

Synopsis

On Monday, September 26 the BHCCFWG met for a full group meeting. The group was informed of recent bioenergy legislation and the potential impact for local infrastructure including Burney Forest Power. Collaborative members provided input for BHCCFWG’s representation at the semi-annual SCALE meeting in Sacramento. A significant portion of the meeting included a group visioning exercise focusing on short and long term goals for individuals, organizations, and the Collaborative itself. In preparation for the Washington/Regional Office CFLR site visit, talking points and field locations were discussed.

Meeting Attendees

Debra Cesmat	Dave Hays	Dean Lofthus
Michelle Coppoletta	Kristy Hoffman	Jason Mateljak
Crystal Danheiser	Pete Johnson	John Owen
Ann Grasso	Bobette Jones	Patricia Puterbaugh
Ryan Hadley	Jonathan Kusel	

Action Items

- A. Grasso to provide a list of FY 2017 projects that includes prioritization.
- A. Grasso to provide information regarding ROC meeting and assessment of recreation sites planned for October, 2016.
- A. Grasso to distribute list of questions from the WO representatives. DONE

Table of Contents

Synopsis1

Meeting Attendees1

Action Items1

Approval and Modifications2

Biomass and Bioenergy Updates.....2

SCALE Discussion.....2

Group Visioning3

FY 2017 Program of Work.....4

Projects..... 4

Planning..... 4

Washington Office Visit:.....5

Tree Mortality Task Force (TMTF): What information does the group need?.....5

Identification and Prioritization of Future Meeting Topics6

Future Meeting Topics (including those added 9/26/16) 6

Setting Meeting Date6

Appendix A7

Appendix B8

Approval and Modifications

- The September agenda was approved with one modification; the group requested additional time to review the meeting notes from the full group meeting on August 15 and a review period was added following the break at 11:45 am.
- The August 15 meeting notes were approved after a brief discussion following the break period.

Biomass and Bioenergy Updates

- The Governor of California approved legislation that directs Investor Owned Utilities (IOUs) to purchase 125 MW of bioenergy; it is a directive for IOUs to contribute to reducing fire hazard and the public good.
- R. Hadley noted that 125 MW is allocated proportionally to the different IOUs in California. It is not clear how much PG&E, specifically, is required to purchase.
- Bioenergy operations accepting hazardous material (e.g., fire salvage, dead trees) have better standing in procuring/extending contracts resulting from this legislation.
- Burney Forest Power (BFP) and Honey Lake Power (HLP) are both likely candidates to benefit from the 125 MW allocation. At this time, both BFP and HLP have contracts expiring in Fall/Winter '16; contracts will be extended at least five years if renewed.
- SB1122 was passed in 2012 to facilitate small-scale bioenergy production (3 MW or less); however, the process has had limited successes.
- A trailer bill for SB1122 was introduced this year that included a revision of the payments required for projects that have completed System Impact Studies (SIS) and are in the interconnection queue.
- The trailer-bill passed, eliminating significant interconnection costs for SB1122 projects.
- P. Puterbaugh inquired about the status of Sierra Institute's SB1122 project.
- Sierra Institute's bioenergy project is currently challenged with environmental remediation needs at the Crescent Mills site in Plumas County; the site was formerly a mill.
- J. Kusel noted that other local SB1122 projects, including Hat Creek Construction's bioenergy project, could be running within a couple of years.

SCALE Discussion

- Sierra to California All-Lands Enhancement (SCALE) was initially a network of three Collaborative groups in California including the BHCCFWG.
- SCALE has since expanded with support of USFS Region 5 (R5) to include a variety of groups from around the state; Sierra Institute for Community and Environment facilitates SCALE and conducts research to advance collaborative forestry in partnership with USFS R5.
- A. Grasso and D. Cesmat will be representing the BHCCFWG at the SCALE meeting on September 27-28 in Sacramento.
- J. Kusel invited group members to provide questions for the representative attending the meeting.
 - C. Danheiser was interested in how the other Collaborative's handle the "downtime" between projects. If members are not collaborating on a project, what are they doing in the interim to continue participating and contributing?

- R. Hadley inquired about the Dinkey Collaborative; recently, Sierra Forest Legacy and the Wilderness Society had members leave or reassigned to other work. What kind of impact has this had?
- D. Hays wanted to know how others strike a balance between proposing a project and getting collaborative input. In other words, how can the USFS present their information and recommendations without having it perceived as a final decision?
- M. Coppoletta echoed Dave Hays' question; where in the collaborative process does the USFS fit in? Also, how do you get Collaborative members to take ownership and interest in the monitoring process?

Group Visioning

- J. Kusel noted that visioning is effective with a diverse group. The presence of Lassen National Forest leadership is particularly important for communicating the goals and interests of collaborative members.
- Group members were asked to write down short and long term goals (1-2 and 3-5 years respectively) as part of the visioning exercise.
 - For the full list of goals, see Appendix A.
- Select 1-2 year goals
 - J. Mateljak discussed new funding opportunities for collaborative work across ownership boundaries. This is not "typical" for the National Parks Service (NPS), but if embraced, could impact a larger landscape.
 - D. Hays commented that the USFS, at times, feels like it is slowing the collaborative process down. One major goal is to enhance the Forest Service's ability to maintain interest and momentum of the Collaborative group despite agency timelines.
 - Multiple members supported "collaboratively designed" projects.
 - Community involvement is an important short term goal; there is an opportunity to engage local youth and community members for small scale projects.
 - There needs to be a method for identifying local benefits from CFLR activities and increasing local employment.
 - Several members would like to see more meetings take place in the field.
- Select 3-5 year goals
 - C. Danheiser asked what the legacy of the group will be. If the CFLRP ends in 3 years, what will the group be remembered for?
 - There is a major goal to implement a project that demonstrates a balance between habitat and ecological resilience; ultimately, having a project that is regarded as a "success story" and fully encompasses the triple bottom line.
 - Several members would like to see a model or template for collaboration. The template would incorporate lessons learned and apply them to future collaborative forestry efforts.
 - The group should play a role in creating a new forest plan for Lassen National Forest.
- P. Johnson noted that the BHCCFWG was not founded in conjunction with the CFLRP. The Collaborative is rooted in the Shasta Resource Advisory Committee's commitment to create a lasting impact on the landscape. The CFLRP has provided new opportunities but does not necessarily define the future of the Collaborative.

- J. Kusel commented that since the last visioning exercise the group has become much more specific in their goals; it is evidence of progress and maturity in terms of collaboration.

FY 2017 Program of Work

- The estimated funding for FY 2017 is \$1,022,000; this is approximately \$700,000 less than the previous year.
- The main budget categories discussed included projects, planning, and preparation. All categories, proposed activities, and estimated funding is listed in Appendix B.

Projects

- An individual has volunteered to install a handicap fishing pier in collaboration with the LNF engineer. There is no NEPA required for this project and the project may be replicated in other areas.
- T. Puterbaugh noted that the roads at Hat Creek and Twin Bridges campgrounds are in disrepair; there are numerous potholes at these sites.
 - A. Grasso has spoken with engineers and has designated \$50k for patching and sealing the campground roads.
- A. Grasso has proposed \$10k for interpretive signage for the district. One potential location is a vista point that is seen upon entering the town of Burney; this location has been largely overlooked by the USFS.
 - Wildfire effects and monitoring practices were suggested as potential subjects for interpretation.
- T. Puterbaugh inquired about the proposed snow plowing activity at the Ashpan/Eskimo Hill OHV trail parking areas. Is this an appropriate project for CFLR funding?
 - A. Grasso indicated that the plowing at Ashpan/Eskimo Hill is not covered by existing services (e.g. CalTrans). Funding this project would significantly increase the accessibility for snowmobile users in these areas.
 - T. Puterbaugh asked that USFS OHV funding be considered for this project.

Planning

- The USFS assigns “tiers” to projects in the planning phase to designate priority. Tier 1 is considered the highest priority.
 - Crossroads HFRA is Tier 1
 - The Plum Project is Tier 2
- J. Kusel asked if it is possible for the Collaborative to recommend or suggest a change in tier designation for certain projects. Also, does the Collaborative have the opportunity to influence the initial prioritization of projects?
 - D. Hays commented that although tiers represent priority, all projects are intended to be completed within a fiscal year.
 - A. Grasso supports the Collaborative providing input on prioritization.
- A. Grasso offered to supply a list of projects with tier designations included. **Action Item: A. Grasso** to provide a list of projects that includes priority (tier) designations.
- R. Hadley added Lost Creek Plantation under the project planning category. A. Grasso believes Lost Creek is synonymous with Twin Butte Plantation.

- B. Jones indicated a need for a Categorical Exclusion or decision memo for the Eiler salvage/replanting study. There needs to be some sort of documentation to allow planting in the leave islands (retention clusters) that are currently categorized as “no treatment”.
- D. Lofthus inquired about plans for the Potato Buttes ATV area.
 - A. Grasso has been in contact with the Recreation Outdoors Coalition (ROC) regarding the opportunities for the district; a meeting is planned for October to visit and discuss the outlook for different recreation areas. Potato Buttes can be included in this discussion. **Action Item:** A. Grasso to provide information regarding the ROC meeting and assessment of recreation sites.
 - Information gathered from the recreation assessment will be brought to the Forest Leadership Team for review; ideally, this process will result in forest-wide recreation projects incorporated into the LNF Program of Work.

Washington Office Visit:

- J. Kusel noted that the conversations can be frank with the Washington Office (WO) and Regional Office (RO) representatives; however, participants should avoid editorial comments that do not contribute meaningfully to the discussion or are inconsistent with group agreements or understanding.
- D. Hays emphasized the importance of transparency and discussing the challenges with the WO/RO representatives. As for USFS policies, the representatives are likely not able to directly impact organizational changes but may have some influence over the process.
- The **WO representatives** sent a list of questions for the group to review prior to the meeting in 2014. **Action Item:** A. Grasso to distribute list of questions from the WO representatives.
- The WO representatives will be visiting the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG) and the Butte Fire area prior to the Burney-Hat Creek visit. The group agreed that the Eiler Fire area should be included in the field tour to reaffirm the issue of wildfire in California.
- R. Hadley suggested Categorical Exclusions be discussed with WO representatives. The Crossroads CE has taken much longer than many Collaborative members anticipated.
 - A. Grasso responded that the CE process is not the limiting factor, rather, it is the required wildlife and botanical surveys. K. Harville has taken steps to avoid these issues in the future by directing surveys beyond the boundaries required at this time.
- There was general consensus to discuss the value of Categorical Exclusions versus Environmental Assessments with WO representatives.
- D. Hays recognized that the CE process has not met many of the Collaborative members’ expectations; however, he suggested focusing on the larger issue of a quickly transitioning landscape. The current tools the USFS has to work with, including CE, do not seem to match the rate that ecosystems are changing.

Tree Mortality Task Force (TMTF): What information does the group need?

- Group members were asked what information would be useful from Tree Mortality Task Force representatives.
 - M. Copolletta is interested in the mapping and monitoring efforts that the TMTF has implemented or been involved with.
 - P. Johnson and others identified biomass utilization as a topic for further conversation. The TMTF’s Bioenergy Utilization Working Group is comprised of

Kim Carr, Assistant Deputy Director CAL FIRE, and Angie Lottes, Statewide Wood Energy Team coordinator.

Identification and Prioritization of Future Meeting Topics

Future Meeting Topics (including those added 9/26/16)

- NRCS and CAL FIRE funding opportunities (B. Darley on CFIP/CALFIRE; Melinda Graves, P. Johnson and Others)
- Monitoring Working Group Recommendations; feedback on monitoring questions (M. Coppoletta)
- Recreation/tourism district opportunities (A. Grasso)
- Tree Mortality Task Force: monitoring and biomass utilization update
- Tribal consultation for grants
- WO Visit Summary

- M. Copolleta requested time to discuss monitoring working group recommendations at a future meeting; the conversation would include reviewing monitoring questions ([download](#), .xlsx, 21 KB) and receiving feedback from group members. **Future Meeting Topic:** Monitoring working group recommendations; provide feedback for monitoring questions.
- The group agreed that the WO visit should be summarized and discussed at the next meeting. **Future Meeting Topic:** WO Visit Summary

Setting Meeting Date

- November 14, 2016 was selected for the next full group meeting.
- The partnership coordinator position was discussed briefly. A. Grasso noted that the position will be filled by November 14, however, it is unlikely that the individual will be present at the meeting.
- D. Lofthus and P. Johnson announced a field day organized by the California Licensed Foresters Association; the tour will be fairly technical and include three stops along the HWY 89 corridor.
 - The primary focus of the field tour is forest regeneration.
 - The anticipated audience is small landowners and consulting foresters.
 - Full event details and registration are available here.

Appendix A

BHC Group Visioning - September 26, 2016

1-2 Year Goals

Visioning	Planning	Implementation	Funding	Outreach
Resilient Landscapes	x Getting more projects together	x Get Crossroads finished	x Working across boundaries, utilizing new funding opportunities	x Cross ownership - enhance relationship with Burney State Park
Large landscape projects, looking broadly	x Focus on forest and district staffing	x Implement a project that incorporates ecological restoration goals (e.g. heterogeneity, resiliency)	x Leveraging dollars and joint work	x Attending meetings consistently, embracing the opportunity to share and learn
Enhance ability to maintain interest and momentum despite agency timelines	x Define project areas with NEPA requirements completed or in the process	Small Scale Successes	Grant funding for thinning and chipping for private landowners	x Community involvement - taking a larger role in local youth development
Defining what collaboration means for this group	x Collaboratively design projects for work across ownership boundaries	x Getting work done on the ground, programs of stewardship	x Having a timeline, budget timeline	x Public outreach for the CFLR
	Design projects for drought induced mortality	x Completing existing and new recreation projects		More economic and social development in the area
	More field meetings	x Define and enhance the bug salvage program within the district		

3-5 Year Goals

Visioning	Planning	Implementation	Funding	Outreach
Thinking about the group's legacy, establishing a legacy	Creating a model or template for future collaborative efforts	x Implement a project that demonstrates a balance between habitat and ecological resilience, a success story		Increase the amounts of interpretive sites, signage, and publicity for the area
Solve the fire funding issue	Watershed scale analysis, determining limiting factors for the health of the watershed	Implement a large project, work in old growth		
Working to maintain and enhance the local infrastructure (e.g. biomass)	Being involved in the new forest plan for Lassen National Forest			

Hat Creek Burney Basins CFLR FY17 Proposed Projects

Projects	Funding	Acres	Descriptions
	Cost		
Estimated Funding			\$1,021,792.00
Old Station Handicap Fishing Pier		n/a	Volunteer - Providing Construction & Funding
Recreation Area		n/a	
Hat Creek and Cave Camp Ground and Subway Cave Entrance	50,000		Road Repair/Repaving
West Prospect Road Resurfacing	20,000	2 miles	\$30,000 matching
Plowing - Ash Pan/Eskimo Hill Parking Areas	21,000		
Vista Point (44/89) Handicap Accessible Trail			Repair and repave
Fishermans Trail			Sloping into water - need to shore up, make wider
Parhams Trail - Switchbacks			Steep shaley slope, needs to shore up
Range Improvement	\$10,000	n/a	Cattleguards, gates, fencing corrals and water tanks
Willow Planting Along Hat Creek	1,000	n/a	
Educational Interpretive Signs	\$5,000	n/a	Update interpretive sites to include recent fires
Ashpan Gravel - Phase 2	\$1,000		Second load of gravel near groomers shed
Planning			
Plum Project (EA)		18,,233	
Cross Roads CE)		-3000	HFRA project
Culvert Cleaning (CE)			Remove trees
Burney Creek Restoration (CE)			Remove trees along the Creek
Vista Point (CE)			Look at all Vista Points within the CFLR boundary for clearing needs
Hat Creek Archeology Sites (CE)			Maintenance on sites that were burned in the Eiler Fire
Ash Pan Plantation (CE)			Thinning in the plantation area
Twin Butte Plantation (CE)			Thinning in the plantation area
Old Station Wildlife Improvement (CE)			Oak/Aspen enhancement
Cabin (CE)		-3000	Enlarge project area. Possible HFRA area.
Roadside Hazards (CE)			
Battle Creek Drafting Site (CE)			Bring drafting site up to standards
Eiler Fire Monitoring (CE)			Create monitoring plots
Cornez Lake (CE)			Bouldering around Lake to keep people out of the meadow
Preparation			

Sunshine Plantation Thin and Mastication Project			IRSC Contract
Sluicebox			IRSC Contract
Whittington			IRSC Contract
Reading Fire Site Preparation		576	
Prescribed Fire			
Eastside Underburn		1500	
Reading Pile Burning		525	
South Station		200	
Fuels Reduction and Site Preparation			
Eiler Fuels Reduction		300	
Misc Pile Reduction		500	
Bald Fire Cut and Deck		500	
Thinning			
Big Lake Meadow Restoration		160	
South Station Burn Prep - Ladder Fuel Cut and Pile		200	
Mastication			
Cypress Plantation		333	
Reforestation			
Eiler Fire	\$200,000	1612	
Bald Fire	\$107,000	1038	
Reading Fire		576	
Monitoring			
Big Lake			Meadow - Hydro
Snow			University of Reno - partners
Range Allotment			Hydro
Plum Project			Hydro
Hat Creek/Screwdriver Creek			Water Quality/Stream Monitoring

Eiler Fire			Create monitoring plots
Miscellaneous			
Overtime	\$5,000		
Supplies	\$10,000		
Travel	\$5,000		
Additional Projects for Consideration			
89 Recreation Corridor			Site visit with Regional Office (September). Discussions with partners and recreation groups to discuss needs.
Wiley Ranch		20000	Discussion with Lomakatsi/Tribe on possible project
Digger Creek			Repair culverts, stream and road (funding needed)
Bailey Creek Aquatic Organism Passage			Repair culverts, stream and road (funding needed)
Personnel			
Fleet			
Estimate			
Total Available for Consideration (Estimate)			
Fy 17 Allocation			
Not within CFLR boundaries - Information only			