

# Plumas County Fire Safe Council



## COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION INITIATIVE

[www.plumascollaborative.org](http://www.plumascollaborative.org)

[www.plumasfiresafe.org](http://www.plumasfiresafe.org)

## MEETING MINUTES

March 4<sup>th</sup>, 2015

Chester, Memorial Hall

### *List of acronyms*

<b>CFLR</b> – Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration	<b>FSC</b> – Fire Safe Council
<b>QLG</b> – Quincy Library Group	<b>HFR</b> – Hazardous Fuels Reduction
<b>SPI</b> – Sierra Pacific Industries	<b>SOPA</b> – Schedule of Proposed Actions
<b>NRCS</b> – National Resource Conservation Service	<b>SRA</b> – State Responsibility Area
	<b>RAC</b> – Resource Advisory Committee

### *Commentary during Nils' presentation:*

Cris Bailey (**Cris**) - Questions about juniper encroachment management – are old junipers part of eradication?

Kathleen Nelson Lassen RD (**Kathleen**) – Explained that the junipers are encroaching on sage grouse habitat due to human intervention in the fire regime.

Dale Knutsen (**Dale**) - What Kind of road blocks have these efforts encountered?

Mike De Lasaux (**Mike D.**) – One collaborative just had a contingency of no commercial cutting on FS lands, another forest restoration group bargained on a 20” diameter limit.

**Kathleen** – The way that funds are allocated is not clear, with matching funds that had to come out of other fs funds, initially it was unknown to the Lassen collaborative how the matching funds worked. Significant commitment from the forest for the effort.

Nils Lunder (**Nils**) – There will be a learning curve amongst the group. May need outside help to interpret rules and NEPA, but effective communication, and aligned interests can lead to successful healthy outcomes.

**Dale** – The best initial move is agreeing that we need to do something, then recognizing a need to reduce fuels.

**Nils** – Let's hold off on contentious issues until our group is solid and trusting. We dodged a bullet last year in our fire season, and we need to act.

**Kathleen** – Burney Gardens Collaborative had some fire in a CFLR area and now they have to stop and look at the area, but at least they have that group.

**Nils** – There are other funds available besides those through CFLRA.

**Dale** - Is there a philosophical issue with selling timber?

**Mike D.** – There are groups out there that do have that problem, but we will work through those issues.

---

**“To reduce the loss of natural and human made resources caused by wildfire through Firewise Community programs and pre-fire activities.”**

*P. O. Box 1225, Quincy, CA 95971*

*(530) 283-0829*

[www.plumasfiresafe.org](http://www.plumasfiresafe.org)

---

**Arnold Selk** - What is the source of this group's (CFLRA) financial backing? I would hate to sell our timber through some effort that is funded by some other country or unknown entity.

**Mike D.** – I doubt that is an issue, these are our public forests and we created systems to enable this dialog, judicial system is here to facilitate if needed. This is what a democracy is.

**Dale** – What if we give the timber away?

**Mike D.** – This is a discussion in other states.

**Mike Donald** Just because there are people who disagree with hazardous fuels reduction doesn't mean they are successful.

**Mike D.** – The only area of focus is the WUI in our proposal. When we figure this out we don't necessarily have to be limited to that region.

Patrick Doyle – Recommended adding the official CFLR Act to the Plumas CFLR website.

**Kathleen** – part of the Hat Creek CFLR challenges – interested in how this comes together and focuses, on the Lassen NF, Firewise communities about private industrial lands as often as FS lands. The Lassen NF staff is at capacity with the Hat Creek CFLR and Storey Fire restoration. Concerned about the ability to commit to a full CFLR but happy to work together and collaborate. Would like to see where the Storey program of work will overlap with our efforts.

**Mike Donald** – A large part of Mt Hough project work is the Moonlight fire restoration. It is important that people are interested, this is everyone's land, and the FS just has the privilege to manage it. Happy people are here and interested and curious to see what people want. Grassroots effort means people are already on board up front, which helps guide FS projects.

**Ryan Tompkins** – Watching Burney Gardens and some of the challenges, not sure if there will be a RFP (Request for Proposals) for future CFLR plans, but we have already done a lot of work with DFPZ through QLG. We are fortunate to have industry and infrastructure, other areas like in the Rockies have lost their mills and are limited in treatments. Less environmentally and economically beneficial.

Collaboration at any scale benefits how FS can manage the NF lands. We see dichotomous opposition in the media, so this effort gives a voice and opportunity to make change. FS as a fed agency can't apply for some funds that could be used on fed lands like the Cal Fire cap and trade money. I come from a forest health perspective, vegetation and fuels programs work well hand in hand, providing multi beneficial facets of forest management

Ryan Bauer (**Ryan B.**) – Grew up fighting fire, and studied ecology, decided to be a part of the solution instead of the suppression effort. Prescribed burning of private lands in collaboration of NF lands, Stevens Funds to treat private lands adjoining FS lands, there are a variety of treatments helping private lands and FS lands. The alarming part is that we thought we would be successful in fire management with treating 20% of land and it's actually 60%, this effort may be our best hope.

Barbara Macarthur (**Barbara**) - What can we do to make it attractive for lands to be treated for fuels reduction, to encourage others? Any education opportunities that we can connect with homeowners?

**Ryan B.** - We can't tell people what to do, but education is the main tool for private landowners. The Fire Safe Council and Cal fire programs are the best opportunity available. Suggested touring Feather River Land Trust and their efforts, fieldtrips.

**Barbara** - We could see demonstration areas and bring information back to our community.

**Mike D.** – Sparking dialog and get people engaged is tough, be patient.

**Nils** – We have great demonstrations of successful community efforts, Gold Mountain success story being published soon.

Patrick Doyle (**Patrick**) – There are opportunities available with being a Firewise community, grants and such to treat lands.

**Ryan B.** – If you can get one or two people to do a treatment, generally neighbors will come on board to do treatments once they see it looks good.

---

**“To reduce the loss of natural and human made resources caused by wildfire through Firewise Community programs and pre-fire activities.”**

*P. O. Box 1225, Quincy, CA 95971*

*(530) 283-0829*

[www.plumasfiresafe.org](http://www.plumasfiresafe.org)

---

**Mike D.** – Butterfly Valley is a great example. Submitted the CFLR proposal in 2011, hasn't been a RFP since. CFLR is not the only opportunity. QLG didn't have any funding but they took initiative and went to congress and brought money in. Issues with the Burney - Hat Creek Collaborative were seen with QLG but they persevered. Not enough money to do it all, but that is not an acceptable excuse. Forests are out of balance and we need to act. Next meeting location to be determined.

**Dale** – Echo comments that a decade ago, Fire Safe Council was a regional effort because Cal Fire covered the Chester area but disconnected from the rest of the County. The local Chester and Almanor Firewise Communities intentionally avoided grants because of the responsibility involved. Managed to treat 2,000 acres because there was a group involved and communicating. Can do a lot with a small group dedicated to change. Lack of funding is not a hindrance, we can do business in a community involvement fashion. Shaded fuel breaks throughout the area were all created without grants. Now efforts are being focused on reentering and maintaining because of the time frame of the fire cycle. As you look at projects, look long term and realize a reentry and management phase is needed. We can solve our problems and our grandchildren's problem.

**Mike Meuser** – Where is the CDF participation? Where is their help since we are being taxed?

**Mike D.** - Different issue, FSC has proposed grant money thru SRA, the issue inside the community is the SRA, but we need to look at our big picture. Think Cal Fire sees this as a FS and FSC program and not involved yet. FS participation is great, some fire chiefs are volunteer, some are paid

**Patrick** – you would think they would be here to field private land CEQA questions.

**Brian West (Brian)** – Is there a Sunset provision?

**Mike D.** - Dec 31<sup>st</sup> is when the grant ends and we hope to have a proposal. No known sunset provision. Hope to see this group continue regardless of grant funding, QLG had none.

**Brian** - Not going to scratch the surface on the need, what is the long term picture, what happens if we do get funding and limelight? We may see less funding since we have had so much in the past.

**Mike D.** - Table question till we are further along.

**Kathleen** – funds available from 2009 to 2019 for CFLR projects, \$40 mil per year nationally.

**Barbara** – What defines participating private lands? What type? Can we influence our neighbors to act? Walker Ranch example.

**Mike D.** - Plumes Eureka example and Butterfly Valley example of industrial and non-industrial private lands collaborating. Can only educate and lead by example. Nuisance ordinance out there but not used yet and we don't necessarily want to tell people what to do.

**Nils** – if we could find ways to engage people, they could make money and have HFR. We have the advantage of a nearby mill. Firewise communities are the logical starting point. Grants come and go and we need landowners on board ready to act to get funding. Need projects in the queue since funding is inconsistent and fleeting. CFLR is similar, we need a proposal ready when funding comes. Need to be nimble, have a cohesive group developing projects.

**Kathleen** – Foresee new funding opportunities since forest management is being discussed in congress.

**Ricky Prows** – there are organizations within our community working close to this effort, the Plumas CFLR website will help connect them to our effort.

**Mike D.** - April 22<sup>nd</sup> next meeting, location TBA

8:00 **Meeting ended**

**Next Meeting:**

Collaborative Group Meeting April 22<sup>nd</sup>  
6 PM, place to be decided.

---

**“To reduce the loss of natural and human made resources caused by wildfire through Firewise Community programs and pre-fire activities.”**

*P. O. Box 1225, Quincy, CA 95971*

*(530) 283-0829*

[www.plumasfiresafe.org](http://www.plumasfiresafe.org)



---

In collaboration with the Plumas National Forest and the  
University of California Cooperative Extension, with support of  
Secure Rural Schools Title II funds



---

**“To reduce the loss of natural and human made resources caused by wildfire through Firewise  
Community programs and pre-fire activities.”**

*P. O. Box 1225, Quincy, CA 95971*

*(530) 283-0829*

[www.plumasfiresafe.org](http://www.plumasfiresafe.org)