

CFLR PORTOLA MEETING NOTES

MAY 20, 2015, PORTOLA CITY HALL

Phil Kaznowski-Local resident, TRAC member

Cindy Nobel-Trout Unlimited, Local Resident

Mike De Lasaux-Overview of meeting. Background on this effort. Process is derived from the CFLR program. Project is to be in a position to submit a proposal for future CFLR funds. There is nothing that says that we need to be tied to those funds. Citizens working to collaborate with USFS.

John Sheehan-Recommends that projects in the Portola area should be showcased in future meetings. May help us to identify the new direction for our effort.

Nancy Francine-Introduced Joint Chiefs opportunity as a new potential funding source to develop new projects (service work in fuels could be done—NEPA planning has been accomplished and projects are ready to be implemented).

Rachael Norton- Common aspects from community meetings

- Biomass removal
- Portola Biomass plant
- Project maintenance
- Limiting litigation on future projects

Name ideas

- Plumas Forest Stewardship Group
- Plumas Restoration Group
- FR Watershed/Forest Stewardship Coalition—Group has not determined final name, but does desire Feather River

Vision

Mission Statement-Desire for proactive approach to forest management, diversity of stakeholders, community basis (place and interest based)

Steve-Reduce wildfire risk in our forest, restore ecosystem health in the Feather River

- Diverse group of willing stakeholders (community)
- Working to reduce wildfire damage, and to improve the ecosystem health in the Feather River
- Public-private lands (all lands) on a voluntary basis

- Develop a productive harmony among community, economy and environment

Presentation of completed, planned projects in Priority Watershed areas

Tomkins-A presentation of resources available to learn about USFS projects

Tools on website-

Region 5-Ecosystem restoration intent

Agency wide priorities:

Priority watersheds: watershed condition assessment—looked at all in the PNF, rated on risk and values. PNF identified 3 priority watersheds, added 5 more (3 in middle fork drainage), lower wolf creek, Spanish tollgate. These watersheds require actions that will improve the condition of its ecosystems:

Grizzly Creek-Area near Lake Davis Freeman, turner, Bahia, Ingles, Hopper were QLG projects that were developed to address some of the resource concerns. Also did range assessments and worked to identify opportunities improve aquatic health, also aspen enhancement. Chip sealed road to reduce sediment into the meadows.

Fire Settlement and Restoration: Pendola, Chips, Storrie, Rich, and Moonlight

Green Program—Veg management program

Salvage Program—Responding to events beyond our control

Restoration-2 tactics: maintain what is functioning or restore the damaged areas.

Collaboration is essential to take on restoration

Watershed Condition Assessment Tool—on web

Francine-Priority watershed map is interactive, has the ability to provide user with data on the watershed.

Plumas National Forest website-Land and Resources Management-Planning, Projects, Resource Management

Schedule of proposed actions report

Timber sale report

Plumas Program of work—Does not include other resources, timber

Sheehan-We should work to identify all shelf stock USFS projects and put them into one place so that our group can seek outside funds to implement those projects.

Steve Munson—Our group should work to help illustrate the good things that have already happened in the region.

Sheehan—We should incorporate trails and recreation development in the process and perhaps in the past the QLG did not engage with diverse parties including cattlemen, fish and tribes. Our group must keep the wide view when thinking about ecosystem health.

Ryan Tomkins—The USFS has worked toward better incorporating all parties.

Mike D—USFS will not propose these projects, must work with other groups to rally to collaborate on joint projects. Sierra Nevada Conservancy will be distributing their Prop 1 funds. Those funds will be available and RFP (requests for proposals) are due in late September

Sheehan – We should join the IRWM Uplands group, request for projects in late June. Beneficial for us to be a signatory since no other multi-jurisdictional forestry group is involved (PC FSC).

Munson - wants to quantify what pace and scale means and to use QLG data to illustrate volume of materials exist in the PNF.

Bill Powers—Steve has a specific radius in mind, Portola has its own radius. All parties must be able to operate within their own spheres in a way that ties the efforts together.

Sheehan—Portola has a huge need to do brushing on Beckwourth Peak from the power line fire. As a result, they have not benefited as much from PC FSC efforts.

Potential Field Trip:

Bumpus: Would be willing to bring a group to an area such as Lakes Basin where planning is occurring, that could be a good fit for a field trip. Hayden is marked and has a signed decision in place. Big hill has the Gallagher (Nickrem) implemented, Lake Davis is also implemented.

Sheehan: Maybe to Lake Davis

Munson—If contracts are developed between Far West Biopower and the USFS, can they get the carbon credits associated with that work? Can someone look further into that? He also wants to have cumulative numbers regarding previous treatments that were proposed that have not been implemented. His perspective is that many proposed projects that were previously opposed by conservation groups may now not be opposed by those.

Deb Bumpus—Credits can be obtained through Stewardship Contracting.

Sheehan – Credits through the Pacific Forest Trust.

Francine—Projects were not completely dropped, were just delayed until resolution was reached by both parties. Are there any areas that are not proposed that should be? Engage the group to identify priority projects.

Bumpus – Plantations are a great place to start for areas that need thinned that won't produce saw logs.