



Sierra to California All-Lands Enhancement (SCALE) Fall 2017 Meeting

*Rural County Representatives of California Conference Room, Sacramento, CA
November 2-3, 2017*

Summary:

On November 2nd and 3rd, 2017, the Sierra to California All-Lands Enhancement (SCALE) workshop was held in Sacramento, CA. The first day of the meeting included sessions on the forest plan revision process, science to inform forest restoration, new projects funded by the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds, Tribal engagement and workforce development. During the morning on the second day, three breakout sessions focused on barriers to landscape restoration, including NEPA challenges, community capacity and securing consistent wood supply. The afternoon featured updates from the state legislature, the USFS Region 5, and CAL FIRE. Throughout both days the group heard updates from eleven of the collaboratives in attendance.

Meeting Attendees:

John Amodio	Les Hall	John Owen
Joe Asagon	Will Harling	Sherry Reckler
Juliana Birkhoff	Sherry Hazelhurt	Matthew Reischman
Lauren Burton	Hannah Hepner	Carinna Roberston
Ray Cablayan	Rick Hopson	Kyle Rodgers
Reuben Childress	Amy Horne	Hugh Safford
Bill Craven	Bobette Jones	Joe Sherlock
Amanda Cundiff	Julia Kim	Todd Sloat
Helge Eng	Bob Kingman	Ben Solvensky
Brian Faeth	Zach Knight	Pierce Tucker
Chris Friedel	Jason Ko	Emily Wasley
Merv George	Jonathan Kusel	Leana Weissberg
Nick Goulette	Izzy Martin	Grant Werschull
David Griffith	Patricia McCleary	Steve Wilensky
Barnie Gyant	Jill Micheau	Kendal Young
Meredith Hackleman	Taylor Miller	

Contents

Day 1 (November 2, 2017)	4
Session 1: Collaborative Updates	4
Todd Sloat (Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest & Watershed Group).....	4
David Griffith (Alpine Biomass Committee).....	4
Grant Werschkull (Smith River Collaborative)	4
Juliana Birkhoff (Dinkey-Creek Landscape Restoration Partnership).....	5
Patrick Koepele & John Amodio (Yosemite-Stanislaus Solutions).....	5
Session 2: Forest Plan Revision Process (Danna Stroud, SNC).....	6
Session 3: Using Science to Inform Forest Restoration (Hugh Safford, UC Davis)	7
Session 4: Landscape Scale Restoration Project Updates	8
Trinity Community Protection and Landscape Resilience Project (Nick Goulette, The Watershed Center)	8
Tahoe-Central Sierra Initiative (Bob Kingman, Sierra Nevada Conservancy)	8
Session 5: Collaborative Updates (Part II)	9
Paul Faeth (Cadmus Group).....	9
John Owen (South Lassen Watershed Group).....	9
Hannah Hepner (Feather River Stewardship Coalition)	9
Will Harling (Western Klamath Restoration Partnership)	10
Session 6: Incorporating Tribes and Traditional Knowledge in Forest Restoration Projects (Merv George, Forest Supervisor, Six Rivers NF)	10
Session 7: The Next Generation: Workforce Development	12
Merv George and Will Harling (WGRP)	12
Steve Wilensky (CHIPS)	12
Jonathan Kusel (P-CREW).....	13
Day One Reflection (Izzy Martin, Sierra Fund).....	13

Day 2 (November 3, 2017)	13
Session 8: Collaborative Updates	13
Ben Solvesky & Kendal Young (South Fork of the American River (SOFAR) Cohesive Strategy)	13
Amy Horne (Sagehen Forest Project)	14
Rick Hopson (Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG))	14
Session 9: Collaborative Impact (Lauren Burton, Sierra Institute)	15
Session 10: Identifying Solutions to Landscape-scale Restoration Barriers	15
NEPA Challenges Group	15
Community Capacity Breakout Session	16
Consistent Wood Supply Breakout Session	18
Session 11: Expanding on Recent Policy Innovations to Overcome Barriers: What’s Next? ...	21
Bill Craven (Chief Consultant, CA Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water)	21
Session 12: Drawing it Together	23
Barnie Gyant (Deputy Regional Forester for USFS Region 5)	23
Helge Eng (Deputy Director of Resource Management at CALFIRE)	24
Meeting Wrap up (Jonathan Kusel, Sierra Institute)	25

Day 1 (November 2, 2017)

Session 1: Collaborative Updates

Todd Sloat (Burney-Hat Creek Community Forest & Watershed Group)

- BHC was started in 2009 with assessment and strategy development through State IRWM process, then evolved into an ad hoc group with strong private partnerships and high level of involvement from Lassen NP

Challenges/Solutions:

- Agency turnover and high percentage of unstaffed positions on the RD: this has pushed the group to try different “team” approaches: RD has low capacity for meadow restoration which can be filled in with other parties (local experts, NGOs, State entities)
- The team approach is less common for forest restoration, BHC is now exploring (possibly making use of GNA)
- There are lots of bottlenecks; infrastructure and wood processing is a big one. BHC is advancing three small-scale bioenergy facilities in the region, one is in the BioMAT queue

David Griffith (Alpine Biomass Committee)

- ABC is a small, informal collaborative started 1.5 years ago with a capacity building grant from NFF, thanks in part to their fiscal agent CHIPS
- Hold monthly meetings with guest speakers
- Will likely be switching over to a 501(c)(3) to make the group more attractive to funders

Challenges/Solutions:

- ABC is not within R5, which has impacted their partnership with USFS - SCALE could work to increase involvement from R4
- NFF grant had a positive balance and the money was returned to R5 unexpectedly

Goals:

- Unifying partners for forest and watershed health and a strong local economy
- Obtaining financing for a comprehensive scoping study to understand what ABC can do to achieve aforementioned goals. Ideally, this will include some biomass utilization facility. Northern California Community Loan Fund and U.S. EPA are potential funders.

Grant Werschull (Smith River Collaborative)

- SRC was developed with an NFF grant in 2015. Smith River Alliance has been existence since ~1980 and has been very active in the basin, leading a campaign to establish a USFS NRA and subsequent restoration work (\$7-\$8 mn. raised)
- There is great need for a collaborative, both in terms of restoration work and local economy. Outcome driven collaborative; few meetings
- Four Tribal groups, American Forest Resources Council, and Fire Safe Council were all signators for a mutual interest document

Keys to Success:

- Internal mediation and facilitation experience from prior work experience was crucial in starting the collaborative quickly

Projects:

- Working on securing funding for a backlog of NEPA-ready USFS projects

- Pilot project is a 1,000-acre project including some TSI work, commercial harvest, restoration, and fuels reduction producing 3-3.5 MMBF in the next 3-5 years
- Completing and updating fuels reduction around the town of Gaskey (WUI) to follow up on previously completed fuels work and shaded fuel break
- Record of decision last year on a travel management project: inventorying FS roads, including informal, and determine which should be kept and which should be restored
- Riparian restoration project >1,000 acres, Little Jones Creek near pilot project: addressing root disease and conifer cover depletion in streamside areas

Juliana Birkhoff (Dinkey-Creek Landscape Restoration Partnership)

- Assessment for the Dinkey was in 2009, funded in 2010
- Good participation from Tribal entities, landowners, FS
- Set annual goals within the collaborative, FS reports back on how those goals could be funded. Projects are then divided up between five working groups, including agency staff and collaborative members

Challenges:

- Project footprint is ground zero for tree mortality (70 – 85%) with limited milling and biomass infrastructure
- High FS turnover, as well as turnover within the environmental NGOs
- Competing for prescribed fire staff and team

Focus:

- Strong emphasis on the use of science in restoration, though limited by mortality
- Increasing the use of prescribed fire: have been working closely with air quality district to move projects along. Also working with R5 to make changes to the way prescribed fire crews are funded.
- Transitioned to a reforestation framework with significant participation from RD, R5, SFL, private landowners, industry, etc.: how to achieve this goal without having plantations or over use herbicide?
- New meadow restoration working group starting now
- Seeking other funding to implement NEPA-ready projects before collaborative funding runs out

Patrick Koepele & John Amodio (Yosemite-Stanislaus Solutions)

- YSS Formed in 2010 when CFLRP was active, hoped to be part of that effort. They were beginning to falter when the Rim Fire happened in 2013, galvanizing the group.
- 24 members: industry, loggers, biomass, environmental groups, Sierra Club, Audubon, Federal & State

Projects/Successes:

- Forged consensus for salvage logging, Stanislaus NF, implementing a “common ground” plan that they put forward.
- Reforestation plan for the Rim Fire area should be implemented over the next few years (\$4.5 million in funding focused on meadows, springs, habitat, aspen restoration, etc.)
- Grants from NFF to form a volunteer tree planting program – community involvement in reforestation efforts

- HUD awarded Tuolumne County and State \$80 million grant to address Rim Fire effects (first time HUD dealing with wildfires)
- Administered by the County and SNC, funding for thinning in areas that didn't burn, establishing a wood products campus, disaster resiliency center in the County
- Focusing a lot of attention on unburned areas of the Stanislaus NF: preventative thinning
- NRV and GTR-220 as framework for approaching the problem, developing prescriptions (emphasis on thinning and prescribed fire)
- Engaged in signing Master Stewardship Agreement with Stanislaus NF

Challenges/Solutions:

- Bring more capacity to the local forest where there is high turnover.
- California is so utterly dependent on these National Forests (water supply, greenhouse gas reduction goals). Rim Fire produced 3x more GHG emissions than was reduced in that year
- Important to engage State agencies (SNC and others) for real impacts, especially with new bond money available

Session 2: Forest Plan Revision Process (Danna Stroud, SNC); [Presentation](#)

Summary:

- Forest Management plans are out of date
- 2012: eight early adopter forests were the first to go through with the new planning rule. Planning rule (revised from 2010) had a significant emphasis on collaboration both with gateway communities and national interests.
- Citizens' Guide for Forest Plan Revision helps to prepare those going through the process.
- Framework is science-based (synthesis and analysis) but also focuses on triple-bottom line initiatives
- Engagement of the public and of local governments, including Tribal groups, is critical
- Inyo NF developed an outreach and communications plan which was not entirely realistic but helped to develop goals.
- Important ("primary") elements will likely be forest specific: for the Inyo NF, recreation was an important component that had to be developed and submitted, in part through the Eastern Sierra Recreation Collaborative (ESRC).
- ESRC held a series of public meetings, professionally facilitated, to include recreational interests (local and national).

Lessons Learned:

- 2008 Travel Management Plan helped to illustrate that community-based collaboratives are critical for success (because it was not litigated)
- Engage early with the FS to outline engagement

Discussion:

A. Horne: How did Inyo NF engage with national interests and how successful were these efforts?

D. Stroud: The ESRC gave them the space to dialogue, establish sideboards and ground rules, to which all participants agreed. Their participation didn't preclude them from providing their own feedback or having their own meetings in the Eastern Sierra. National interests are tracking the Forest Plan Revision process, it's a big deal – they just need the space to play.

J. Birkhoff: Has facilitated lots of Forest Plan Revision engagement processes and worked with the region to plan different kinds of engagement (local and regional). Focused in-person meetings and conference calls (reviewing plans once they came out) were effective forums to learn about and engage in the process. These meetings and calls were also organized by interest group, which was a productive exercise. The Region seemed to be responsive to the need to involve a wide array of stakeholders.

N. Goulette: What about the leadership/facilitation model and the funding associated with it? FS hired CCP for facilitation, what was SNC's involvement?

D. Stroud: R5 had agreement with CCP to provide facilitation for FS public meetings. As for ESRC, SNC was asked by the Eastern Sierra stakeholders to provide a level of support. SNC provided financial support only in the form of Danna's time. ESRC had a facilitator and a leadership team, including Dana and another neutral party. Together they developed meeting frameworks and established discussion topics. This team then consulted with the FS for revisions to increase meeting effectiveness. NFF also awarded Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access funding to cover some costs.

J. Kusel: New chief of the FS was the lead in putting Forest Service Planning Rule together, it is not going to diminish in importance.

D. Stroud: Deputy Chief Lesley Welden spoke last week and stressed that they need partners (collaboratives). Where the funding will come is still TBD but FS is looking more and more to their partners. A cultural shift toward collaboration is occurring within the agency. Where we find the resources to keep these collaboratives going is the big question. FS FACA is a national advisory body representing diverse interests. Their website is a good resource.

Session 3: Using Science to Inform Forest Restoration (Hugh Safford, UC Davis)

Hugh Safford presented highlights from a new document ([GTR 256](#): Natural range of variation for yellow pine and mixed conifer forests in the Sierra Nevada, southern Cascades and Modoc and Inyo National Forests) that synthesizes three years of research of function, structure and composition of forests. Dr. Safford discussed select findings presented in the large document, highlighted below (page numbers included for reference):

- Sierra forests are burning less often than they did pre-settlement. Systems in the Sierra Nevada should burn frequently; the problem is that today's wildfires are the wrong kind of fire (page 36).
- Based on measuring and counting which trees have grown since fire suppression, the density of trees in each stand has increased (page 97)
- Specifically, there is a higher density of small trees but a lower density of large trees, regardless of the logging activity in the area (page 102)
 - There is more biomass (by basal area) but it is predominantly small diameter (page 109)
- Historical estimates of canopy cover show that dense stands were rare on the landscape (page 137)
- Forest competition has changed: species that are increasing in frequency are those that do well in low light and are poorly suited for fire (page 171). Ponderosa and Jeffrey Pines are

adapted to fire (thick bark and self-pruning branches) and encouraged fire to kill their competitors.

Dr. Christina Restaino's [research](#) was on the topic of forest treatment efficacy in regard to beetle kill. On the El Dorado treated (low density) forests had low beetle-kill, but on the Sierra National Forest, there was no difference (it was too damaging an outbreak to mitigate.)

Some notes from Dr. Safford's [power point presentation](#):

- Under current fire severities, there would be almost no old-growth in the Sierra Nevada
- Due to climate change, the snowpack is changing: The Southern Sierra will receive more snow and the Northern Sierra will be a rain driven system in 2-3 decades.
- The bottom line is that wildland forests in the Sierra Nevada need more fire, not less
- People learn when things go wrong, and we have to try new things (use an experimental approach) and risk failure so that we can continue to learn
- Don't give up on restoration: focus on restoring processes, not replicating historical conditions, it is a losing battle to set goals we cannot reach (such as HRV)

Session 4: Landscape Scale Restoration Project Updates

Trinity Community Protection and Landscape Resilience Project (Nick Goulette, The Watershed Center); [Presentation](#)

The two-year program contributes \$1 million of CALFIRE funding to the Trinity Community Protection and Landscape Resilience project, which is the smallest forest health project grant (from a pot of \$22 million). In order to be a more competitive grant, they had to choose projects with the greatest carbon benefit, and prescribed fire was not a competitive project. The grant requires a balance between reforestation and fuels reduction projects to achieve the greatest overall carbon benefit. The project is being supplemented with lots of match and projects that are able to utilize prescribed fire. Some of the challenges ahead include:

- A changing dynamic as the Watershed Center takes a more administrative role
- Managing cash flow, especially considering slow reimbursement process from the state, and increasing partnerships to secure those upfront costs
- Reversal of match (with this program, federal funding will match state funding)
- Foresters will need to understand carbon
- Work can be done on private or public lands, but this grant requires 50 year easements on private land, the details of which were too unclear for landowners who were then unable to commit

Tahoe-Central Sierra Initiative (Bob Kingman, Sierra Nevada Conservancy); [Presentation](#)

The Tahoe-Central Sierra Initiative was started by several high capacity partners, including three forests (El Dorado, Tahoe and Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit) that already had a lot of NEPA ready projects. Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) acted as the applicant and is now the fiscal agent for the project. Similar to the Trinity project, the Tahoe-Central Sierra Initiative determined that projects involving prescribed fire would not be competitive, and is using a mix of treatments including pre-fire work on 3300 acres. They were able to get a 1:1 match. The area has high visitor use and the ability to capitalize on marketing and education, and they see an opportunity to show that investments in forest health will pay off. The grant was awarded for \$5 million, which must be implemented in a 2-year timeframe, and will include a monitoring

component so that they can be more competitive in the next round of funding (from a pool of \$200 million).

Session 5: Collaborative Updates (Part II)

Paul Faeth (Cadmus Group)

- Using models in situations where stakeholders are not in agreement to stimulate discussion
- User-friendly models that collaboratives could use, incorporating mapping, state and transition models, etc.

John Owen (South Lassen Watershed Group)

- 600,000-acre boundary
- SLWG developed out of conversations between Lake Almanor Watershed Group (LAWG) and Sierra Institute on expanding the scope of LAWG and engaging new stakeholders to address watershed and fire-related issues at a landscape scale
- 5-6 meetings over the last year, Sierra Institute has been volunteering to plan the meetings

Challenges:

- Securing funding for projects and coordination. There is unanimous agreement regarding the need for coordination and a unified face/voice for the group.

Projects:

- SI has partnered with LNP for an extensive fuels treatment and prescribed burn project in South LNP
- Preliminary map: questions have arisen regarding the boundary and interactions with other collaboratives working in the area
- Currently prioritizing projects, funding will follow

Hannah Hepner (Feather River Stewardship Coalition)

- Group established by RAC grant in 2013. Monthly public meetings began in 2015, first focused on charter, website, logo, etc.
- Have two SNC grants and NEPA ready projects from the QLG era
- Two additional applications for service work projects for fuels treatment
- Not yet at project initiation phase

Goals:

- Put on a summit with Plumas NF next year to strategize and plan for upcoming revision process

Challenges:

- Stakeholder self-identification
- Funding through June 2018, future is uncertain after that

Questions for Other Collaboratives:

- General advice regarding contracting on behalf of the FS
- Documenting FS contributions (matches)
- Systems for project monitoring, they have a lack of in-house funding

Will Harling (Western Klamath Restoration Partnership); [Presentation](#)

- The collaborative and its projects (e.g. TREX) are driven by a need for community protection but also to restore human-fire relationship broken in today's society
- Fire Wise program, connecting with Incident Command teams during wildfire events to change how they were being fought, educating the community about good fire
- Critical that we use fire as an initial treatment, we don't have time to treat everything by hand or machine

Community Involvement:

- Organizes one of the most robust community led prescribed burning programs in the State. The Klamath TREX received one of the first Cal Fire exemptions to burn during a burn ban, in part because they use the same Type III IMT structures Cal Fire uses for WUI
- Everyone needs to be involved in the burning – all agree to take the smaller risk of prescribed fire vs. waiting for the greater risk of catastrophic wildfire
- WKRP facilitates co-ownership of wildfire and community understanding by bringing schoolkids on the burn, children gathered acorns with Tribal elders
- Provide comparative smoke impacts (wildfire vs. prescribed fire) to communities

Projects:

- Burning around the town of Orleans, establishing good black working off of recent fire footprints and anchor points – MOUs with the FS
- TREX: burned 1,500 acres with 300+ participants and no escaped fires over the last 13 years
- 1.2 million-acre planning area, still working on the first of three pilot projects and are limited by the number of people
- Some Bar project is managing wildfire on a larger landscape

Lessons Learned/Successes:

- Building trust first has been critical
- Prescribed fire: had to treat private lands first to make FS treatment viable, collaborated on NEPA for private lands
- Organizing people around open standards process and shared values
- Share liability to get fire back on the landscape

Session 6: Incorporating Tribes and Traditional Knowledge in Forest Restoration Projects (Merv George, Forest Supervisor, Six Rivers NF)

- The Six Rivers NF manages all of the ancestral forestland for the Hoopa and Karuk Tribes, Merv aims to manage for seven generations into the future. The Hoopa have been harvesting timber in this region for almost 100 years, protecting watershed, sacred sites, CASPO, and providing jobs.
- Hardest part of collaborating is getting the FS to let go of their “expert” role and engaging with human issues. FS has to ask what can actually be implemented based on what the *community* wants.
- Recipe for a collaborative: bring all perspectives to the table, including radical ones, and take an average. Throw all of your resources and staff at what comes out of it.
- FS staff need to have the political acumen to understand who should be at the table. The Karuk Tribe is one of the region's heavyweights and needed to be co-lead on projects.

- Tribes have unique political power due to their ability to conduct government-to-government relations.
- Tribes bring a lot of perspective and history, we need to find ways to blend old school practices with new school policies and laws for real change on the landscape
- In some cases, the integrity of Tribal relationships has been compromised because groups have been denigrated as partners and not made to feel that they share project ownership

Discussion:

N. Goulette: Does the collaborative know how many BF need to be taken out to meet targets and achieve desired conditions?

M. George: There is one NEPA team for 1 million-acres with lots of competing interests. It is difficult to plan projects due to spotted owl habitat and sacred sites. 1,000-acre projects help get results faster. Politically viable projects are 50% fuels and 50% timber. Natural fire helps the FS get work done without NEPA – it's prudent to avoid sinking resources into large fuels projects in case they burn before that work gets done. In recent years, they have been putting out 10 MMBF. Lots of people who had those timber skills are gone and FS is contracting to cruise and mark timber.

N. Goulette: Collaboratives struggle when they don't understand the constraints of the agency.

M. George: That's the reason that the agency needs to be part of collaboration, not separate from it. Small acreages and CEs also help get work done and facilitate collaboration. Emphasized the need to include the human and socio-political element when talking about NRV, climate change, etc. These are human issues and planning documents that are based purely on science won't be well-received by the public. We need to ask ourselves what we can actually influence in the communities in which we work.

J. Amodio: What is it that we need to know or think about to better assist the FS in achieving shared goals which they are constrained to act upon? How can we bring the human dimension to it?

M. George: Most people think that folks from polarized politics won't be able to come together. Surprise them. In 2015, 100,000+ acres burned on the SRNF and disparate interests were concerned about what was going to happen with salvage. Merv was able to engage diverse stakeholders to establish sideboards and facilitate collaboration.

W. Harling: Back to the previous question and timber targets: on a recent project, the SRNF didn't outline the board footage necessary to move the project forward. The District approached the collaborative with a project within the collaborative's footprint – the collaborative agreed that they wanted to take the project on. They achieved sustainable community objectives, getting out sawlogs without degrading the environment. It's important that the agency sit down at the table, not just pull the strings of the collaborative.

S. Wilensky: Do you feel that you can use fire restoration efficiently without herbicides? Industry is often eager to use herbicides especially after fire or as part of fire restoration projects, while others are dedicated to chemicals not being used at all.

M. George: Better to follow up with fire before putting chemicals on the ground (routine interval fires). Don't let a project be the first time you meet your partners, personal history helps. Collaborative work is all about people and social skills are critical. The more insight collaborative partners have into the agency, the better.

Session 7: The Next Generation: Workforce Development

Merv George and Will Harling (WGRP); [Presentation](#)

The WGRP area has limited capacity and few resources. They have used the Wyden Authority to do work on private lands as part of the Somes Bar Project. Some additional comments about using the Wyden Amendment:

- It was important to crosswalk between NEPA and CEQA.
- The money was federal, but not from the forest. It was funding specifically for the purpose of working on private lands through the Stevens Act and other sources.
- When using Wyden, the proximity of the private land to the forest is important.
- They also utilized the Tribal Forest Protection Act

The Somes Bar Project was implemented through a collaborative team including members from the Forest Service, Karuk Tribe, and Mid Klamath Watershed Council. They incorporated traditional ecological knowledge (TEK) into their prescriptions. One of the most innovative things about this project was that cultural resources were surveyed and incorporated into their maps. LiDAR data was essential.

Steve Wilensky (CHIPS)

Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions (CHIPS) began 13 years ago today in an effort to use the resources available for economic development opportunities. CHIPS received a grant to start a non-profit and also to visit Hayfork to learn from the Watershed Center. In addition to working locally, they have also worked in Utah doing post-fire restoration, and have a 3-year agreement in Tahoe restoring to Washoe conditions. They have received contracts for as long as five years, which allows them to reinvest and plan ahead. Recently, CHIPS has received a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) under SB1122 and are ready to build a 3 MW cogeneration power plant on their mill site. With this project, CHIPS will be in a position to hire and executive director in January and predicts 50 people working on 9 contracts next year, including some in year round positions.

CHIPS has had a number of successes in youth engagement, including a Miwok youth that was hired as an intern becoming foreman and a mixed tribal youth crew in the Yosemite Valley. However, there continue to be unexpected challenges, such as addiction in the community, seasonal employment competition with the cannabis industry, youth work ethic, worker's comp costs, and some near fatal accidents with employees who did not know they were allergic to bees.

Jonathan Kusel (P-CREW); [Presentation](#)

After the Moonlight Fire that burned very close to Taylorsville, Sierra Institute began a natural resource education program with local and Tribal students. In addition to the education program, this is more school based, Sierra Institute runs the Plumas Conservation Restoration and Education in Watersheds (P-CREW) program during the summers. 2017 was the third year having crews in local forests (particularly Plumas and Lassen National Forests). One of the goals of the program was to expose urban youth the forest, but they decided to put urban and rural students on crews together (many rural students also need to be exposed to the forest). The crew members are picked up at their schools, provided all the necessary gear (including books and jackets) and are paid \$1400 at the end of a five-week session. P-CREW incorporates educational activities, recreation opportunities and exposure to professional partners. Staff follow up with students and are starting to track their post high school activities. As P-CREW alumni are beginning to graduate, some of them are pursuing studies in natural resources.

Day One Reflection (Izzy Martin, Sierra Fund)

- There is a diversity of people in attendance, including people who are working on the ground (rather than national NGOs)
- Some obstacles to restoring resiliency that have been brought up in these sessions:
 - We're not in pristine forest- it's been irrevocably changed (by hunting for gold, silver, cows, timber, fish) and we need to understand that the cause was our arrival
 - Forests are not self-managed
 - Funding was the most talked about topic today
 - Funding is an obstacle, especially when grant recipients end up doing what funders want and not what needs to be done.
 - Stakeholders are hard to reach and they don't self-identify: they don't know they should be coming to the table at all, or don't understand the language, processes, or even what the threat is
 - We sometimes have naïve ideas about fixing the problem, but we can't just start an NGO and solve it. It's hard work: we have to address 150 years of resource extraction, genocide and mismanagement.
- Collaboration is key; it's how we'll get things done
 - Need to talk to people who disagree with you
- Some exciting things on the horizon:
 - SB5 will be on June ballot, another bill in November
 - Re-emergence of tribal presence: we need to support that voice
 - Millennials are the most hopeful thing: they both bring and believe in change, and are accepting of new ideas

Day 2 (November 3, 2017)

Session 8: Collaborative Updates

Ben Solvesky & Kendal Young (South Fork of the American River (SOFAR) Cohesive Strategy)

- Ben is a wildlife biologist and consistent participant in SOFAR. SOFAR has been meeting regularly for one year.

- A Cohesive Wildland Fire Management Strategy is a collaborative mechanism for addressing wildland fire management issues. SOFAR formed to enhance resilient landscapes, fire-adapted communities, and promote a safe and effective response to wildland fire.
- One significant project out of SOFAR is an 8,800-acre prescribed fire project. SNC provided funding for the planning and implementation of this project, and the first acres were burned in the week prior to the SCALE meeting.
- Since the last SCALE meeting, SOFAR has institute a charter and created a website.
- SOFAR members are developing a landscape vision document to spatially define a focus area and priorities.
- The group is exploring outlets for small diameter trees and biomass, particularly, a biomass cogeneration (heat/power) facility and a post and pole operation.
- SOFAR signed a Good Neighbor Authority agreement with CAL FIRE to implement fuels treatments on the “Fire Adapted 50” project along the HWY 50 corridor.
- Fire Adapted 50 is a good example of SOFAR’s commitment to instituting partnerships and assisting the federal workforce.
- For SOFAR, much of the capacity building over the last year has been focused on outreach to various partners.
- Q: How does SOFAR finance NEPA/CEQA work?
 - A: Supplemental fuels dollars.

Amy Horne (Sagehen Forest Project)

- Sagehen Experimental Forest is located ten miles north of Truckee. The area was originally a field station for UC – Berkeley.
- 9,000 acres was set aside for an experimental forest under USFS Region 5.
- There is a large dataset associated with Sagehen from past and current research.
- The Sagehen Forest Project benefits from stable staffing in the Truckee Ranger District (USFS).
- UC Berkeley professors provide consistent support for research efforts at Sagehen.
- There is little forest products infrastructure surrounding Sagehen. The closest mill is nearly 100 miles away in Lincoln, CA.
- SNC funding allowed for treatments in areas without merchantable timber.
- Amy invited SCALE participants to visit Sagehen and learn/view the forestry principles being applied, particularly, the methods described in GTR-220.

Rick Hopson (Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG))

- Rick is the Amador District Ranger on the El Dorado National Forest.
- ACCG is one of three Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) recipients in California.
- ACCG is on year seven of a ten year CFLRP program of work. The priority now is to implement the projects that have resulted from the collaborative program.
- ACCG recently held a monitoring workshop covering a variety of topics including roads, meadows, among others. The workshop served to inform and advance monitoring activities on the forest.
- ACCG has been dedicating time to strategic planning in light of the CFLR program concluding in the next few years. It is unclear if the program will be renewed in any fashion.

Session 9: Collaborative Impact (Lauren Burton, Sierra Institute); [Presentation](#)

- L. Burton collected publically available USFS data on forest activities to begin tracking collaborative projects and start a conversation on how to measure success.
- There are different elements of collaboration that are not represented in these data (e.g., relationship building).
- L. Burton presented graphs depicting timber harvests and timber stand improvements over time within select collaborative footprints (see presentation link above).
- Community projects and activities are not reported to the USFS; this is a missing link for tracking progress.
- Participants noted the downward trend in acres treated.
- N. Goulette mentioned that the USFS has started to track wildfire acres and whether those acres were beneficial to forest health. This is an important metric for advancing naturally occurring wildfire as a management tool.

Session 10: Identifying Solutions to Landscape-scale Restoration Barriers

NEPA Challenges Group

Challenges:

- NEPA takes a lot of time, where exactly is that time being spent?
- There are multiple styles and types of NEPA (every forest and maybe every team). Requirements must be met by law but there are also common practices that help to avoid litigation.
- Can we identify the points where the collaborative would be most helpful? If so, is there sufficient trust to move forward?
- We perceive the bottleneck with NEPA to be the left side, can it be more efficient?
- We want larger landscapes treated more quickly but there's a tradeoff (increased time investment and/or risk of litigation with larger projects). How can we get ahead of this and where can collaboratives be involved?

Solutions:

- 1) Timing of when FS decisions are made, collaborative need to get information to them in a timely manner (at least one FY ahead). FS needs to know you have that idea and information for their program of work (January)
- 2) Define the scope and scale of your project (depends on the decision maker)
- 3) Build into the charter types of strategies that help you move past hurdles and disturbances that would change your course
- 4) With smaller decisions and projects, consider how a rapid assessment model could be developed. Important to re-think how we structure ID teams and the time they spend on projects
- 5) Let collaboratives own more controversial projects, e.g. fire salvage. Involve collaboratives in diffusing conflict with environmental groups in opposition
- 6) Perform large-scale resource surveys for more static resources (e.g. heritage, archaeology) for your entire footprint
- 7) Aim to complete analyses that satisfy both NEPA and CEQA. This is preferable to CEQA after NEPA because it saves time, money, and doesn't re-expose the project to litigation

8) Collaboratives should act as a litmus test to determine where the agency's analysis efforts should go (avoiding analysis paralysis)

Discussion:

W. Harling: Different forests have different resources (NEPA teams) and it affects what the collaborative can do.

T. Sloat: The best way to stay resilient is to be able to outsource some of that work to specialists in the collaborative.

S. Hazelhurst: USFS is trying to group Forests into zones to share resources and plan work across all of those units to meet goals. Trying to be more strategic around that and could use input from collaboratives.

B. Solvesky: Two other examples of outside groups doing NEPA. TNC did the NEPA work on French Meadows project on TNF. Trout Unlimited doing restoration work and NEPA. Another vehicle for achieving NEPA. Both seem to be going well and are well received.

B. Kingman: SNC Has been very involved in these projects. They went into that process trying to minimize impact on the Forest. Had good support from TNF staff, they knew that they had to release control and trust the consultants. Regular check ins are built into that to instill trust. There should be no hesitation on the part of FS staff to approve it. These types of projects illustrate the growth of this "industry." The people doing this are retired FS folks who have the expertise – maybe the consultant world can be built out around people who have the experience.

B. Solvesky: They've been meeting with SFL regularly and successful in avoiding litigation.

R. Cablayan: The way we did business is much different than the present. In the past, the districts had all the specialists in-house. Now, we need to rely on the FS more broadly to finish NEPA. Their projects are determined by the limited number of specialists that they have.

Community Capacity Breakout Session

What do we mean when we talk about capacity? The capacity to do what?

- Work in the woods
- Increase collaborative restoration
- Economic benefit
- Achieve the specific outcomes that the collaboratives themselves have identified (which may differ for each collaborative)
- There is also an issue of intellectual capacity (understanding good fire and natural forest conditions)

What do we need to increase community capacity?

- Local infrastructure: not enough biomass processing centers
- Employee retention: competition with industry, short contracts and commitment

- Something to draw people and business to the area
- Higher value for local hires (current bid process is to their disadvantage)
- Ability to plan and commit to contracts
- Identification of agencies and stakeholders that should be involved
 - Limited ability of volunteers/NGOs to participate
 - Important to maintain communication even with those that don't come to the meetings

Opposition prevents projects from getting off the ground

- One of the benefits of collaboratives is that local environmental groups can contact the big NGOs and “call off the dogs”
- Collaborative work is promising but does not get the same amount of press as litigation; good collaborative work just isn't breaking news

Challenge of retaining and recruiting a workforce

- Especially in low population, high public land ownership areas there are simply not enough bodies to do the work that is needed
- It is more expensive to hire locally, so what is the socioeconomic benefit (and how do you find a good balance)?
- Possible solution: invest in institutions and partnerships, support programs where the value outweighs the costs
 - There have been some variable successes with corrections or youth conservation corps though they bring other challenges
- What are the obstacles to local contracting?
 - Their rates are so much higher
 - How can we help local contractors to be more competitive? Can we help them to be the best value but not necessarily the lowest bid?
 - Even with local contracting rules, it's hard to find people who can do the work, but other funding sources do not have the same rules and can be more flexible
 - Can't award contract because there's no capacity but there's no capacity because you can't award the contract.
 - Local contractors don't have the machinery
 - SOFAR is looking into a grant as a collaborative to purchase some of that infrastructure to invest in local manufacturing capacity
 - Local contractors do not have the experience
 - WKRP has used non-local contractors to train locally
 - There have been bad experiences with local contractors (an example mentioned involved the desecration of a cultural site)

Community Capacity Recap

Challenges/Goals:

- How can we increase local infrastructure and capacity? ID people, agencies, stakeholders that need to be part of the process as we move forward (including private citizens).
- NGOs need funding, time, staff, etc.
- “Grow our own” and focus engagement on schools, increase interest
- Support programs where costs may seem high relative to the value (e.g. local contractors bidding higher what a large, remote contractor would bid because they're recouping investments on equipment)
- Keep money in the local communities and economy, overcoming “work ethic” challenge

- How do you acknowledge the competitive environment in which they have to operate? How do you give them a toehold? How do you negotiate larger, more established firms (SPI)?
- How do you deal with the absolute shortage of resources in rural places, e.g. people?

Solutions:

- When larger firms do work, the collaborative should help them train local labor
- Make more use of stewardship authority when and where practicable, helps alleviate challenges around contracting rules
- Outreach: make sure folks in the local area understand what the agency is looking for and are able to respond
- Understanding good fire vs. bad fire
- Increased funding

Discussion:

R. Cablayan: In awarding contracts, preference is given to contractors that hire local labor

N. Goulette: Important to think about fire contracting structure. Their model drives down the costs of service contracting because they like to rehire the same people and not retrain them. That makes small companies less successful because they're trying to make money on service contracting and are underbid. Fire industrial complex and contracting related to fire does effect this whole landscape. What are some alternative models for businesses, but also agencies, around contracting? Is there a role for somebody who doesn't want to be ready to deploy all over the country, but focus regionally instead, in fire contracting?

J. Kusel: There also has to be a mechanism by which we both monitor and enhance the socioeconomic benefits that the agency is required to deliver. We have to build capacity in manufacturing that will stimulate local jobs and beneficial outcomes.

K. Rodgers: In order to do that, we need to know that there is a supply to work with.

Consistent Wood Supply Breakout Session

- The problem statement:
 - Federal resource agencies are unable to meet the demand of the forest products industry, particularly small enterprises, in a consistent and effective manner.
- The following underlying issues contribute to the failure of supply:
 - Lack of infrastructure (harvesting, transportation, processing of raw materials)
 - Federal contracting mechanisms
 - Time spent on environmental review
- N. Goulette emphasized the need to address supply, considering there are multiple small-scale biomass cogeneration facilities preparing to sign Power Purchase Agreements (PPA) with electrical utilities. These enterprises will require a consistent source of feedstock throughout the life of the PPA.
- B. Kingman spoke about the vacuum that is created when the US Forest Service is required to divert resources away from their ongoing projects. Similarly, private contractors are prone to shift resources to areas affected by wildfire, making it difficult to get bids for routine harvests on the forest. Both of these factors contribute to instability in supply.

- Transportation was discussed. Since the recession (circa 2008), it became difficult for small transportation companies to make ends meet and many went out of business.
- Past and present polarization in the timber industry instituted a lack of trust and public support. Rebuilding trust and communicating the benefits of restoration and the forest products industry is one way to approach this problem.
- A participant asked if the established timber industry (large, corporate firms) are doing anything to invest in local development or small-scale industries?
 - The short answer is no. The large timber companies have little incentive to invest in/support local enterprises that will, essentially, directly compete with their operations.
 - Note: large timber companies do benefit local communities and are often one of the largest employers in rural forested communities.
- NEPA
 - Extended NEPA timelines disrupt the flow of supply.
 - The concept of “what if” NEPA documents was discussed. This type of NEPA is theoretically easier to enact. Analysis is done on an as needed basis.
 - Programmatic NEPA was mentioned as a similar mechanism. There is an umbrella decision and projects are tiered off of the larger document. This, however, requires multiple decisions.
 - Enabling external contractors to conduct analysis is a sound approach to supplement federal resources and increase the pace of review.
- N. Goulette further discussed the sticking points for economic development in forested communities. Capital investments require an entity to acquire debt in most cases; without a demonstrated supply source, it is more difficult to finance small-scale enterprises in these communities.
- Contracting was seen as a feasible way to address the supply issue. If there could be a 10 or 20-year contract in place that would ensure supply, small businesses could obtain financing and have a greater chance of success.
- It was noted that the timber harvesting season is much different in the Sierra than other forested regions (Oregon or the Southeast, for example). In addition to the reduced season from weather, Limiting Operating Periods (LOPs) for wildlife further restrict the time contractors can complete a sale. Both of these factors contribute to a relatively small window for contractors, and in the worst case, a sale goes without a bid.
 - In response, refining environmental regulations, LOPs specifically, could have a significant impact on the availability of contractors to bid on and complete sales.

Consistent Wood Supply Recap

Challenges/Problem Definition:

- Supply is limited by NEPA (timeline, legally compliant, etc.): need to be more creative about third-party NEPA, what other money can we bring in other than Federal? This might include tiered decisions that cover one large landscape
- GNA, Cal Fire, local conservation districts, etc. are all alternative ways to work with NEPA – might work better for different types of projects (e.g. meadow restoration vs. timber)
- State investment: this is a big deal. GGRF is a huge investment that can create more biomass supply. What other incentives can the State create?

- Creating a consistent and guaranteed flow of wood. Ten-year stewardship contracts have been looked to to fill the gap of high volume sales or lack of restoration. There hasn't been a huge appetite for that in the region and industry isn't particularly interested.
- SB1122 contracts need security in contracting and can't be forced to cobble supply together. They have to be able to do contract preparation, development, administration and management. These are big investments whose failure would be very difficult to weather. However, there are constraints here just like every other Federal workforce.
- Will the FS be able to service multiple contracts?
- TWC built up an old mill and firewood manufacturing that seemed to align with FS program of work, but supply didn't come because the contracting strategy didn't work (how to package the contract, how to do the crews)

Solutions:

- Creativity with contracting on behalf of State agencies

Discussion:

W. Harling: There are so many factors that are misaligned, if any one goes wrong it upsets the apple cart. Across collaboratives, some are the same and some are different. FS lands are being managed with single-species management and, if they are the only supplier of wood, it puts collaboratives and small scale biomass projects in a precarious situation. We may not get past these hurdles until we embrace holistic management on our national forests.

Also need people to invest, outside of political terms, on the timescale that these communities need results. Lots of these places aren't ideally located as it begins with, they have a lot of ground to cover even just to build infrastructure.

J. Amodio: Lots of conversations where we outline the problem and don't have a solution. If we were to start now designing an approach with today's constraints, what would it look like? We need to develop a bigger and bolder picture.

J. Birkhoff: In the Sierra NF, don't know who to bring in when and what needs to be connected. How do we work a system? How do we think through that problem?

D. Griffith: Politics is missing. We need our problems to be acknowledged at a higher level. These are not regulatory issues, these are legislative. This is the issue with a lot of rural problems.

W. Harling: Examples of NEPA being done by outside groups seems to be the exception and not the norm. Is there going to be a time when that's entertained at a larger level with the FS? Will they embrace NEPA teams that are coming from non-FS sources? That's a huge bottleneck across the State.

B. Kingman: Every Forest has a different culture and that dictates their willingness to collaborate with outside groups. It takes time before the collective culture of the FS will change.

J. Kusel: Requires a combination of time, culture, and direction.

Session 11: Expanding on Recent Policy Innovations to Overcome Barriers: What's Next?

Bill Craven (Chief Consultant, CA Senate Committee on Natural Resources and Water)

- CAL FIRE: Outreach for GGRF funding has been interrupted by Sonoma fires
- The budget awarded \$200 million to CAL FIRE for Healthy Forests, \$25 million in local assistance (grants to high hazard severity fire zones), \$15 million for wetlands restoration, \$80 million to backfill SRA fire fees, and other adaptation funding (\$26 million)
- Parks Bond money is not available until voters approve – additional support for large-scale restoration work (Tahoe Conservancy, SNC). This is the first time that those two conservancies are treated as co-equals with various others in Southern California in a Parks Bond (rural representation)
- Additional funding for upper watershed projects (Sierra and Cascades), flood funding, storm water, Delta
- Have been working to get CAL FIRE and air quality districts to support more prescribed fire on private, public and Federal lands. Agencies seem to be on board. A little bit of money is available but not a lot of courage. The State needs to have more of a partnership with FS on NFS lands.
- SB 623: impose a public goods charge on water to pay for disadvantaged communities water supply and district management. This has just gone into session, lots more work to do.
- Cal Fire, RWB, State FWS, State Air Board at a meeting at UCD: platform for watershed restoration. Probably couldn't have done that 8-10 years ago. Each of those agencies has a platform that could become the basis. There is no agreement yet on the best way to do this – lots of possible outcome.
- AB 2480: Source watersheds for State and Federal water projects shall be treated as infrastructure for purposes of financing. Now eligible for financing, just like SWP or CVP. Considerable issues associated with that: which tools should be used?
- To realize your goals in Sacramento, your coalitions have to be larger. It's true that rural counties have less political power. Many local elected officials/legislators don't share priorities and goals.

Discussion:

J. Amodio: Dealing with Rim Fire and, increasingly, the issue of preventing this type of incident elsewhere on the Forest? How can the collaborative bring collective knowledge and experience to Sacramento in a way that will influence the types of decisions that are being made? There are lots of process issues that can't be solved by increased funding.

B. Craven: Coalitions need to expand – need to cultivate and maintain the involvement of groups that have direct connection in Sacramento. This means local government, local/state NGOs, state trade associations. Groups like that have dedicated lobby staff. You need to be able to translate your wish list and activities into the kind of language spoken by groups that have lobbyists in Sacramento. Local government officials have to be able to talk about why forest treatment is important to those governments, not just in the context of fire. Mitigating fire risk, climate resiliency would sell those projects without even touching restoration potential.

Z. Knight: Money from CALFIRE GGRF has to be spent in a certain timeframe and this crunch is exacerbated by implementation-related challenges (infrastructure, crews, etc.). Now we have an exponential increase in funding available. This could be a longer-term commitment vs. one-year allocation. Let's put some of the money from these trust funds (GGRF) into infrastructure up front and save some for future allocations.

B. Craven: All this money isn't going out in the first year, it'll be a multi-stage effort. Collaboratives should be asking departments to extend the timeline for implementation. Parks Bond has this built in: all of those grants help build capacity. Whatever the funding source, it's important to think about the next step, e.g. we can bond against ongoing revenue streams with public benefit to develop long-term, sustainable funding sources.

Z. Knight: It would be good to differentiate between benefits that are better suited for grants and those that are better for long-term cost shares.

A. Horne: We're talking in terms that we understand but not sure we're talking about things in ways that effectively communicate to urban legislators or EJ communities in urban areas.

B. Craven: That's a thing. The Legislature is predominantly urban, from Southern California. 90% of California's population lives within an hour of the coast. There's your problem. Expand your coalitions. You need to be able to teach urban legislators about the value of watersheds and working and natural lands. Working in the Capitol is difficult because committee members are mostly urban.

B. Kingman: For the last several years, people have been trying to get GGRF funding, the next big pot is marijuana. Who's going to try to get it?

B. Craven: CA FWS and State Parks are going to receive some *cannabis money*. Some goes to Secretary of Resources, then sub-allocated to the above to restore illegal marijuana grows. Cannabis money can't be used to reduce the budgets of those departments, it is additive. How do we make sure that happens (in the process of budgeting)? How do we focus it on restoration and how direct of a connection does it have to have to an illegal grow site? Same footprint? Same watershed? Not sure what the mechanism will be to funnel that money to Federal land management, if any.

R. Childress: Regarding the use of "good fire" to increase pace and scale: can we leverage the well-trained workforce from CALFIRE to get work done?

B. Craven: This is a conversation that has been going on for at least 20 years. Sometimes CAL FIRE has increased their defensible space inspections, which is an important thing to do in the non-fire season. CAL FIRE has come a long way in recognizing the need for more burning but they're still very risk averse. For 100 years, they've been a fire suppression agency. Forestry management has been nowhere near as robust as fire suppression. That's slowly changing. Lumber assessment has paid for more people to do

forestry regulation at the department (and CA FWS, regional water boards). Forestry management is slowly starting to climb the priorities ladder at these agencies.

R. Childress: Where do we engage in those discussions?

B. Craven: Delivered by multiple people (local Sups, local NGOs, trickle up to Sacramento). Many voices coming from many different directions.

J. Birkhoff: How can we make the connections between agriculture, watershed, and forest clearer and stronger?

On cannabis: the issue is reminiscent of gold mining (mitigation bonds, investment in air, water and soil as requirements for permitting). It's helpful to think about these mitigation efforts for the entire permitting cycle.

B. Craven: Important for your message to be championed by trade associations. Will they support your message? That's a different question. Champions for ag, and other large industries, are mostly silent.

W. Harling: Lots of talk about expanding prescribed burning and very little investment. Asked for a set-aside for prescribed burning in the SRA that didn't come to pass. GGRF now has a specific bias against burning because you're burning carbon in the short term to increase long-term sequestration potential. What's the best hope to fund those projects? Just like timber, you need to invest in the training and infrastructure.

B. Craven: Conversations with CAL FIRE and Air Board – emissions from prescribed vs. wildfires. He thinks they have resolved that in the right way. The proof will be if the department ever actually starts doing the work. He is still pushing for later this year but TBD.

D. Griffith: Many bond issues and other programs stop at the Sierra crest because they don't benefit urban downstream users.

B. Craven: All the money going to SNC/Tahoe Conservancy can be spent on the East side.

Session 12: Drawing it Together

Barnie Gyant (Deputy Regional Forester for USFS Region 5)

In 2011 Region 5 set a goal of 500,000 acres a year, but since then we didn't move the needle very far, maybe 230,000 acres. At that point, we also started to invest in collaboratives, we realized we weren't going to be able to do what needed to be done without help. It's been a challenge; culturally as an agency, we aren't very good at letting other people do our work. We are going to try to do a better job accepting help.

We need to think about communities as part of the forest. A large portion of rural counties consists of forests, and there is a significant impact on tourism when the landscape burns. We also need to change the way we think about how ecosystems are connected, such as the effect of forests on water and fisheries.

In 2018, the vegetation and fuels program will be a priority, not just for region 5, but for the whole agency. There will be a focus on collaborative work in an area when giving out funding.

Helge Eng (Deputy Director of Resource Management at CALFIRE); [Presentation](#)

The current situation is pretty bleak. There is an increase in wildfire and tree mortality continues to be a problem. The recent fire in Santa Rosa shows that the rules of the game are changing. CALFIRE has specific targets to meet, including 20,000 acres of prescribed burning, 20,000 acres of fuels treatment and 250,000 defensible space inspections. There is a need to increase the capacity of collaboratives to get work done.

The \$200 million cap and trade funds can be well spent with a coordinated effort between collaboratives. Partnership is crucial: this is a lot of money and we'll need a lot of ideas. There is also an issue of timing: the process is slow but the governor likes to see fast results. They have not allocated the funds by category, but would prefer for the demand to guide spending decisions. The deadline for Forest Health Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund (GGRF) concept proposals is January 30, 2018 with grants to be awarded in June 2018. The public view of active forest management is changing. There is growing recognition that California consumes more wood than it produces and that there is a place for active forest management.

Discussion:

What will the process look like for allocating resources?

- **Barnie:** Fire and veg will be the priority. We want a list and schedule of projects. Farther ahead (2020) we will look at where collaboratives are working, where industry needs support and priority areas. We are also looking at how to move human resources around.

Is there support for building infrastructure and capacity?

- **Helge:** Yes, unfortunately the cap and trade funds depend on showing a greenhouse gas benefit, but I think it can still be done with a biomass facility.
- **Barnie:** The 7 biomass facilities that got contract extensions to deal with tree mortality had better be successful at the risk of losing support.
- What about new 3 MW facilities that need 10-year supply? USFS doesn't do ten-year funding cycles.
 - Even without tree mortality, we still have densely stocked forests that need treatment
 - Collaboratives prescribe large treatments, but the NEPA process is still small treatments
 - **Helge:** not everyone is a fan of biomass, but I think there is a five-year window to demonstrate benefit
- **ABC:** There is a stronger case if we make biomass a forest health issue, not an energy one
- **YSS:** We need a better dialogue with agencies. How do we get larger scale analysis?
 - Need to streamline CEQA
 - **Barnie:** Litigation is not a failure, but a process. What is the level of risk we're willing to take to do something versus nothing? Doing nothing is not working. While litigating one thing, another thing is burning up.
 - **Helge:** Need good data, CALFIRE has a Cal Mapper software, but typically not as available as it should be to the public. We're trying to do better.
 - There is document put out last month that would be a tool available to collaboratives: Vegetation Treatment Program Environmental Impact Report.

How can collaboratives help to do NEPA?

- **Barnie:** if there's someone with the expertise, why wouldn't we accept help? We have a lot of agreements already, but there needs to be a culture change to collaborate with the people who have the skills.
- **Helge:** Cap and trade is mostly applicant led CEQA. CALFIRE has strength in greenhouse gas calculations and working with ARB, so for small organizations in might be more appropriate to have CALFIRE do the CEQA.
- **Barnie:** The Forest Service does environmental compliance differently than other agencies out of fear of litigation, but if there are new ways of doing things, all bets are on.

There is a need to focus on the NEPA/CEQA crosswalk. We've had to convert NEPA to CEQA and back to NEPA. The USFS is using Wyden for prescribed burning. How can GGRF be a source for prescribed burning?

- Cap and trade are best funding source. We have talked with ARB a lot about how fuel reductions, including prescribed fire have a greenhouse gas benefit.

What would you see for number of acres for prescribed fire vs wildfire in the 2040?

- **Helge:** There is always more wildfire than prescribed fire so the question is more about forest conditions and if the wildfire more closely resembles the natural regime.
- **Barnie:** By 2030 I want to treat a million acres a year across the landscape (federal, state, private lands) and get to a place of maintenance. I don't want to stop at 500,000 acres a year, I want to get the whole thing. There is an opportunity with biomass facilities, a state emphasis on prescribed burning will stress its importance, and Santa Rosa will be a wakeup call. Our agencies have different limitations so we can work together: CALFIRE can thin without running into problems with ARB and USFS can burn.
- **Helge:** A state goal of 500,000. Already the state estimates 350,000 acres on private lands; it's a new and different forestry. If we count state parks and other land ownership, maybe we're not all that far from million acres as a state. Remember that 70% of wildfires are beneficial, those count as treatments.

Meeting Wrap up (Jonathan Kusel, Sierra Institute)

- A recap of what was heard during the last two days: too much of the wrong kind of fire, restoration work is moving too slowly, cap and trade funding favors project that add more trees and the landscape is changing.
- The CFLR program might be coming to an end, but the ideas generated through those collaborations remain. They lead to a reduction in lawsuits, but they don't move very quickly.
- Be careful what you wish for: there is a lot of money coming in now for forest health, but is it coming fast enough and to the right projects? Funding is coming and we're likely to see more of it, so let's think about where it should go and how it should be spent. This will involve a bigger role for collaboratives.
 - Also think about the public goods charge on water and what the implications will be for you.
- Let's help to develop courage among the group itself and partners.
- There has been a lot of discussion these past two days about all kinds of capacity: community, workforce and manufacturing. There are not vehicles in place for communication with Sacramento regarding policy. There is a need for education and advocacy. When Bill Craven says we need that presence, I listen to him.

- Hugh Safford said that we learn when we fail. I believe that we fail when we don't learn from our failures.
- Comments from the audience about critical ideas that we need to work on:
 - The NEPA/CEQA crosswalk
 - Focusing on all lands accomplishments and looking outside just one agency's accomplishments
 - Creating space for a long term vision and not only focusing on immediate challenges
 - Cultivating the collective experience from collaboratives, and creating a consistent presence in Sacramento and a greater mass of support
 - Possibility of a government relations committee?
 - A flowchart or map detailing the process from planning to monitoring and where collaboratives can get involved in that process
 - Concern with the limited Tribal presence at this meeting
 - Models for collaborative NEPA work, including some transferrable lessons, and better information sharing between meetings. How can we track and learn from all of the experience?