

CFLR Meeting Notes July 23, 2015

Welcome and Introduction

Mike D—Intro, background on Title II funding source

John Sheehan—Retired

Bob and Barbara MacArthur—Lake Almanor Country Club Firewise

Brian West—Collins Pines Co.

Ryan Tompkins—USFS

Leah Wills—IRWM, Plumas County

Darra Hopper—Citizen

Lynn Campbell—SNC

Kathleen Nelson—USFS DR Almanor RD

Final decision on group name, vision and mission

Rachael Norton—Background on process, presentation of final group name—**Feather River Stewardship Coalition**

Vision—“To restore and maintain forest ecosystems, landscape processes and community vitality in the upper Feather River Watershed.”

Mission—The FRS is a diverse community of willing stakeholders working to improve the ecosystem health of private and public lands within the Feather River Watershed. We work to identify solutions that facilitate productive **(harmony/balance)** among community, economy and environment.

Final word will be selected by voting on the website (2 week deadline)

Sheehan—prefers harmony due to the language of the original NEPA framework.

West—prefers balance due to the reality that harmony is elusive.

MacArthur—prefers balance because it is more realistic when discussing the integration of diverse groups as we work to collaborate on these issues.

Charter—Based on the Charter of the Burney/Hat Creek Collaborative group. Rachael is hoping to engage with members of the collaborative to help to develop elements of our Charter ASAP.

Draft Charter is posted online:

Elements—

- Background and development
- Vision and mission
- Goals and objectives based on the mission and vision
- Guidance documentation
- Joint Fact Finding
- Membership

Sheehan—willing to help with the Charter, recommends that we look at existing info in the region, recommends integrating Leah Wills, utilize IRWM outcomes.

Recommended local documents to utilize in Charter development:

EIS from the QLG (1998) may be helpful

QLG annual reports submitted to Congress by USFS

Subsequent USFS documents based on that EIS

Pinchot Group analysis of the QLG

Pinchot Group review of the CFLRA

Plumas County Wildfire Protection Plan

County Hazardous Fuels Assessment (2005)—Approved by the USFS, provides goals and objectives for each of the 60 + communities in the County.

Next steps—Group will work to clarify the charter and to integrate as many of the existing locally available elements into our charter. Wills, Sheehan and others will work to do this.

Tompkins—Feels that each charter is influenced by individuals that are writing the charter, urges the group to review and integrate the elements of example charters that resonate with the group

Mike D—What is our timing with this process? How can we best position ourselves to be legitimate group? Opportunities are and will continue to present themselves.

Sheehan—IRWM is underway and the process is working to identify a stable of projects that could and should happen if funding becomes available. The collaborative is hoping to secure funds to assist in planning and implementation of non-economically viable projects on USFS lands.

Wills—Discussed how our effort and the IRWM process are working in parallel to seek solutions to our ecosystem issues.

Nelson—Lassen is certainly on board, just not if the CFLR is what is desired. Collaboratives are great, but they do not have the capacity to meet matching requirements that the CFLR calls for.

Tompkins—Is pleased that there is the IRWM and the FRSC are occurring in parallel. He sees the strengths of a free form collaborative that is nimble and able to take advantage of diverse funding sources. Recommends that we remain broad based, that is not initiative dependent. He feels that the future will require collaborative groups (ex. Forest plan revision, Insect Categorical Exclusion (related to 2014 Farm Bill includes forest health benefits—3000 acres or less). Having both a RAC and an active local broad based collaborative is a huge benefit to local national forests.

Sheehan—Discussion on the Plumas County Coordinating Council, a group that exists to discuss projects on USFS lands. Elected officials are briefed by the group to keep in the loop regarding the current activities on those lands. He sees the collaborative as an important active group that goes beyond talking and moves projects into action.

Nelson—Parallel efforts commonly saturate the volunteer base. How can we reduce the duplication of efforts locally?

Sheehan—That depends on the future of our collaborative effort. Do we incorporate or do we keep things more simple. Example FR CRM(Feather River Coordinated Resource Management), vs QLG (Quincy Library Group). Lots of overlap, QLG focus was trees and forest and economy; whereas CRM was an interagency group focused on meadows, streams and rivers. He feels that it would be best to integrate all focus into one collaborative.

Example: Creeks project, meeting was set to resolve issues of the project. PCT association (Pacific Crest Trail) rep was concerned about the visual impacts of a thinning project on the PCT. That illustrated how important it is to get trails folks in discussions to better understand linkage.

Mike D—Example Lake Basin public meeting—USFS is largely focused on forest health, public was dominated by recreation focused, he felt that this illustrated the need for public education to teach the public regarding how one element influences the other. There is an opportunity to provide linkages between diverse parties.

Wills—Emergence of the tribal voice has changed the equation, they are owning land, developing management plans, and we need to engage with them as we move forward. Maidu Summit Consortium has proposed a protocol proposal, to integrate a long term methodology to integrate Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK) into landscape scale management.

Campbell—SNC has supported numerous projects that have included TEK. From now on, new projects will provide opportunities for local tribes to comment on proposed projects. Tribes look at forest thinning is a different way than other folks.

Sheehan—Example: Wolf Creek Stewardship vs. Neighboring lands managed by Collins—Field trip opportunity?

Discussion of parties not present at our meetings:

Rachel—Has been in touch with Ricky Prows of the **Maidu Summit Consortium**

Nils—Recommends contacting Kenneth Holbrook, Lorena Gorbet, Trina Cunningham, Harvey Marino

Tompkins—Mike Savala has been attending for the **Greenville Indian Rancheria**, Danny Manning. Ryan is hoping to work with Wade McMaster (Tribal Liaison for the USFS) to better engage with tribal interests.

Wills—Recommends that folks attend the upcoming Project Integration meeting on August 21 at 0900 in Quincy at the Fair Grounds.

Wills—Marion Meadow project on Collins Pine ground, Lodge Pole removal to open up encroached meadows. Great tool for illustrating impact of our projects.

Mike D—Other interests?

Tompkins—IRWM meetings are getting representation for **Soper, Collins, SPI, and Beatty**. How do we get them to the table at these meetings?

Mike D—Maybe we develop a one page briefing to send to folks that have not been at the table to date.

Sierra Access Coalition, Sierra Buttes Trail Stewardship, Rec and Tech, FRLT, Sportsmen (mule deer, wild turkey, rocky mountain elk, trout unlimited)

Projects discussion

PC FSC

Nils—FSC Highway 70 HFR, American Valley HFR, Indian Valley HFR, LACC CWPP, Greenhorn CWPP, Greenhorn, Dixie Valley

Sheehan—Canyon Dam RAC, what is the status?

Tompkins—That was a timber sale (Stoy was the operator, SPI bought the logs). Hand thin and pile burn near the camp at Canyon Dam (Service work). Contract was finishing up during Chips Fire, back burns were conducted to combat the fire. Project has been analyzed for under-burning; but has not happened yet.

Sheehan—Canyon Dam was identified as an important area for treatment, each community has an outline in that plan. Prioritization should be revisited and attempts should be made to pursue projects to keep these moving forward.

Tompkins—Rush Hill motorway project was used to combat Chips fire as well. These projects are examples of successful HFR and should be showcased.

USFS

Tompkins—Keddie Ridge project, lots of truck traffic, variable thinning projects, biomass to HLP (Honey Lake Power).

Refuge Stewardship Contract—Empire project above Taylorsville

Bucks Lake Stewardship Contract

Hayden Project—Near Delleker

Lakes Basin/Plumas Eureka—BRD, complex project (in recreation area, lots of public scrutiny)

Forest Plan Revision—Exciting and cumbersome

Draft Interim Guidelines for alternative for the planning teams (result of the 2004 Sierra Nevada Framework)

Spotted Owl Assessment Strategy

Restoration within the Storrie Fire, and Moonlight fire, many planting projects

Nelson—Tree planting success from 2014 planting was pretty good

Efforts on the ARD are focused on the Storrie Fire, restoration projects in fire footprint and on adjacent lands as well:

Grizzly project: aspen, meadows, HFR, thinning in riparian areas (south side of Humbug summit)

Snow Mountain project, prescribed fire in June

NEPA analysis for planned burning on the Fox Farm Project

SNC Funding

Campbell—SNC represents the region from Modoc to Kern, 25 million acres, 23 counties, staff throughout the region, we are in the north sierra region (Butte, Tehama, Plumas and Sierra Counties)

Funding is really associated with water and corresponding ecosystem projects

Distribute state bond funds, newest bond is Prop 1, they have \$25 million available in the next few years, all focused on forest health

Watershed Improvement Program (WIP)

Large scale ecological restoration projects

WCB/CDFW are funding partners for this project

What types of projects can we come up with?

Private lands can be included if there is a nexus with adjoining public lands

Category 1-\$500k cap, for projects with CEQA/NEPA complete

Category 2-\$75K cap, to do planning to accomplish CEQA/NEPA

Will have funding for 6 years, can apply for planning and then implementation too, will also help to identify other funding sources to complete the scale needed

Water quality, watershed health, resilient forests, USFS cannot apply

Diamond Mountain Initiative--LCFSC will apply for planning funds to do CEQA/NEPA and will then apply for implementation (2 projects, 2 proposals)

Mike D-PC FSC is a 501c3, do not necessarily need to have Plumas Corporation as fiscal sponsor

Wills-California Water Commission meets on August 20, hearing on forest water relationship, policy groups are beginning to realize that the forests are the only water source to improve

Mike D-Programmatic Timber Environmental Impact Review (PTEIR) is an option for large project areas, perhaps this could be an option for our County (what is the lifespan?)

Do we have any NEPA ready projects in the region to propose?

Round Valley-Keddie,

Hayden Project (service work)

Bucks Lake (service work)

Canyon Dam (prescribed fire)

Planning—Lakes Basin, Middle Fork Feather River, Plumas Eureka?

Second round in in March 2016