Sierra Institute
for Community and Environment

Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest & Watershed Group
Strategic Planning Meeting
Monday, July 8th 2:00-5:00pm

Meeting Synopsis

The Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest & Watershed Group met for a full-group Strategic Planning meeting on Monday July 8th, 2019. The group revisited their vision, shared pathways for further socioeconomic monitoring, and discussed obstacles and solutions for pushing pace and scale for treatment across jurisdictions and to address large landscape challenges.

Attendees

Pete Johnson	Kristy Hoffman	Michelle Coppoletta
Sharmie Stevenson	Tanner Olson	Jonathan Kusel
Don Curtis	Jason Mateljak	Hilary Sanders
Todd Sloat	Janine Book	Dov Weinman
Dean Lofthus	Jim Richardson	
Greg Mayer	Garrett Costello	

Action Items

- Sierra Institute to synthesize meeting notes from May and July for group review.
- Sierra Institute to plan monthly check-ins with Socioeconomic Work Group.
- T. Sloat to develop subgroup for CCI prioritization and data aggregation.
- Group to seek clarity about credentials and levels for specialists and NEPA.

Approvals and Modifications

- H. Sanders is coordinating with D. Weinman to synthesize meeting notes from May and plans to distribute them to the group as soon as possible. D. Weinman introduced as Sierra Institute's new Watershed Coordinator who will connect with the local watershed coordinator.
- July meeting agenda approved.

Strategic Planning

Visioning

J. Kusel asked the group to revisit previously identified projects and gave the option to reevaluate the group's bigger vision. The group continues to assess goals for the entire landscape and incorporate available information to truly understand needs and priorities over the next 1-2 years. After looking at the fire map now and all the way back to the group's beginnings, it's clear that fire is not a question of if, but when and how large. The group considered both spatial and temporal dimensions, and G. Mayer suggested the importance of identifying how partners are approaching the issue as well as how the group can work through obstacles and barriers. D. Curtis asked if most of the restrictions or problems have been identified. G. Mayer responded that they need to identify issues and added that with some staff changes they have more capacity to pursue that information now.

Socioeconomic Monitoring

H. Sanders presented on Sierra Institute's two-pronged approach to collecting data, using both quantitative and qualitative methods to monitor socioeconomic conditions in the BHC footprint. The Sierra Institute has examined census data, state agencies, American Community Survey, and have

surveyed contractors, interviewed community members, and held Community Capacity Workshops. H. Sanders mentioned they are looking for support to fill gaps in the targeted data. She asked group members for suggestions for potential participants, people to interview, and different sectors to consider. The FS needs data for reporting on CFLR outcomes in October, so baseline and basic socioeconomic data used in the report from 2010 will be the focus of the effort between now and then. The current study area is divided into communities based on census block groups from the 2010 report and they may expand the area to what was used in Sierra Institute's 2016 Defining Local report. H. Sanders added that they're planning monthly check-ins with the Working Group and that the group's input is critical because of their community-based knowledge. H. Sanders sent out a doodle poll on Friday, July 5th for the next call.

J. Kusel mentioned that the purpose of CFLR socioeconomic monitoring is to determine whether and how the CFLR has affected local communities from when it started though to today. This is particularly challenging given the socioeconomic bumps, fires, recessions, etc., that have taken place since the launch of the CFLR. G. Mayer added that although most of the contractors are based in Oregon, they spend money in the community while working down in this area. These types of elements should be factored into reporting on socioeconomic impacts of the CFLR. D. Curtis questioned how the report may be used and whether or not it could trigger a continuation of the CFLR. G. Mayer responded that the CFLR was extended another two years and that congress requested additional money providing potential to fund the entire project; meaning there may be an opportunity to put additional funds into project work within a new timeframe. J. Richardson said the group should strive to weave money with community well-being and tie the projects on the landscape to projects that can make positive changes in communities.

J. Book updated the group of the permanent Forest Supervisor Deb Bumpass who will start August 6th.

M. Coppoletta produced three maps (Forest Health Treatment Priority Map, Wildfire Risk within the Burney Hat Creek Basin CFLRP, Completed Treatments 1999-2018) and shared insights with the group. Maps were also handed out to participants. T. Sloat proposed that the group develop prioritized products with regards to CCI and data aggregation within the next six months. He emphasized the need for a subgroup to follow through on that process. G. Mayer shared Badger Mountain Landscape Assessment map and aspects of the Plum area project. He added that PACs are being redone and they'll be able to mechanically treat through PAC areas (university research from this past April led to an acknowledgement that this has been done ineffectively in the past). J. Mateljak reiterated the ongoing issue with bard owls. G. Mayer emphasized opportunities for cross boundary work with the park, highlighting that other examples for this kind of collaboration don't truly exist but it will be possible with members from both agencies working together. He suggested a need to understand how to administratively pursue the work and to continue blurring administrative lines for effective cross-boundary projects and treatments.

J. Kusel showed slides showing the groups 1-2 and 3-5-year goals and asked participants to identify missing elements as well as new goals for funding, planning, and implementation. Participants wrote their responses on cards and passed them forward to be added to what the group had previously developed. Participants were given dot-stickers to place next to goals they would prioritize. The number

of dots were recorded in parentheses in the following spreadsheet:

BHC Group Visioning - September 26, 2016				

1-2 Year Goals

Visioning	Planning	Implementation	Funding	Outreach
	Complete Landscape scale prioritization and assessment (10)	FS staffing sufficient to accomplish goals and NEPA must be priority (10)	secure additional CFLR funding (8)	
	Develop recreation strategy, contribute support for future recreation projects (5)	Two new CE projects ID and permitted (2)	Fund/Equpment/Capacity for Removal of Materials (6)	Show examples of project successes to community, ex: where fire was contained due to treatment (10)
Resilient Landscapes (9)	Getting more projects together (0)	Get Crossroads finished (3)	Working across boundaries, utilizing new funding opportunities (11)	Cross ownership - enhance relationship with Burney State Park Inc Private Industry and Small, Private Landowners (6)
Large landscape projects, looking broadly (12)	Focus on forest and district staffing (10)	Implement a project that incorporates ecological restoration goals (e.g. heterogeneity, resiliency) (7)	Leveraging dollars and joint work (5)	Attending meetings consistently, embracing the opportunity to share and learn (1)
Enhance ability to maintain interest and momentum despite agency timelines (6)	Define project areas with NEPA requirements completed or in the process (0)	Small Scale Successes (20	Grant funding for thinning and chipping for private landowners (7)	Community involvement - taking a larger role in local youth development (3)
Defining what collaboration means for this group (0)	Collaboratively design projects for work across ownership boundaries (9)	Getting work done on the ground, programs of stewardship (7)	Having a timeline, budget timeline (1)	Public outreach for the CFLR (5)
	Design projects for drought induced mortality include climate adaptation strategies (2)	Completing existing and new recreation projects (10)		More economic and social development in the area (5)
	More stewardship agreements (4)	work from partners (0)		
	Remove road block from Partnership planning efforts (4)	Define and enhance the bug salvage program within the district (0)		
	More field meetings (3)			

3-5 Year Goals

Visioning	Planning	Implementation	Funding	Outreach
Thinking about the group's legacy, establishing a legacy (0)	Creating a model or template for future collaborative efforts (1)	Implement a project that demonstrates a balance between habitat and ecological resilience, a success story (4)	Fund self-sustaining NEPA teams without grants (8)	Increase the amounts of interpretive sites, signage, and publicity for the area (2)
Solve the fire funding issue (8)	Watershed scale analysis, determining limiting factors for the health of the watershed (0)	Implement a large project, work in old growth (1)		
Working to maintain and enhance the local infrastructure (e.g. biomass) (4)	Being involved in the new forest plan for Lassen National Forest (1)	FS staffing sufficient to accomplish goals and NEPA must be priority (3)		
Add human capacity ie heavy equipment operators, truck drivers, and logging operations. (3)	Triple number of acres planned and permitted (3)	Initaite new NEPA/CEQA projects and develop team to do independetly of current agency staff (4)		
maintain momentum of the group beyond the life of the CFLRP (0)	increase capacity and expertise of partners (3)	Prioritize recreation project that meets group's desired conditions and improve socioeconomics (2)		
Large Scale Successes (0)	NEPA efficiency/Plantation NEPA (1)	Develop skilled industry wokers and businesses in forest industry (2)		
	Routine inter-agency and private combined projects (4)	cross boundary projects (5)		
	expanding/improving recreation facilities and opportunities (3)	integrate user experiences as well as ecological targets (0)		
		Biomass Infrastructure (2)		

J. Kusel led a discussion about the group's concerns with the pace of projects. Participants agreed that sometimes it's about being okay with a partner to carrying out their respective project even if it's not the way they would have approached it themselves. Other times partners must pick up the slack to move projects forward. J. Book stated that the new model emphasizes the entire region working

together and that while priorities might change, having partners with higher capacity helps increase both pace and momentum. She emphasized that the public should be driving NEPA; if the public doesn't have issues with a project then agencies must reflect on why they keep going back to it to make reports and projects perfect. T. Sloat mentioned the high amount of staffing required to write and review all the reports and that they are often at or near capacity. J. Kusel asked if there were alternatives to address these bottlenecks. Group members agreed on the importance of building a relationship with someone over time. M. Coppoletta mentioned that it also depends on the level of the report writer. Incrementally there is obvious change toward more agency-partnership work and developing these working relationships through reciprocity and trust building. With regards to liability and getting through the writing, the group discussed the necessary qualifications and standards to cross-walk these qualifications between agencies and partners. Part of the complexity of transboundary work is there is often need to trust the credentials without necessarily knowing the individual. The group agreed that it's necessary to clarify the process of credentials from the region. J. Book mentioned that ultimately accountability will fall on the Forest Supervisor. The group will invite the new Forest Supervisor to meetings, introduce her to the work, and provide her a sense for how the group functions. J. Mateljak shared his experience of learning from small projects and the various obstacles and failures. He learns from these and moves forward; he's not shying away from potential. J. Kusel added that mistakes are only mistakes if you don't acknowledge and learn from them. T. Sloat emphasized the aspects that he likes about GNA and MSA, regardless of the pace, is that both entities are motivated to see the partnership work.