Garberville Point Delgada	500 MBF	No
Section 29, T3S R2E, HM N1/2 NE1/4; 80 acres	Garberville	600 MBF	No
Section 30, T3S R2E, HM NE1/4 NW1/4; 40 acres	Garberville	100 MBF	No
<u>Lake County</u>			
Section 36 T16N R9W, MDM N1/2 NW1/4, NW1/4 NE1/4, 100 acres	Lakeport	130 MBF	Yes
Section 36 T18N R11W, MDM NW1/4, NE1/4 NE1/4, NW1/4 SE1/4; 240 acres	Potter Valley	250 MBF	Yes
Section 16 T19N R9W, MDM NW1/4 NW1/4, SE1/4 NW1/4; 80 acres	Hull Mtn	250 MBF	Yes

EXHIBIT "A" (Cont.)

Parcel Description	USGS Quad	Estimated Harvest Volume	Within National Forest
<u>Lassen County</u>			
Section 36 T28N R8E, MDM NW1/4, W1/2 E1/2, lots 1, 2,3,4; 480 acres	Almanor	12,000 MBF	Yes
Section 24, T38N R6E, MDM SW1/4 NW1/4; 40 acres	Bieber	250 MBF	No
<u>Mendocino County</u>			
Section 30, SE1/4 SW1/4 and Section 31, lots 1,2 T S R3E, HM; 80 acres	Piercy	400 MBF	No
Section 17, T11N R14W, MDM SW1/4 SE1/4; 40 acres	Ornbaum Valley	250 MBF	No
Section 16, T19N R13W, MDM N1/2 NE1/4, W1/2 NW1/4, SW1/4, W1/2 SE1/4; 400 acres	Willits Laytonville	500 MBF	No
Section 16, T22N R13W, MDM all; 640 acres	Spyrock	500 MBF	No
<u>Modoc County</u>			
Section 36, T41N R9E, MDM N1/2, N1/2 S1/2, SW1/4 SW1/4, SE1/4 SE1/4, 560 acres	Canby	600 MBF	Yes
<u>Plumas County</u>			
Section 16, T23N R8E, MDM NW1/4 NE1/4, SE1/4; 200 acres	Bucks Lake	2000 MBF	Yes
Section 16, T25N R12E, MDM N1/2 NE1/4, E1/2 NW1/4, ptn SE1/4 NE1/4; 194 acres	Kettlerock	500 MBF	Yes
Section 16, T25N R14E, MDM N1/2, N1/2 SW1/4, SE1/4 SW1/4 NW 1/4 SE1/4, S 1/2 SE1/4 560 acres	Milford	500 MBF	Yes
Section 36, T26N R15E, MDM SW1/4 NE1/4, W1/2 W1/2, SE1/4; 440 acres	Doyle	300 MBF	Yes

EXHIBIT "A" (Cont.)

Parcel Description	USGS Quad	Estimated Harvest Volume	Within National Forest
Section 36, T27N R5E, MDM lots 2,3,4; 75 acres	Jonesville	1500 MBF	Yes
<u>Shasta County</u>			
Section 2, T30N R1E, MDM SW1/4 NE1/4, lots 4,9, 10,11; 180 acres	Manton	80 MBF	No
Section 8, T31N R3E, MDM E1/2 NW1/4, N1/2 NE1/4; 160 acres	Manzanita Lake	800 MBF	No
Section 2, T34N R1W, MDM NE1/4 SE1/4; 40 acres	Montgomery Creek	100 MBF	No
Section 16, T35N R5W, MDM all, 640 acres	Lamoine	100 MBF	Yes
Section 36, T37N R5W, MDM S1/2 SE1/4; 80 acres	Dunsmuir	200 MBF	Yes
<u>Siskiyou County</u>			
Section 36, T39N R11W, MDM NE1/4 NW1/4, W1/2 NW1/4, 120 acres	Cecilville	200 MBF	Yes
Section 16, T40N R10W, MDM NE1/4 SE1/4; 40 acres	Sawyers Bar	1200 MBF	Yes
<u>Tehama County</u>			
Section 4, T25N R8W, MDM SW1/4 NW1/4, SW1/4 NE1/4; 80 acres	Yolla Bolly	500 MBF	No
Section 16, T26N R3E, MDM S1/2; 320 acres	Butte Meadows	600 MBF	Yes
<u>Trinity County</u>			
Section 14, T31N R10W, MDM E1/2 NW1/4; 80 acres	Weaverville	100 MBF	No
Section 32, T33N R8W, MDM S1/2 N1/2; 160 acres	Weaverville	100 MBF	No
Section 8, T33N R9W, MDM W1/2 NE1/4, SE1/4 NE1/4, E1/2 NW 1/4, N1/2 SE1/4; 280 acres	Weaverville	1000 MBF	No

EXHIBIT "A" (Cont.)

Parcel Description	USGS Quad	Estimated Harvest Volume	Within National Forest
Section 16, T34N R11W, MDM NE1/4, N1/2 SE1/4, SW1/4 SE1/4; 280 acres	Helena	750 MBF	No

CALENDAR PAGE	171
MINUTE PAGE	1035

EXHIBIT "B"

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO THE INFORMATIONAL PAPER  
"MANAGEMENT PLAN ALTERNATIVES FOR FORESTED  
STATE SCHOOL LANDS" JULY 1979

INDUSTRY

Louisiana Pacific Corporation:

Sell school land with patent restrictions requiring timber or multiple use.

Georgia Pacific Corporation:

Since the parcels are too scattered to be managed, they should be sold so they may be assimilated into neighboring industrial holdings.

California Forest Protective Association: (Industry lobby)

Impractical for State to manage the isolated parcels so they should be traded to round out State Forests and the remainder sold to private owners.

Kimberly-Clark Corporation:

The lands should be disposed of to the private sector through sale or exchange. Presumably, the exchange properties would block up State ownership at existing facilities.

Walker Forest:

The school lands are too small, too scattered and lacking in access for State management and should be sold to adjacent owners.

Pacific Gas and Electric Company:

A combination of land exchanges to block up State ownership and a sales program to dispose of those parcels of marginal value should be pursued.

CONSULTANTS

W. M. Beaty and Associates:

(Former member State Board of Forestry)

Parcels that can be used to block up State Forests including Latour Forest should be exchanged. Those that cannot be used for consolidation exchanges should be sold. Consolidated holdings should be managed by CDF.

Frank Hortig:

Exchanges to consolidate lands in State Forests is preferable and if this cannot be accomplished then resource management (timber harvest) by SLC staff on the parcels in place should be pursued. If the State acquires 16 million acres of BLM lands then management by SLC staff is preferable.

Peter C. Passof, UC Extension, Mendocino County:

Sell scattered small parcels to the private sector but use other parcels to block up State Forests if possible.

Paul C. Smith, UC Extension, Humboldt County:

Lands capable of supporting commercial forests should be kept in productive status. Exchanges with US Forest Service to block up State Forest is the First priority. Parcels outside of National Forests could be sold if they could be channeled to industry ownership that would manage them for timber production with their other lands. Otherwise CDF Service Foresters could handle resource management on those parcels.

James Nicklos and Associates:

All the forested school lands should be sold to the private sector to reduce the cost of government and increase the local tax base. The method of sale of land should be modified to increase its saleability.

Peter O. Thill:

Timber on school lands should be offered for sale and harvested and reforestation should be pushed on all school lands capable of commercial production.

COUNTIES

Nevada County Planning Department:

Comment as to the one, 150 acre parcel in Nevada County was that management be turned over to Forestry, Fish and Game or Parks providing for timber harvest where and when appropriate.

Placer County Board of Supervisors:

Only one parcel in Placer County but a combination of timber harvest, sale to private sector and exchange for consolidation is suggested for school lands generally depending on individual conditions for each parcel.

Shasta County Board of Supervisors:

Several parcels are involved in this county. Disposal to the private sector is the preferred alternative with the second choice exchanges to acquire lands for other State agencies. Management of the resources on the lands whether interim or long term should be done by Department of Forestry.

## PUBLIC AGENCIES

### Resources Agency:

The comment of the Resources Agency came as a transmittal of Departmental comments which generally favored retention in public ownership but consolidation for practical management. The Agency is strongly opposed to passing the school lands to the private sector.

### Department of Forestry:

First priority is to complete the land exchange consolidation at Mountain Home and then look to blocking up at other State Forests or the demonstration forests. Management of lands whether consolidated or not should be handled by CDF.

### Department of Parks:

Land exchanges should be pushed to consolidate lands for greater revenue potential. Park quality lands should be sold to park agencies and any other marginal lands should be sold to the private sector.

### Department of Fish & Game:

Harvesting timber on school lands should be coordinated with Fish and Game staff to preclude adverse impacts on fish, wildlife and rare plants.

### State Water Resources Control Board:

The preferred alternative is to exchange the scattered school lands to consolidate holdings managed by other state agencies. Forested school lands should be managed by Department of Forestry to lessen any possible impacts to water quality.

### Department of Conservation:

The school lands should not be sold to the private sector but used for exchanges to consolidate State Parks and Fish and Game holdings as well as State Forests. Those parcels not used for exchange should be managed by Department of Forestry.

### U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

School lands within National Forests should be exchanged to block up existing State Forests. The State or local government would then not only get the revenue from timber sales on the acquired lands but would also get 25% of the receipts from revenues generated by the Forest Service on the former State lands. The parcels not useable for consolidation should be sold with government agencies given priority.

LEGISLATURE

John A. Nejedley, 7th Senatorial District:

(four of the 62 parcels included in the report  
are in the 7th Senatorial District.)

".... the best option appears to be retention  
of forested lands for future exchanges .... this approach  
may prove useful in the future for completing acquisitions  
of parks, wildlife habitat areas, and state forests."

CALENDAR PAGE	175
MINUTE PAGE	1039