

Comments from Co-Chair Moreno on Research Themes and Critical Monitoring Questions:

1. Global comment:

We should consider more explicitly communicating in the opening paragraph of the CMQ document that the listed CMQs are provided as example questions, but that prospective grantees may wish to form other questions that investigate ecological performance and management practice in California, aligned with the themes as described/listed herein.

My concern is we're confusing would-be grantees with the listed questions that would seem to be the exclusive questions prospective grantees may ask. Some may suggest that this is not an issue, but I would suggest any outsider should readily be able to understand our process, and the way the document presently reads and based on questions we received from commenters on the CMQ document, this is unclear to folks. Further, there are many great questions that we want people to ask and we can't anticipate them all in this document that I think is meant to be more illustrative of emphasis we're looking for and not the be all, end all.

2. Theme 6: Wildfire Hazard:

- i. Preamble to this section states: *"A goal of the FPRs is the production and maintenance of forests which are healthy and naturally diverse (14 CCR § 897). Numerous studies have shown that creating these types of forests reduces the risk of high severity wildfire..."*

However the questions posed do not investigate forest function as a result of management which would serve to directly assess "production and maintenance" of the forest (as reflected in such measures as net ecosystem production, net primary productivity, gross primary production, net biome production, change in return intervals). We should explicitly invite and allow in evaluation of forest functional response to treatments and fire severity post-treatment, and not just look at forest form and fire severity in isolation (e.g. state of slash and piles).

3. Theme 9: Wildlife Habitat: Cumulative Impacts

i. Question (a):

- "terrestrial wildlife habitat" singled out. Shouldn't this be broader in scope to capture habitat and ecological processes both aquatic and terrestrial from the cumulative impact perspective?
- "Characterizing and describing...habitat...and...processes" does not itself involve a study of management. Rephrasing needed to evaluate management impact on habitat and processes described. Suggest striking underlined language and rephrase to be more in line with other CMQs.

ii. Question (b):

- suggest similar update aligned with comment (i) above to be more inclusive beyond terrestrial habitat/processes.
- though this current Theme 9 is focused on Wildlife Habitat, consider adding cumulative impacts themed questions for other categories (e.g. water quality, supply reliability, carbon, etc.) as has been done here.