

Meeting Synopsis

On Monday, February 22, 2016, the Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest and Watershed group met and accomplished the following: (1) Continued to discuss potential projects and their prioritization; (2) Discussed priorities and projects as they relate to the draft CFLR budgets; (3) identified the next steps needed to re-establish the monitoring work group; and (4) approved a letter of support to be sent on behalf of Burney Forest Power. The group will meet again in April, 2016 to continue to review and prioritize opportunities for CFLR work and to continue progress on other items as described below.

Meeting Attendees

Michelle Coppoletta
Crystal Danheiser
Peter Feller
Marissa Fierro
Ann Grasso
Ryan Hadley

Pete Johnson
Katie Johnson Hansen
Jason Mateljak
Greg Mayer
Patricia Putterbaugh
Aaron Rieffanaugh

Todd Sloat
Skip Willmore

Decisional Items

- Group decided to send the letter with “Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest and Watershed Group” listed at the top.

Action Items

- *Rolled over from November Meeting:* [C. Danheiser](#) to report back on the opportunity to pursue 2017 planning funding under the Chief’s Initiative.
- [All](#) to share the June grant writing workshop information with others that may be interested in attending (the workshop is free and is not restricted to charter members). *Ongoing.*
- [A. Jolley](#) to send a follow-up email to the group regarding the June workshop with a workshop outline and clarification that the workshop is free. *Done.* [Due to the ratio of collaborative members and USFS personnel attending the workshop, C. Danheiser is now coordinating the workshop.](#)
- [A. Reeves-Jolley](#) to coordinate with M. Klimek regarding a date for a CFLR meeting in Lassen Volcanic National Park. [M. Klimek will get back to the group in April.](#)
- [C. Danheiser](#) to share the fuels treatment layer’s attribute data with the group. [April meeting topic.](#)
- [C. Danheiser](#) to input Bureau of Indian Affairs layers as well as label the Clark Creek Community on the group maps. [To be included in April map discussion.](#)
- [C. Danheiser](#) to reach out to NRCS about getting private land data: Melinda.Graves@ca.usda.gov
- [C. Danheiser](#) to include an oak woodland layer on the interactive map.
- [S. Willmore](#) to follow up with more information regarding Scenic Byways funding opportunity.
- [A. Reeves-Jolley](#) to see if the Dinkey can share its ecological monitoring matrix with the Burney-Hat Creek group. [Email sent 3/22/16.](#)

BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016

- M. Coppoletta to confirm how long the next working group meeting needs to be and to coordinate scheduling it with A. Reeves-Jolley. 90 minutes, to be the morning of the next full group meeting.
- All those interested in getting a copy of the data are invited to bring their hard drive to the next collaborative meeting. There will be an opportunity to copy the data prior to the meeting.
- M. Coppoletta to share Brandon Collins' paper: <http://sierrainstitute.us/bradon-collins-psw-paper/>
- M. Coppoletta to provide more information on cross boundary lidar grant opportunities.
- C. Danhesier to provide more recommendations for the group to consider at the April meeting, see page 7 for recommendation specifications, including a digitized polygon for a potential CE project area. April meeting topic.
- C. Danhesier to communicate with the tribe that the CFLR is interested in the project, based on their understanding that it is of cultural importance to the tribe, but they are tabling their formal process of supporting it until they hear confirmation from the tribal council that it is in fact a project that the tribe would like to see completed. Done, project is moving forward.
- T. Sloat to confirm two of the numbers in the Burney Forest Power letter of support. Done.
- A. Reeves-Jolley to coordination the collection of signatures and send the letters. Done.
- A. Reeves Jolley to reach out to Elissa Brown (Sierra Nevada Conservancy) for her most recent grants clearinghouse memo: <http://www.sierranevada.ca.gov/other-assistance/funding-sources/funding-sources-and-incentive-programs>, see "Fuel Reduction on Public and Private Land."
- A. Reeves Jolley to look into an appropriate spokesperson regarding CALFIRE funding opportunities. CFIP Regional Representative: Brook Darley, (530) 224--1420
- All come with information on grants opportunities to share at the next meeting.
- A. Reeves-Jolley to administer Doodle poll to schedule next full-group meeting. Done.

Contents

Meeting Synopsis	1
Meeting Attendees.....	1
Action Items.....	1
Meeting Notes.....	3
Follow-up on January action items	3
Update on facilitation agreement budget	3
Sierra Nevada Conservancy Grant Writing Workshop.....	3
Other January action items.....	3
Continued spatial review of potential USFS/CFLR opportunities for collaboration	4
Reestablishing the Monitoring Working Group.....	6
Lidar Data	7
Review of USFS CFLR Budget	7
Burney Forest Power letter.....	8

BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016

Identification of potential upcoming meeting topics 8
Closing business 9
Appendices..... 9

Meeting Notes

Follow-up on January Action Items

Update on Facilitation Agreement Budget

- The proportions of funds spent, match leveraged, and time passed are all fairly similar:
 - 6 months into the 18-month agreement with the group (~33.33%)
 - 29.84% of the funds allocated by the agreement are spent.
 - 25.56% of the match promised have been leveraged.
- This budget was based on meeting every other month. Although the group has met month-to-month in some instances, the group is still averaging 3 meetings every 6 months.
- Some of the time spent on the agreement has been performing interviews with the group’s charter members to write a stakeholder synopsis.
 - Concern over inclusion of the Pit River Tribe in this synopsis was brought up. Sierra Institute made attempts via email, phone call, and regular mail to engage the tribe in this synopsis. M. Fierro will be submitting written feedback in lieu of an interview.
 - M. Fierro suggested that the synopsis be categorized by stakeholder affiliation. Sierra Institute plans to present a draft synopsis to the group prior to its next meeting, organizing the content around trends and perspectives rather than stakeholder affiliations. Doing so will allow informants to remain anonymous, as promised at the onset of the interviews. Informants and stakeholders are welcome to choose to self-identify. Further discussion on the synopsis was tabled until April.

Sierra Nevada Conservancy Grant Writing Workshop

- Registration for Elissa Brown’s June 14 workshop is now open, everyone should have received an email link to register.
- Registration is formally going to be open for another week; **ACTION ITEM:** All please spread the word to others that may be interested (the workshop is not restricted to charter members).
- **ACTION ITEM:** A. Jolley to send a follow-up email that includes a workshop outline and notes that the workshop is free.

Other January Action Items

- **Facilitators** were to follow up with USFS R5 Budget Director regarding the use of CFLR funds outside of USFS property. **USFS CFLR dollars are currently restricted to the USFS CFLR footprint. There is conversation in Washington regarding a potential legislative adjustment, based on all-lands emphasis of the CFLR program.**
- **Todd Sloat** was to draft a letter in support of Burney Forest Power and provide it to a working group (D. Curtis, R. Hadley, J. Oldson). **The draft is to be reviewed by the full group later in the meeting.**
- **A. Reeves-Jolley** was to poll the group regarding interest in holding a future BHCCFWG meeting on Lassen Volcanic NP property. **8 of 8 survey respondents indicated interest in a meeting held at Lassen Volcanic NP. The group will plan for a meeting in LAVO when the road is open and M.**

BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016

Klimek. is available. **ACTION ITEM:** A. Reeves-Jolley to get a list of available months from M. Klimek.

Continued Spatial Review of Potential USFS/CFLR Opportunities for Collaboration

- In ArcGIS, C. Danheiser reviewed the portions of the CFLR footprint that fall within USFS jurisdiction.
 - C. Daneiser showed the group where harvesting and fuels reduction treatment have occurred, as well as proposed projects within the CFLR footprint.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** C. Danheiser to share the fuels treatment layer's attribute data with the group.
 - Clarifying point: the work done in areas where projects haven't started yet (ex: Plum) was done in the context of an older project.
 - The group reviewed the ideas generated in November's visioning session. M. Fierro added TEK and wildlife retention zones to the list and discussed how to merge management activity with those goals and objectives. M. Fierro would like to add additional concepts.
 - **FACILITATORS' NOTE:** The items on this list were generated in the November visioning brainstorm (see [November notes](#)) session.
 - C. Danheiser noted that the Lassen District came up with a similar list of objectives, which included: protecting the WUI, insect and disease, forest health, increasing recreation opportunities, owl, goshawk, overall fire risk (in both the wilderness and the WUI), and increasing service contracts. From C. Danheiser's perspective, these lists have a lot of overlap and often times are just using different words to express the similar ideas.
 - The project area labelled as Crossroads is preliminary and a point for further discussion.
- In terms of ownership in the Crossroads "area," the USFS is largest owner, followed by Fruitgrowers and then the State Park.
- **ACTION ITEM:** C. Danheiser to input Bureau of Indian Affairs layers as well as to label the Clark Creek Community.
- Conversation around the Late Succession Reserve (LSR) and how far west to take the Crossroad's boundary:
 - USF&W wants the USFS to go into that area, but it would be a slower process.
 - **Aaron**, wildlife biologist stated that in order to go into the LSR, 2 years of goshawk, spotted owl, carnivore, and migratory bird surveys would be necessary.
 - Surveys are good for 4-5 years. Generally, survey season is mid-April to mid-August.
 - A smaller area could be surveyed in one year with double the efforts; however, those surveys are then only good for one year (making this a viable option only if a post-action plan is already in place).
 - Projects aren't picked and then done, surveys impact where the project actually can occur.
- A Healthy Forest Restoration Act project could work here. There might be a preliminary Categorical Exclusion (ranging from 250 acres to 3,000) done in addition to the larger Environmental Analysis.
 - The mortality layer was created using an aerial detection survey done by the USFS Regional entomologist. The data is mainly restricted to Lassen NF.

**BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016**

- Lassen NF's resource management plan has standards and guidelines to follow for snag habitat.
- M. Fierro likes the idea of smaller scale (250 acre), site-specific planning that allows for GPSing of snags, etc.
- **ACTION ITEM:** C. Danheiser to reach out to NRCS about getting private land data.
- Private land information can be viewed on google earth as well.
- G. Mayer: Current District specialists are working to complete the Plum project in order to get the NEPA signed in FY17
- M. Fierro and P. Putterbaugh: Feel that the FS has already picked the Crossroads project area.
- M. Fierro expressed concern about meeting not being recorded.
- **FACILITATORS NOTE:** Meeting recording and transcription were neither planned for nor included in the facilitator's budget.
- M. Fierro: The Pit River tribe is also interested in cultural plant reintroduction, native plant reintroduction, and propagation.
- A. Grasso: The Lassen District has hired outside consultants, including the Resource Conservation District and T. Sloat to help conduct surveys. This could be an option when personnel capacity is a limiting factor.
- P. Putterbaugh: hiring local was an original focal point for this group, but so far the work has consisted of large, pre-planned projects. WUI and hiring local could get the group the triple bottom line results it wants, not necessarily going into the LSR.
- M. Fierro: She has attended meetings for a number of years, with different USFS representatives, different facilitators, etc., yet feels that innovative, collaborative projects have not occurred that include her interests in the community, local youth employment, etc. She also expressed concern regarding GIS data integrity and plans to resubmit input to the Washington USFS Office and others.

Project Prioritization: Discussion

What does the group's vision(s) look like in terms of projects?

- There is an opportunity to move forward on the Crossroads project and start multi-year surveys. The group could also prioritize a small Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) project.
- M. Fierro: The Pit River Tribe is looking to balance what happens to the landscape.
- The HFRA allows for the shortening of the comment period by 15 days (can apply to both CE's and EA's)
 - 602 HFRA- larger treatments of land assuming it meets a certain type of criteria
 - M. Fierro: the minimization of public comment is not always a benefit; she looking for projects that advance fisheries protection, banks stabilization, etc.
- C. Danheiser: it is possible for the group to identify a HFRA project that integrates the triple bottom line. She also feels that the project needs to have at least one very clear objective.
- T. Sloat: both in Crossroads and the State Park, multiple objectives are at play (water, fire safety, etc.).
- M. Coppoletta: What is the actual process of project planning for this group? How detailed does the group want to get and at what point, and to what degree, do the USFS specialists come in?
- M. Fierro: When we're looking at the USFS budget and USFS projects, where does collaboration come in?

**BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016**

- A. Grasso: The USFS is trying to collaborate, that is why drafts, rather than plans, are being discussed. There is also the need for collaboration in terms of what other landowners are doing/planning as to identify instances of potential cumulative effects.
- T. Sloat: It should be relatively easy for the industrial timber landowners to catch up once the group gets going on Crossroads, given their speedier compliance process.
- M. Fierro: what are the indicator species we should be looking at for planning and monitoring?
ACTION ITEM: C. Danheiser to look into putting an oak woodland layer on the interactive map.
- P. Putterbaugh: Recreation should be on the CFLR budget (Example: “89 recreation corridor EA” line item, Proposed Program of Work 2017, Appendix C).
- A. Grasso: the regional recreation planner will be coming to Lassen, but CFLR funds can only go to roads and trails, not campground sites.
- There is group frustration that the agency has moved forward on projects in the past without truly collaborating.
- R. Hadley shared reflections on past meetings and the lack of action. Despite attending every meeting since the group formed, he is frustrated with the lack of results. There are countless opportunities to do good work, ranging from the wilderness, burned areas, or on private land. He urged the group to pick a spot, follow environmental regulations, and do something.
- The Collaborative was on “hiatus” and not meeting during the formation of the 2016 Budget (Appendix A). Therefore, the CFLR did not formally approve/recommend it.
- C. Danheiser: it appears that a CE in the Clark Creek area would satisfy all stakeholder groups.
 - The Lassen’s entomologist and C. Danheiser will be flagging that area and can present a polygon to the group for consideration. **ACTION ITEM: C. Danheiser** to present a digitized polygon of this potential project site.
- P. Putterbaugh: To the USFS and to the timber industry, what is restoration besides cutting trees?
- S. Willmore: The Scenic By-Ways Program is looking at funding restoration. The group would be interested in hearing about those opportunities. **ACTION ITEM: S. Willmore** to follow up with more information.
 - McArthur-Burney Falls Memorial State park is identified by many as the crown jewel of northern California’s intermountain region. S. Willmore has been working with its forester for years and feels that land is getting ready to burn.
- M. Fierro: the Pit River tribe has been doing hand piling work in the Crossroads area and wants that to continue, not mechanical thinning.

Reestablishing the Monitoring Working Group

- M. Coppoletta provided a history of the monitoring work group and its needs to date.
 - Thus far, the group has been focused on ecological monitoring. An overview of last year’s ecological monitoring activities was provided in a [January webinar](#).
 - The work since the working group’s last meeting has been primarily driven by the USFS.
- Next steps:
 - The monitoring group needs to reconvene. Like all working groups, this group would be open to all.
 - The monitoring questions developed by the group in summer 2014 (27 questions total) need to be revisited and formally accepted/modified.
 - Whether or not these questions are relevant to the group’s interests and concerns, as well as if answering them is feasible, all needs to be considered.

**BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016**

- Given how close we are to summer, this will likely require a short term strategy (and associated questions) for this summer and then a more long term strategy (and questions) for future years.
- Structure- the concept of working group co-leads (perhaps one USFS person and one non USFS person) was mentioned and tabled for a formal decision at the next CFLR meeting.
- Content- M. Coppoletta suggested that this working group also coordinate educational, ecologically-focused webinars on topics such as watershed health, reburning, etc., as a means of identifying and refining monitoring questions.
- Socioeconomic monitoring component still needs to be addressed.
- The Dinkey Creek CFRL came up with a long wishlist of monitoring topics. Meeting attendees expressed an interest in being more focused. **ACTION ITEM: A. Reeves-Jolley** to see if the Dinkey can share its ecological monitoring matrix with the Burney-Hat Creek group.
- **ACTION ITEM: M. Coppoletta** to confirm how long the next working group meeting needs to be and to coordinate scheduling it with A. Reeves-Jolley. The meeting will be open to the whole group and posted on the Google Calendar.

Lidar Data

- Lidar data is now available. **ACTION ITEM: All** those interested in getting a copy of these data are invited to bring their hard drive to the next collaborative meeting. There will be an opportunity to copy the data prior to the meeting.
- M. Coppoletta's [January webinar](#) also covered these data and some of their implications/use.
- Brandon Collins has used lidar to research landscape treatments impacts on fire. **ACTION ITEM: M. Coppoletta** to share his paper.
- There are opportunities for more collective/cross boundary lidar grants. **ACTION ITEM: M. Coppoletta** to provide more information.

Review of USFS CFLR Budget (Appendices A-C)

- If there is a dollar amount indicated next to an item, the contract has been awarded. Otherwise, that portion is left blank due to internal USFS protocol.
- There are some flexible funds, and that is why there are additional projects listed at the bottom.
- USFS surveys start in April; the USFS needs a physical boundary for the Crossroads area to start surveys. USFS has completed informal surveys and confirmed that the general area is in need of treatment. Formal survey results would be ready to share with the group in September and must include at least a half mile buffer outside of the potential project area.
- **ACTION ITEM: C. Danhesier** to provide more recommendations for the group to consider at the April meeting. Recommendations to include:
 - Short term CE that could be completed by the end of the calendar year.
 - Prices and timelines for the potential projects listed at the bottom of the draft 2016 budget.
 - A long term EA, with associated acreage, boundary, and budget estimate.
- P. Johnson expressed the notion that getting something done "in the now" is a priority.
- A. Grasso pointed out that that another project that could be done this fiscal year is 60 acres of thinning around the archeology sites around old Four Corners EA.

BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016

- A. Grasso reported that the Pit River tribe wants the USFS to do this work. **ACTION ITEM:** C. Danhesier to communicate with the tribe that the CFLR is interested in the project, based on their understanding that it is of cultural importance to the tribe, but they are tabling their formal process of supporting it until they hear confirmation from the tribal council that it is in fact a project that the tribe would like to see completed.
- This project is not in the WUI.
- **PROCEDURAL NOTE:** According to the group's charter, the group can only make a decision if the agenda indicates that a particular item is "decisional."
- There are 17,000 acres in the current Crossroads draft boundary. The old Four Corners EA was for 3,000 acres. Avoiding LSR, rock, and brush would take that acreage down quite a bit.
- Insect salvage Categorical Exclusions can be up to 250 acres.
- A. Rieffanaugh aims to survey the entire 17K acres, with the top portion of the crossroads boundary surveyed twice in order to cover potential CE areas.
- There is group debate over how far west to go with the Crossroads boundary. The western areas require longer analysis due to species richness and diversity. Perhaps the solution is to survey as much as possible and for the group to make a decision based on those surveys? The catch is that LSR surveys will take an extra year, so if the group is leaning towards not including that area, it could get work done a year quicker by not surveying, and not going into, the LSR.

Burney Forest Power letter

- Since the last meeting, T. Sloat and J. Olson drafted a letter of support concerning Burney Forest Power.
- **DECISION:** Group decided to send the letter with "Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest and Watershed Group" listed at the top. The letter will be signed by those individuals that would like to do so. The letter will be sent to the State Assembly and Senate Committees on Natural Resources, as well as CALFIRE and the Governor's Office.
- **ACTION ITEM:** T. Sloat to confirm two of the numbers in the letter.
- **ACTION ITEM:** A. Reeves-Jolley to coordinate the collection of signatures and send the letters.

Identification of potential upcoming meeting topics

- [*Understanding and Addressing Emerging Frustration Among Citizens' Collaborative Groups Interacting with the USDA Forest Service*](#) White Paper (discussion)
- Annual Stakeholder Synopsis (discussion)
- USFS prelim survey updates and preliminary polygon for CE area (C. Danheiser)
- NRCS and CalFIRE funding opportunities (P. Johnson and others)
 - Upcoming grant opportunities/deadlines; opportunities for the group to promote these opportunities (discussion). Examples: [California Forest Improvement Program](#) (CFIP), NRCS Equip, CalFire SRA, AB32, Get Elissa's updated memo and/or ask CalFIRE to discuss programs/opportunities
 - State clearinghouse is out as well (Todd)
 - **ACTION ITEM:** A. Reeves Jolley to reach out to Elissa Brown (Sierra Nevada Conservancy) for her most recent grants clearinghouse memo.
 - **ACTION ITEM:** A. Reeves Jolley to look into an appropriate spokesperson regarding CALFIRE funding opportunities.

BURNEY HAT CREEK COMMUNITY FOREST AND WATERSHED GROUP
MEETING NOTES, FEBRUARY 22, 2016

- **ACTION ITEM:** All come with information on grants opportunities to share at the next meeting.
- Government to government relations in terms of the Pit River Tribe and the USFS, and how that impacts CFLR. Understanding how the new Master Stewardship Agreement works (informational).
- Prioritize additional projects (decisional)
- Monitoring working group co-leads (decisional)
- 60 acre thinning project (decisional)

Closing business

- The National Forest Foundation's Collaborative Restoration Workshop is April 25-28 in Denver. Travel funds for non USFS attendees is available; contact A. Reeves-Jolley for more information.

Appendices

- Appendix A: [2016 BHC CFLR Budget](#) (pdf, 16 KB)
- Appendix B: [2016 Hat Creek Implementation Schedule](#) (pdf, 47 KB)
- Appendix C: [2017 Draft Program of Work](#) (pdf, 53 KB)