

POSSIBLE RANKING SCORES:

		1-5	1-5 (x2)	1-5	1-5	0-25		
Project Number	Project Title	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	Overall Ranking	EMC Funding Request	Awarded?
EMC-2023-001	Climate-Adaptive Post-Fire Oak Restoration through Upslope Migration and Seed Provenance in the Angeles National Forest	2.5	6.7	2.6	3.4	15.4	\$ 220,226.04	No
<p><u>Comments on EMC-2023-001</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The study period is short, would it be long enough to see treatment effects. I think it is interesting science, just not making the connection of this research to the direct application of the FPR's. Good design, good discussion of the potential outcomes and limitations of the study This study seems like it will be limited by the conditions that occur during the study, which may limit the conclusions that can be drawn. 								
EMC-2023-002	Assessing Fire Hazard, Risk, and Post Fire Recovery for Watercourse and Lake Protection Zones and riparian areas of California	3.7	6.9	4.3	3.5	18.3	\$ 57,625.00	Vote tabled until Nov 2023
<p><u>Comments on EMC-2023-002</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Limitations in the FPR's have created WLPZ's that have high fire risk. The inability to use mechanized equipment to adequately apply the necessary silviculture prescriptions is something that needs reform. These WLPZ areas can and have in the past acted as fire wicks extending fire across the landscape. We need more information and tools in the rule book to manage these areas better to reduce wildfire risk while maintaining adequate riparian function. In order to have the most impact on addressing Timber Practice within the state. Please consider the following: 1) Compare results using meaningful signifiers for the FPRs: a. Region – Coast District, Interior, Norther/Southern, ASP areas, these are meaningful distinctions for the Forest Practice Rules, comparing across would be helpful in; b. Identify the nearest fuels treatment – were riparian areas near fuel treatment any more or less likely to burn, Fuel treatment could include harvest prescription; c. For the deliverable on fire hazard compare WLPZ to areas adjacent to the WLPZ in terms of flame length and other modeled fire characteristics; d. Compare areas of the state that have been harvested using CALFIRE layers of harvest boundaries vs the rest of the state (excluding federal lands); e. WLPZ is never 300 ft., it would be helpful to compare a 150' buffer to the surrounding 150' for Class I watercourses (can be found in CALFIRE published GIS layers for previous THPs); f. Compare whether riparian areas were more or less likely to burn relative to adjacent areas. The fire severity may have been a function of ambient conditions in addition to fuel conditions. This would help determine whether Forest treatments need to address forest conditions as a whole as compared to forest conditions within riparian areas. An interesting aggregation of largely existing data. 								
EMC-2023-003	Pre- and Post-Harvest Fuel Loads and Implications for Site Productivity	4.6	7.8	3.8	4.1	20.4	\$ 244,328.00	Yes
<p><u>Comments on EMC-2023-003</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> I would like to see a data management plan. Post-harvest fuels management is a critical component of healthy working forests. These activities also can improve site productivity and expedite the recovery of stands post harvest. Air quality regulations create significant challenges for forest managers that are attempting to implement treatment of slash and pile burning. Please ensure that data will be available for public use. Practical project that may effect a change in FPRs for slash treatment. 								

POSSIBLE RANKING SCORES:

		1-5	1-5 (x2)	1-5	1-5	0-25		
Project Number	Project Title	Critical Question	Scientific Uncertainty	Geographic Application	Collaboration & Feasibility	Overall Ranking	EMC Funding Request	Awarded?
EMC-2023-004	Evaluating California oak woodland forest management and its cumulative impacts on wildlife habitat	3.0	7.3	2.6	3.5	16.7	\$ 115,122.00	No

Comments on EMC-2023-004

1. I would like to see a more detailed description of the methods.
2. I think this is interesting science. With the increases in catastrophic wildfire across the state I believe we need to look into more ways to reduce wildfire risk. I understand that these management activities can have a negative impact on wildlife species/habitat, but after decades of fire suppression across the state we have a long way to go to become fire resilient to fire. That being said there is a need to better understand the impacts that fuels management is having on wildlife species.
3. It is difficult to see how this study would answer more than a narrow band of question specific to the project area.

- **Critical Question(s)** Proposed monitoring project addresses one or more EMC critical monitoring questions with appropriate study design and experimental methods.
- **Scientific Uncertainty** Current scientific understanding is not well-studied or validated. This ranking is weighed twice (2 times) the weight of other rankings.
- **Geographic Application** Critical question and proposed project has broad geographic application.
- **Collaboration & Feasibility** Number of active contributing *collaborators* relative to the monitoring subject. Consider the magnitude and expertise of the collaborators. *Feasibility* of monitoring project to meet stated goals and objectives within expected budget and timelines needed by the EMC, Board or stakeholders.

On a scale of 1 to 5, reviewers should refer to the following guidance when reviewing and ranking a proposal:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1 = Does not meet any portion of the Ranking | 3 = May meet some portions of the Ranking, either key or ancillary |
| 2 = Does not meet key portions of the Ranking | 4 = Meets key portions of the Ranking and does not address ancillary portions |
| 5 = Meets all portions of the Ranking | |