

## Meeting Synopsis

The Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest and Watershed Group met for a two-day meeting focused on strategic planning on Wednesday, March 28, through Thursday, March 29, 2018. Attendance on the first day was optional, with a purpose to begin strategic planning discussions to be further developed the following day. Members in attendance on March 28 identified desired outcomes for strategic planning, discussed the Forest Service's Five-Year Plan within the current CFLR boundary, explored the question of whether to expand the CFLR boundary, and considered ways to augment Forest Service capacity in implementing projects within the CFLR. On March 29, members of the collaborative provided updates on projects, advanced the development of a project list ("the list") in which the collaborative can pre-determine its level of support for individual project advancement, and discussed various mechanisms for increased frequency and efficiency regarding internal and external information-sharing. Additionally, collaborative members reached consensus on the concept of working with a Master Stewardship Agreement (MSA). **Note:** Meeting notes from March 29<sup>th</sup> are presented in this document first with an abbreviated summary of notes from March 28<sup>th</sup> following.

## Action Items Summary

- **K. Bourg** to revise January 2018 meeting notes. DONE (will be posted to new website May 15, 2018)
- **G. Mayer** and **T. Sloat** to compare/check project property lines in relation to the Rails to Trails project in order to not duplicate efforts.
- **G. Mayer** to send D. Cluck a map of treated area in station 4.
- **Sierra Institute** to help partners expand "the list" for review at the next meeting
- **G. Costello** to develop a list of recreation projects to be added to "the list."
- **Sierra Institute** to bring printed CFLR boundary maps for participants at each meeting and maintain a list of running action items.
- **K. Bourg** and **G. Costello** to brainstorm outreach mechanisms to present for the next meeting.
- **G. Costello** and **T. Sloat** to send project language and photos to **M. Coppoletta**.
- **M. Coppoletta** to share an outreach template with the group once it becomes available.
- **Monitoring working group** to review and suggest socioeconomic indicators to share with the full group.
- **K. Bourg** to update collaborative contacts. DONE
- **Sierra Institute** to schedule next BHCCFWG meeting for a late May date. DONE

## BHCCFWG Meeting: March 29, 2018

### Attendees

Janine Book  
Kaily Bourg  
Steve Buckley  
Debra Cesmat  
Kelly Conner  
Michelle Coppoletta  
Garrett Costello  
Don Curtis  
Colby Elliot  
Ryan Hadley

Ramsey Harvey  
Kylie Hensley  
Kristy Hoffman  
Peter Johnson  
Chantz Joyce  
Jonathan Kusel  
Doug Lindgren  
Dean Lofthus  
Lori Martin  
Jason Matelijak

Greg Mayer  
Alexis Montgomery  
Joe Murphy  
Xem Muscarella  
Jeff Oldson  
Patricia Puterbaugh  
Ben Rowe  
Todd Sloat

## Introduction

Attendees introduced themselves roundtable. **J. Kusel** announces that some footage will be captured for a film about Sierra Institute and partners. Audio and visual will be captured, but only visual will be used with narration. **J. Kusel** introduces four guest students from the applied ecology program at CalPoly who are interested in gaining hands on application outside of the classroom, including learning about the collaborative process.

### Approval of January 2018 Meeting Notes

- **Revisions:** Update Plum Restoration project number from 30 to 20 and fix broken links.
- **Action Item:** **K. Bourg** to revise January 2018 meeting notes and post to website.
- **Approval:** All approve notes with revisions discussed

### Approval of March Agenda

- **Approval:** Group members approve the March Meeting Agenda.

## Project Updates

### Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) Crossroads Awards

K. Hoffman announced that the Crossroads project was one of 15 proposals awarded a Proposition 1 award from SNC. Majority of the awards went to planning efforts, including Crossroads. K. Hoffman expects that more implementation projects will be considered in June.

- T. Sloat mentioned the group's decision six months ago to submit a grant application for Crossroads and in addition, Manzanita Chutes. Manzanita Chutes did not reach the 80-point scoring criteria.
- K. Hoffman suggested two tips for improving the Manzanita Chutes application: 1) be explicit about long-term solution regarding maintenance, and 2) since funding was from the proposition 1 bond, clearly link project benefits to watersheds and natural resources.
- G. Mayer asked about property lines in relation to the FS "Rails to Trails" project. **Action Item:** **G. Mayer** and **T. Sloat** to compare/check project property lines in relation to the Rails to Trails project in order to not duplicate efforts.

### Cal Fire Proposal

**T. Sloat** submitted a Climate Change Initiative (CCI) pre-proposal. A subcommittee contributed information to the pre-proposal. CalFire is interested in issuing large awards to proposals that address generally large landscapes. The pre-proposal included projects on the Modoc, Tamerac, Big Valley, Bald Fire, Eiler Fire, Manzanita Chutes, Backbone, Crossroads, and others. The ask amount was \$10.5 million, offering a \$5.8 million match.

- **B. Rowe** mentioned there is more money coming out in the greenhouse gas funds. Awards will be focused on supporting implementation having direct benefits to state forest lands.
- **J. Kusel** acknowledged that there is a dramatic increase in state climate investments.
- **K. Hoffman** mentioned the proposed proposition funding in June and November

- **D. Curtis** asked about criteria for the Cal Fire dollars. **B. Rowe** responded that T. Sloat has been exploring how it gets scored. Southern Sierra has high priority, but proposals are evaluated statewide. J. Kusel mentioned there is pressure on CalFire to allocate funding to the north also.

### Plum Project Public Scoping Update

A public meeting six months ago helped inform a draft project description for the Plum Project. Once the draft receives approval from the supervisor it will go out to public for true public scoping likely in two weeks. **J. Book** brought a copy of the document and to go through at the meeting.

- Anticipated project timeline: Public scoping to begin in April and conclude in May, Analysis to be completed before the end of the field season, draft EA before the holidays
- A goal of the scoping is to include enough language in the document to gain support of the collaborative, which will reduce or mitigate litigation. **J. Book** pointed out that time is critical considering any service contracts that will come about in the final year of the current CFLR structure.

### Stewardship Council Fee Title Transfer for Burney Gardens

**C. Joyce:** The Stewardship Council received two proposals for land stewardship of the Burney Gardens project (1600 acres), one from the Fall River RCD and one from the Pit River Tribe.

Stewardship Council is in the process of reviewing those proposals. The goal is to have staff recommendations by July and a Board review in October. The close of escrow will likely occur within two years.

- **D. Curtis** asked about who will continue the work that needs to be done on the project with the title transfer.
  - It is considered in the proposal review. Stewardship Council wants to see continuation of that work. There is interest in implementing an outdoor classroom. The proposal from Fall River RCD also incorporates that vision.
- **P. Johnson** asked about the RCD proposal summary regarding treatment. **J. Oldson** mentioned that treatment will not occur under the current Timber Harvest Plan (THP). There is a hope to repackage and restart the THP. **T. Sloat** said that it is not an easy decision moneywise, but it is nice to finish what we started.
- **J. Oldson** discussed the challenge for Beatty in getting a THP going because they are not in a hazard zone. Being in a high hazard zone adds value to the product.
- **D. Lofthus** shared a map of high hazard zones. The map was created by FRAP as a GIS exercise looking at dead trees. **B. Rowe** mentioned the opportunity to list more areas as high hazard by doing a site by site analysis and providing supporting information.
- **L. Martin** thanked Todd and the RCD for submitting a proposal for the title transfer.
- **All** discussed the presence of cascade frogs and yellow-legged frogs on the site. It is unclear what extra work may be required regarding habitat protection.
- **J. Oldson** discussed the extremely poor conditions of the biomass market. **J. Kusel** seconds, when you have low value material, you cannot get work done because – who will fund it?
- **L. Martin** asked if there will be more rounds of resource work and treatment funds from Stewardship Council. **C. Joyce** explained the concept of enhancement funding. Stewardship Council has \$3 million, but that has to be used on PG&E lands. The Stewardship Council will know by the second half of 2019 whether there will be more enhancement dollars.

## Strategic Planning

### Strategic Planning Discussion: Forest Service Five-year Plan

**J. Book** presented the FS's five-year project plan for the Hat Creek District. The project list is not a final, fixed list. Projects included on the list will be implemented in phases, including award, contract, NEPA decision, and prep/appraisal. **J. Book** emphasized operating within at least a five-year vision to avoid hitting a dead spot on project implementation. Due to funding and staffing challenges within the FS, the three district are no longer distinct and resources will be balanced.

- **J. Book** discussed the scalable nature of the five-year plan list. For example, if the FS receives project help from collaborative members on any of the projects, all projects will shift up on the list. The list could also speed up if FS staff increases.
- FS developed a mechanism for rating projects all across the district to help prioritize resource allocation. Criteria considered elements such as: collaborative group present, biomass element present, legal obligations, located within a priority watershed, complexity level, Washington interest, special authorities. Most projects scored a 6 out of 10; a project on the West side of the Almanor district scored a 9 out of 10. The scoring is not a competition or a decision, it is a conversation starter.
- **D. Curtis** asked about where recreation planning fits in. **J. Book** responded that it would be squeezed in the cracks. Fuels acres treated is priority however recreation is still important; three to one, timber to recreation. Recreation is where the collaborative can add capacity.
- **S. Buckley** inquired about fuel break projects. **J. Book** responded that the FS list is focused on larger projects, but smaller projects that only require CEs can be incorporated.
- **J. Oldson** encouraged the group to consider integrating more reforestation efforts.
  - **G. Mayer** suggested a future conversation about grass out competing trees considering all site prep is completed with dozers. Perhaps chemicals should be used.
- **M. Coppoletta** presented a map developed by entomologist, Danny Cluck. The map identifies areas with high risk of beetle kill, which corresponds with high severity wildfire. Data from 1915 reveals that mixed conifer forests today were previous pine forests. The map will be available soon on ArcGIS online.
  - **J. Book** suggested overlaying projects on the list with the high hazard map. **P. Johnson** believes a ground level assessment to supplement data on the high hazard map will be necessary.
- **S. Buckley** stated the group should always be ready for/plan for a big fire. **T. Sloat** seconded.
  - **J. Book** responded to a question about scheduling impacts from a fire, everything else drops off the plate because salvage is time sensitive.
  - **B. Rowe** suggested wrapping surveys into a fire salvage NEPA document.
  - **G. Mayer** mentioned that wildlife surveys will always have to be redone, but archaeology and botany surveys may still be able to roll over.

### Strategic Planning Discussion: Contracts and Agreements

- **T. Sloat:** The conversation is different now from 7 years ago. The FS has identified projects (e.g., recreation and fire-scape) that need capacity and help. The collaborative might be able to provide that role as a partnership. If you have existing funding and a project list, how do you add

capacity to that? What is the strategy when a fire happens? It makes sense to have another team that is ready to do fire salvage (i.e., adding and building a broader team seems like a good strategy.)

- In discussing Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) and Supplemental Project Agreements (SPA)—non-federal money is only leveraged with value, and currently the only value is in timber. We have an opportunity with SNC to put KV funds and future sale money into stewardship document and use a match from SNC. This model can move a project like crossroads pretty quickly, with the possibility to have NEPA and CEQA done this year. An ideal scenario would be to leverage non-federal dollars to be paired with federal dollars.
- **G. Mayer** asked **J. Kusel** to discuss match.
  - **J. Kusel:** The agency has different areas (contracts and agreements) with a minimum 20% match requirement. Various activities count as match (excluding federal funds). For example, there is a certain hourly rate for non-federal employee participation that gets counted as match.
- **T. Sloat** explored the Backbone project in a Stewardship Agreement (SA) scenario. Once the project is treated and implemented, money would flow out of that into the SA and leverage non-private, non-federal dollars, which could fund NEPA work.
  - Some express fear of losing forest service staff and resources to other districts if the CFLR capacity is significantly increased. **T. Sloat** and others do not feel believe this is highly probable, however if the CFLR can do more work here and that does result in lost FS staff etc., someone else would be receiving the help.
- **S. Buckley** asked about where forest restoration bonds fit into the matrix. Private investment and a funding source. If B. Rowe is accurate in suggesting that there is more money in the Greenhouse Gas and Climate Change Initiative funding pool, there is a good chance that it will be invested in the landscape. **[Future Meeting Topic]**
- **B. Rowe** suggested there are limitations of how much CCI funding can be used for planning.
- **P. Puterbaugh** asked if this is including the SPAs and MSAs discussed at the last meeting.
  - Yes. **T. Sloat** clarified that it doesn't matter whose MSA you are working under (another NGO or RCD, etc.). There are benefits from having the locals doing the work and having an opportunity to keep young people here.

### Strategic Planning Discussion: "The List"

Collaborative members discussed developing a list of projects to be used as a tool to pre-determine members' formal support of individual projects should a grant opportunity arise. **J. Kusel** presented the question, if the project is on "the list," can a partner feel comfortable moving forward on a proposal without needing to consult the group?

- **D. Lofthus** seconded the question.
- **J. Kusel** pushed the group to consider the consistency with projects and objectives.
- **P. Puterbaugh** mentioned that in the Plum Project, the FS asked the group to okay the project before the group saw a draft. We can support a proposal, but it's hard to support if you don't have enough information.
- Group members clarified that it's not support for the end of the project but support for the application. Once a project is awarded, then further discussion would occur.
- **P. Johnson:** We need to have an approved list but be clear about projects and types of projects that are universally supported.

- **T. Sloat** highlighted activities the group could support, including those that are less controversial (e.g., plantation and reforestation) and projects that have already secured NEPA or some value already invested.
- **D. Curtis:** We need to develop a plan or protocol.
- **J. Matelijak:** Janine has that list started. For example, we could go for a proposal on a project that needs NEPA if it's on the list.
- **D. Curtis and J. Kusel** asked the group if there is a consensus on the projects on Janine's list and if there is support for proposal development. Most heads nod, but consensus not confirmed.
- **J. Book:** We have the opportunity to add other projects (NPS, State, Private, etc.) to the list.
- **S. Buckley:** What would we identify right now considering the parks bond in July and CCI funding possibilities? Can we prioritize a forest-wide fuel break project? **T. Sloat:** It's the next logical step. Evaluate the need then go attract the money.
- **Action Item:** Sierra Institute to help partners expand the list for review at the next meeting. **J. Kusel** asked is there is general consensus about the list.
- **J. Oldson** suggested that if someone has time to apply for a grant, we shouldn't discourage applications that are lower on the list. We have to be opportunistic.
- **J. Kusel** restated the group's desire, if someone is going forward with a proposal, they need to know whether it is supported by the collaborative. **J. Oldson** clarified that he is referring to the ranking.
- **L. Martin** highlighted one benefit of the list—as opposed to saying we are a member, we can say there is formal support by the CLFR collaborative group for this project. Perhaps a formal letter of support.
- **J. Kusel** asked if there is any objection to the list. Consensus not confirmed.
- **P. Johnson** suggested that “the list” can be presented at each meeting.
- **P. Puterbaugh** expressed concern about the Snow Mountain project included on the list. **J. Book** confirms that the list is not stagnant. **P. Johnson** asked about what can be done on Snow Mountain now. **J. Book** responded, surveying. Surveys are good for about 3 years depending on the resource.
- **P. Johnson** stated concern that a new grant opportunity may delay or push other activities back. The group may need to do a prioritization process.
- **T. Sloat:** Everything is opportunistically driven. Manzanita Chutes is prime for grant application. **T. Sloat** references the SNC grant soon to be awarded and S. Buckley's statement about protecting assets and values with a forest-wide fuel break.
- **T. Sloat** asked the group, what is the most important thing you can protect? The group responded, communities and people.
- The group discussed projects that might be added to the list: Burney and Johnson Park, project of the Burney Firesafe Council, etc. There is desire to expand the list to reflect the collaborative perspective.
- **D. Loftus** pointed out that the FS lands that have the greatest threat to Burney is Snow Mountain. Every fire moves north and east. If fire starts at Snow Mountain, it will go right down Burney Creek. **T. Sloat** asked if it is more important than the Backbone Project.
- **R. Hadley** suggested that a list be made then the collaboration can come up with their own prioritization of it. **J. Book** restated that we have be forward thinking in implementing the list, making sure there is always more coming.
- **J. Matelijak** suggested that the collaborative identify objectives and determine levels of support. It will be key to identify what is actually ready when a grant becomes available.

- **G. Costello** discussed developing a list of recreation projects (e.g., vista point, recycling bins, interpretive trail information). **Action Item:** **G. Costello** to develop a list of recreation projects to be added to “the list.”
- The group discussed identifying what is an appropriate type of treatment for a particular timber stand location. While that information would be revealed in the NEPA process, money would typically not be invested into NEPA unless there is some idea of the treatment type and value of the timber. There is risk in guessing the value (i.e., trying to value the product without understanding the need). Treatments for certain habitat types can be part of a range. The group might compartmentalize project types and types of work and things that can be CEs.
- **J. Kusel** recognized there is some level of agreement over principles for investment in values.
- **M. Coppoletta** discussed the NEPA development options and possibility for a conflict of interest. If FS does NEPA, the sales go into the treasury. If a private entity does NEPA with the idea they will be reimbursed with the outcome from that NEPA, will another entity need to be involved to assure that it is having the ecological outcome that the group wants (i.e., watchdog). Not an implication that people would abuse it.

### Strategic Planning Discussion: Roundtable of Key Points and Next Steps

The following is a summary list of key points from the morning’s conversation as identified by each collaborative member.

- Add Non-Forest Service and Forest Service recreation projects to the list
- Identify projects the collaborative supports for developing proposals and develop a green light list of what projects have support from the collaborative already
- Get a better sense of the capacity questions. What do we need to do in terms of NEPA prep, compliance, and understanding what gaps we have to fill? Improve data management, integrate between agencies. Get a better idea of what is going on.
- Include industrial partners’ projects on the list.
- From an MSA angle, establish clear direction and identify which project(s) the group is going to move forward. The group to commit to taking a project from cradle to completion, out of the hands of the FS. “Seedling to Saw”
- Pursue opportunities to overlay those GIS layers and develop a priority, including a needs assessment. FS has a list of projects. If you unmask, there are projects that could leverage additional man power and move higher on the list.
- Develop the list. It’s important. Including the nexus of existing plans (IRWM, CWPP community wildfire protection plans, etc.) Benefits include tracking that a project is meeting all targets. Bring back the CFLR boundary maps for everyone at each meeting. **Action Item:** Sierra Institute to bring printed CFLR boundary maps for participants at each meeting.
- There is a lot of money and a lot of opportunity from the CalFire grants. Thanks T. Sloat for figuring out these grants.
- Want to be closely connected to the private industry. More products, more revenue. Maintain a good social-economic balance.
- Is there consensus on the list?
  - **P. Johnson:** It’s a two-step process. Compile the list. Determine the “green light, yellow light, red light” status of the projects listed.
  - **D. Curtis:** How do we approve projects on a collaborative basis? Being on the list, are we implying that you can say the collaborative has approved. How do we approve projects on the list? What is the protocol? We need to develop steps.

- **J. Book:** We need to get in those projects that are not timber (e.g., recreation, bridge, etc.) from all the partners.
- The group discusses that instead of project by project, across the CFLR boundary, different project types would be green-lighted. What is our desired condition across the landscape? Identify areas and corresponding project types. **Future Meeting Topic:** Identify each collaborative members' desired conditions across the landscape.
- Resistance and resilience on the forest; increase pace and scale using partners
- Identify treatment types, fuel break salvage type, describe the general nature of forest health
- Recreation and outreach, developing that list which can be expanded upon.
- Having a consistent voice and message throughout the collaborative regarding outreach.
- Parameters so the collaborative can be nimbler post-fire. Develop a 5-10-year plan that doesn't get interrupted when there is a fire. How can the collaborative be more proactive and develop a more resilient plan? Find a way to keep green projects going when doing a salvage.
- We need more work outside of these meetings to not lose momentum between meetings. The list is a good thing, and categorization of the list is good—we need to focus in on things.

### Strategic Planning Discussion: GIS Tool, Outreach, and Information Sharing

- **J. Book** mentioned the need to identify goals, end results, and milestones. What does it look like to move forward?
- **J. Kusel** recognized that this group has moved a lot with respect with being more explicit about goals. Conversations have resulted in finding more ways that projects are linked. A map that lists all the projects may help the group identify what is missing and the direction to move given the opportunity for more resources.
- **G. Mayer** mentioned the map that is on the proposal. It would be nice to incorporate all the maps discussed into one map tool.
- **J. Matelijak** asked if someone has the capacity to hire someone to develop a map database. There is the possibility for a product here that could be very useful.
  - **G. Mayer** announced that a recent hire at the FS office has GIS capabilities.
- **M. Coppoletta** suggested utilizing GIS online in the future.
- **D. Curtis** recognized a need to complete an outreach program. **P. Puterbaugh** supports the idea of increased information sharing between meetings. **G. Mayer** suggested creating a shared folder online for collaborative members.
- **Action Item:** **K. Bourg** and **G. Costello** to brainstorm outreach mechanisms to present for the next meeting.
- **T. Sloat** advocated the advancement of a database and mapping exercise, though it is not clear who will take leadership. **Future Meeting Topic:** Responsibilities associated with developing a mapping tool and GIS database
- **S. Buckley** suggested putting the data with Sierra Institute, visualizing a database that tracks all activities.
- **M. Coppoletta** asked about the agency coordinator. **J. Book** responded that the forest is working to get a partnership coordinator for all three districts.
- **Action Item:** **Sierra Institute** to have printed maps available for the next meeting.

### Strategic Planning Discussion: Master Stewardship Agreement (MSA)



- **T. Sloat** updated the group that the forest has contributed funds to a stewardship agreement specialist. The specialist is waiting for license from the collaborative to move forward. The options are for the collaborative to 1) work under an existing MSA or 2) entity in the collaborative to develop own MSA. It is possible to work under someone's existing MSA (preference is Mule Deer Foundation) for a year to prevent losing SNC match.
- **Decision:** Group members reach consensus on the concept of proceeding with an MSA.

### Strategic Meeting Discussion: Increasing communication in between meetings

- The group discusses losing momentum from one meeting to the next. Suggestions to resolve momentum loss include: 1) meet more frequently, 2) strategic meetings in between full-group meetings and have subcommittees report back, and 3) contact every other month (between meetings) to disseminate updates and share accomplishments.
- Group members discuss that sharing a document every other month containing updates would benefit end of year reporting and the administrative component for NEPA.
- **J. Book** suggested tracking action items in a summary that precedes meeting notes and that keeps being carried forward. **J. Book** also suggested revisiting the collaborative vision statement.

### Additional Discussion Points

- Finish projects that have time and value invested in them.
- Working on plantations allows more trees at a quicker pace.
- Watershed projects should be considered at the top of the list.
- Economic drivers; utilizing private dollars to do NEPA to leverage funding adds value.

### Outreach and Communication

**M. Coppoletta** is working with a graphic artist around the Lassen to create a webpage on the Lassen NF website and develop a template for the group for sharing highlights and project successes. The idea is to provide a 1-2-page brief containing language and photos that the artist can use to design a template. Projects to showcase include: Whittington, Burney gardens, and Hat Creek enhancement.

- **Action Item:** **G. Costello** and **T. Sloat** to send project language and photos to **M. Coppoletta**.
- **Action Item:** **M. Coppoletta** to share an outreach template with the group once it becomes available.

### Ecological Monitoring

**M. Coppoletta** provided an update from the monitoring working group call with FS resource specialists on March 27<sup>th</sup>. To date most of monitoring has been focused on baseline pre-treatment data. The focus this summer will be on North 49 timber sales. FS has been waiting to complete implementation to move forward on post-implementation activities.

- The monitoring working group identified the following monitoring gaps: fire risks across landscapes, wildlife, and forest structure (i.e., how different treatments are looking at forest structures).

- Next steps for ecological pieces include: 1) work with the ecological monitoring working group to make recommendations to the Forest Supervisor to approve a second version and 2) review 2018 goals and activities.

### Socioeconomic Monitoring

**M. Coppoletta** discussed another component required of the CFLR is socioeconomic monitoring. A Chico State researcher performed a regional assessment for the Forest Service, completed in 2017. The assessment can be useful in reducing redundancies in a forest-scale assessment.

- Sierra Institute has submitted a proposal for conducting socioeconomic monitoring for the CFLR.
- **Future meeting topic:** Visioning discussion on how the group might start to capture socioeconomic indicators and determine the right time (i.e., when will impacts be seen) to conduct socioeconomic monitoring.
- Group members referenced the 2010 Report and Socioeconomic Assessment conducted by the Sierra Institute as a baseline.
- **J. Kusel** discussed the challenges in conducting socioeconomic monitoring related to causality and identifying appropriate data. **J. Kusel** suggested a mix of methods including interpreting census data and school populations and conducting interviews with aware parties and interests.
- **J. Matelijak** mentioned the Lassen National Park tracks economic contributions to the community.
- **M. Coppoletta** suggested next steps to review proposals and reports that are already available in order to help with identifying the types of data to be gathered. **Action Item:** Monitoring working group to review and suggest socioeconomic indicators to then share with the full group.

### Closing Remarks

- Forest Service personnel update: Bobette Jones is currently working with the agency on the Eagle Lake District.
- The group revised the current collaborative contact sheet. **Action Item:** **K. Bourg** to update collaborative contacts.

~ *Meeting Adjourned* ~

## BHCCFWG Meeting: March 28, 2018; 2:00 pm – 6:00 pm

### Attendees

Janine Book  
Steve Buckley  
Danny Cluck  
Kelly Conner  
Michelle Coppoletta

Ryan Hadley  
Peter Johnson  
Dean Lofthus  
Jason Matelijak  
Greg Mayer

Ted O. McArthur  
Ben Rowe  
Todd Sloat

### Introduction and Announcements

- J. Kusel begins with stating the purpose of the strategic planning meeting as brainstorming and visioning possibilities going forward. What does the landscape need and how might we begin to get there?
- J. Kusel also announces that CCI funds can be used on federal lands if state interests or issues are addressed.

### Strategic Planning

#### Strategic Planning Discussion: Desired Outcomes

Meeting attendees participated in a round table exercise listing “desired outcomes” for the strategic planning meeting.

- Develop a list of goals that are attainable
- Develop a list of projects to take the group through the transition of CFLR budgets and partner changes
- The group to become an action group in addition to a planning group; get projects and successes on the ground
- Discuss ways to maintain fire resistant forests, resilient landscapes, and a viable forestry-based economy
- Identify areas for implementation
- More active management on FS lands, collaboration, and balance from socioeconomic and biological perspectives
- Grant writers have the autonomy to apply for grants
- Implementation in the woods that the group can take credit for

#### Discussion: FS Five-year plan

**J. Book** presented the FS Five-Year draft plan; engaging the group makes the plan a more collaborative venture and a shared vision can be developed. **T. McArthur** further described the plan’s context. As FS staff is downsizing, there is a push to work more at the forest level and less at the district level. The FS appreciates working with the collaborative to raise the relevance and importance of the plan.

- **T. McArthur** mentioned the American Forest Foundation (AFF) is interested in joining the collaborative as a private, non-industrial partner.

- **J. Book** discussed the urgency in implementing projects with current CFLR funds coming to an end in the next couple of years. There is emphasis on not spending too much time planning new projects when there are projects on the shelf and implementation dollars available.
- **J. Book** presented FS five-year plan, including a list of projects each in a different phase (i.e., award, prep and appraisal, NEPA, survey) of completion in a given year.
- All discussed the potential associated with working through a Master Stewardship Agreement where the group completes planning and receives the revenue. Heads nodded in agreement.
  - **T. Sloat** highlighted that identifying projects that have value is important because you can attract a non-federal partner to do NEPA.
  - **G. Mayer** commented that similar to the CCI grant proposal, a combination of projects was included that will pay themselves out.
- **J. Book** considered the pace in which the 5-year plan would move forward. The project list is adjustable and scalable. The pace is contingent on prioritization on the overall forest plan, which could slow it down, and the amount of capacity augmented by collaborative members, which could speed it up.
  - **S. Buckley** asked to specify what is meant by capacity. J. Book provided examples of what types of capacity help the FS could use: planning, sale prep and administration, contract writing, and preparation. At every point in the process, more bodies could be used.
  - **T. McArthur** mentioned that Lassen is restricting the way it works and putting more energy into sale administrators by making it a high-grade position.
  - **T. Sloat** expressed it still feels like the group is in the mindset of planning for “what we think we can do and what can be done.” He encouraged the group to think about “what we can do vs. what we should be doing.”

#### Discussion Question: Are the boundaries right?

- **J. Kusel** highlighted that this CFLR uniquely has more private land (~ 48%) than any other CFLR.
- **G. Mayer** indicated he is a proponent of including the whole district, including the Pit River watershed. Expanding the boundary would give more place to do work and help with an MSA. There are areas outside of the CFLR project boundary that may not have received treatment in 50 years. T. Sloat supported the idea of expanding to include watersheds and the idea of complementing an MSA.
- **P. Johnson** proposed that is the objective is to help capacity, can the capacity bump be scaled up to a larger boundary? There is high value in some of the areas outside of the boundary. It makes sense if the group can scale up successes.
- **M. Coppoletta** asked about how the original boundary was determined and what might be gained with only one more year left of the CFLR.
  - The original boundary was determined mostly by watersheds and firesheds instead of jurisdictional boundaries.
  - The group discussed what changing the boundary would look like if the CFLR does or does not get reenacted. **J. Kusel** reminded the group that this is not a decision conversation.
  - **D. Cluck** pointed out that are many priority areas within the CFLR footprint, and there is incredible value outside of the boundary.
  - The group determined a next step would be to identify landscape needs and objectives to inform the hypothetical expansion. If there is an extension to the CFLR, it is not too

soon to determine whether expanding the boundary is appropriate. There is general interest in further exploring the idea—if it makes sense at a landscape level and contributes to continued resiliency. [Future Meeting Topic]

- **D. Cluck** presented a high stand density map that was developed to display bark beetle risk, which will be available on ArcGIS online in the upcoming weeks.
  - **G. Mayer** pointed out that an area highlighted on the map as high density has already been treated. **Action Item: G. Mayer** to send D. Cluck a map of treated area in station 4.

#### Discussion: Monitoring Commitments

- **J. Book** mentioned the FS's monitoring commitment.
  - **J. Kusel** asked whether the projects that the collaborative has advanced added a burden on the agency in terms of monitoring obligations. The idea is to augment monitoring capacity with partner agreements. T. McArthur described the Klamath's multi-party monitoring mechanism. Monitoring is an important commitment but hard to keep.
  - The CFLR monitoring piece requirement extends 5-10 years beyond the CFLR. The group considers looking for alternative funding/ways to support monitoring commitments.

#### Discussion: Landscape projects and Augmenting FS Capacity

- **G. Mayer** mentioned the FS having challenges with plantation survival. Money was put into a grant for planting but it was not enough. FS will need help and would love to develop partnerships with timber companies.
- The District would like to work in the Thousand Lakes Wilderness, which is where the Eiler fire came out of the Thousand Lakes wilderness. However, FS does not have money to do the NEPA. Limitations in doing work on the wilderness area include: additional documentation, limited prescribed fires, and minimal tools may be used.
- **D. Lofthus** asked what is private land role in augmenting capacity. P. Johnson recognized all of what Fruit Growers has contributed with land management on adjacent properties.
  - **J. Book** suggested finding a way to better coordinate and exchange information and estimates on what private inholdings are doing. J. Kusel recognized that coordination and recognition should be to everyone's benefit.
  - Private work would act as match within an MSA.
  - **G. Mayer** thanked D. Lofthus for thoughtful information sharing and recognized the value of having a neighbor like Fruit Growers.

#### Discussion: Vision

- **T. Sloat:** GNA is not useful unless there are non-federal interests. The best way to leverage funds is to offer something that has value. For example, crossroads does not have value but value can be added through K-V funds. If the project is not put into an MSA, it can be linked to something of value with FS money should they have increased capacity. If there is an existing capacity to do NEPA, a larger area can be identified and offered up to anyone who wants to tackle it and receive the revenue. There can be community emphasis and also benefit to the private entity. The idea is to build capacity by doing private work.
- If projects are linked strategically together, when opportunities do come, there is value in developing a local NEPA team. Projects can be lumped into Stewardship Agreements.

- Enterprise teams sometimes are not the best way to go in terms of cost. Local contracting may be a better option in terms of cost and supporting local socioeconomic conditions.
- The group discussed a major barrier, which is having more money and projects than capacity to implement them.
- **J. Book** recommended the group discuss each partners' desired condition on the landscape.
- Group attendees determined discussing the following topics in the future: walking through an example of an MSA, what does it look like to use GNA with CalFire for Crossroads, and preparation for barriers that might challenge the process.

*~ Meeting Adjourned ~*

DRAFT