



Sierra to California All-Lands Enhancement Fall 2018 Meeting

29-30 October 2018 | Indian Creek Lodge, Douglas City, CA

Summary:

Sierra Institute held its bi-annual Sierra to California All-Lands Enhancement (SCALE) Meeting on October 29th and 30th in Douglas City, CA. The first day, representatives from six collaboratives gave updates on their group's successes and challenges. Sessions included breakout groups to discuss lessons and barriers to implementing restoration projects, brainstorming what defines a collaborative, and sharing stories connecting collaboration and restoration through innovations such as MSAs and third-party NEPA. Erin Kelly from Humboldt State University presented her research on engaging private landowners in the all-lands approach to restoration. On day 2, participants discussed addressing the triple bottom line, heard about cases of landscape scale restoration and discussed what "landscape scale" means, and also heard from Joy Tucker about CALFIRE's California Climate Investment grant opportunities.

Attendees:

Janine Book
Sheri Elliott
Jenny Ericson
Cynthia Ford
Pat Frost
Shannon Johnson
Holly Jorgensen
Erin Kelly

Jonathon Kusel
Cathy LeBlanc
Ted O. McArthur
Amye Osti
Sherry Reckler
Kyle Rodgers
Scott Russel
Hilary Sanders

Mike Senn
Kelly Sheen
Todd Sloat
Joe Smailes
Joy Tucker
Megan VanPelt
Leana Weissberg

Table of Contents

Attendees.....1

Table of Contents.....2

Day 1

Introductions and Meeting Overview.....3

Story of the Trinity County Collaborative Group.....3

Collaborative Group Updates.....4

Implementing Restoration Projects: Lessons and Barriers.....5

Defining a Collaborative.....6

Engaging Private Landowners in the All-Lands Approach to Forest Restoration.....8

Stories Connecting Collaboration and Restoration.....9

Day 1 Closing Thoughts.....9

Day 2

Introduction of Day 2.....10

Integrating Economic, Environmental, and Community Interests for Triple Bottom Line
Projects.....10

Connecting Forest Restoration to Community Development Innovations and Opportunities for
Landscape Scale Restoration.....11

California’s Investment in Forest Health and Fire Prevention.....13

Meeting Wrap Up.....14

Day 1

Introductions and Meeting Overview (Jonathan Kusel, Sierra Institute)

SCALE meetings began as informal lessons-sharing between Calaveras Healthy Impact Products Solutions (CHIPS), Burney Hat Creek Community Forest and Watershed Group (BHC), and the Dinkey Creek Landscape Restoration Partnership. It gradually expanded to include other groups in Northern and Southern California and was formalized through funding from the Shasta RAC and Region 5. It is a collaboration of collaboratives focused on peer learning and overcoming barriers.

This meeting is the first regional SCALE meeting. Regional meetings will allow more intimate discussion and help members create local connections as SCALE makes a transition from a project-by-project focus to tackling landscape scale issues.

Story of the Trinity County Collaborative Group (Pat Frost and Kelly Sheen, Trinity County Collaborative Group)

- TCCG grew out of the Weaverville Community Forest (WCF)
 - o Bureau of Land Management (BLM) was trading unproductive landholdings for Trinity River frontage (formerly industrial) to contribute to Trinity R. restoration
- “Burger King clearcut” on industrial lands impacted the watershed and raised community concerns about industrial ownership of the 985-acre BLM parcel
- 2002-2005: County sought to circumvent industry by acquiring lands to transfer
 - o A stewardship agreement with the Resource Conservation District (RCD) was ultimately established in lieu of ownership
- 2012: TCCG formed in response to *no* harvests on Trinity County Federal lands
 - o Harvest levels in part due to litigation and public opposition to active management
 - o Included community members, environmental interests, industry
 - o Creating a program of work that produces sawlogs and creates efficiencies
- TCCG has improved interactions between the community and agency
 - o FS increased transparency, designs projects responsive to community needs
 - o TCCG’s fuelbreak prescriptions adopted by the Six Rivers National Forest
- Work is facilitated by two 10-year stewardship agreements with the RCD (FS and BLM)
 - o Brown’s Record of Decision (ROD) has facilitated multiple projects, some via stewardship contracts, resulting in three green harvests (FS)
 - o Brown’s ROD had no upper diameter limit, an outcome of social license
- How is WCF being used to build consensus?
 - o Community field trips to observe and learn about pre- and post- conditions, both with harvest and fire (wildfire and Rx); greater social acceptance of Rx fire
- What would it take to go bigger?
 - o Expand the Master Stewardship Agreement (MSA) to all NF lands in the County
 - o Long-term agreement with regulatory agencies to expedite programmatic environmental reviews/consultation

- Pace and scale will increase processing capacity, need NEPA professionals
- Responding to wildfire impacts the group's ability to work proactively
- Mad River Ranger District is pursuing a programmatic NEPA with USFWS and NFMS to expedite projects - perhaps this could be expanded?
- FS and BLM let the green sale contracts, BLM sales didn't even go out to bid and the RCD essentially administered the sales via the MSA
- Reconciling fuelbreak approach with landscape scale, forest health oriented approach
 - Fuelbreaks are stepping stones to landscape scale: building community buy-in
 - Opportunity to evaluate outcomes: contractor adherence, community perception

Collaborative Group Updates

Smith River Collaborative (Cynthia Ford and Megan Van Pelt, Tolowa Dee-ni')

- Has been working as a collaborative for a little over 3 years, includes Tolowa Dee-ni' Nation and Smith River Rancheria, environmental groups, the county, and FS; Smith River Alliance and county are co-chairs
- Promising developments
 - Has found positive synergy with tribes' participation, great to see tribes more active
 - Finally getting to implementation for 3 vegetation projects and a travel management project that have been planned
- Barriers
 - No formal or clear decision making process or by-laws, processes can be clunky and not always transparent
 - Fiscal sponsor through which NFWF funding is funneled
 - Figuring out what grant administration takes and how to include in budget, can be challenging when continuing everything else the group is doing

Burney Hat Creek (Todd Sloat, Fall River RCD and Pit RCD)

- It has "only" taken 10 years to develop the trust to openly share frustrations productively
- Promising Developments
 - Pit RCD doing salvage sale in the Cove Fire area on the Modoc NF, have been invited to do another in Stone Fire area; The RCD wrote NEPA and is implementing, although currently being litigated
 - The Fall River RCD assisting the Lassen NF with the Whale Back Fire salvage
 - Continuing to build trust and get NEPA experience
- Consider RCDs a local Forest Service team member

South Lassen Watershed Group (Leana Weissberg, Sierra Institute)

- The group started in 2017 but was born out of an advisory committee to the county so there are long-standing stakeholders and energy invested
- Promising developments

- Awarded CCI grant which supports implementation and planning work through sub-contracting with Todd or assembling a team, and tribal consultation/TEK
- Sierra Institute assembling a NEPA team for one of the projects is exciting but is a new role for Sierra Institute and a new model for the Ranger District so there will inevitably be challenges

Butte County Community Wildfire Protection Plan (Holly Jorgensen, Sacramento River Watershed Program)

- CWPP is a support organization for the watershed, helping people understand the nexus between upstream and downstream for last 10 years
- Many players including private landowners and CSU, working on bringing more people in
- Promising developments
 - Working with CALFIRE to develop framework and planning areas, hoping to help groups with limited resources work together
 - Started with fire breaks, now doing planning with CCI grant and working with 34 North
 - Strategic planning and looking at projects that work strategically on the landscape
- Barriers
 - Sustainable funding
 - Have to reassess where to put time and energy when fire comes through a project area

Camptonville Community Partnership (Cathy LeBlanc)

- 3 MW biomass project in Yuba County foothills partnered with Yuba Watershed Protection and Firesafe Council, would be great nexus for developing a collaborative and makes the connection between in-the-forest management and utilization
- Promising developments
 - Meets community goals to increase employment, manage forest, minimize haul distance
 - Continuing to learn about fuel supply, biochar, technology, etc.
 - Will not impact the Loyalton plant because Yuba Pass divides the area, doing supply inventory with Bureau of Indian Affairs
- Barriers
 - The bank needs to see supply contracts before issuing a loan but developing an MSA with the Forest Service is challenging
 - Line officer turnover is a perceived barrier to MSAs but the new chief is passionate about collaborative activities and hopefully will change attitudes

Implementing Restoration Projects: Lessons and Barriers

Participants discussed lessons and barriers of restoration project implementation in two groups, then came back together to share key points.

- Projects and Activities
 - Restoration overarching purpose
 - Recreation, education build community support

- Firesafe council in process of getting 6 fuel-reduction crews not available for fire assignment unless in drawdown/needed for overhead
- Successes
 - Bringing industry and environmental groups together, developing relationships, finding common goals
 - Reducing high severity wildfire through fuelbreak/restoration work
 - Quantifying ecosystem services to educate and persuade legislators on impact of forests on people's daily lives
 - USFS Region 5 has data on water, carbon, timber output of forests
 - New entry points for tribe to engage in planning, prioritization, implementation, integration of TEK
 - Knowledge to create more collaborative projects
- Challenges and Barriers
 - Process*
 - Prioritization essential for focusing limited resources, but challenging when available funding is restricted, sometimes have to do what there is money for
 - Lack of decision-making process
 - How to meaningfully approach landscape scale: although strategic and proactive fuelbreaks are important, they cannot achieve landscape scale
 - Agency*
 - Fire trumps everything, resources must go to fire recovery when it happens
 - Agency turnover hinders meshing group and FS goals and trying new mechanisms
 - New timber targets take focus away from collaboration
 - Need to demystify and make available Stewardship Authority and other tools
 - Capacity*
 - Building tribal and collaborative capacity
 - Building local workforce capacity including planners, implementers, and processors with sufficient long-term work availability to create job security
 - Financial*
 - Match: who among the collaborative members is the fiscal sponsor and how do we collectively come up with matching funds? Is match a dated concept?
 - Grant management: 10% retention creates difficulties with contractors
 - Financial security for small organizations: funders reimbursing in timely manner, grant restrictions, and grant management can limit ability to invest in human capital

Defining a Collaborative

The group brainstormed essential elements of a collaborative, then discussed.

1. Working collectively to ID strategies and projects within collaborative area
2. Include community and funders to develop and implement collaborative goals
3. Inclusive of diverse interests working toward common goals
4. Common geography and identified boundaries (the two are distinct)

5. Local ownership i.e. people and groups in area are represented and invested
6. (a) Transparency and (b) shared decision making
7. Understood and accepted decision making processes
8. Trust within the group
9. Desire to work past individual ideologies for a common goal
10. Some level of disagreement
11. Intake mechanism for getting information
12. Process for evaluating progress that the whole group can participate in
13. Goals in line with the communities represented
14. Recognized authority or framework that empowers group to act
15. Effective forum for communication that allows consistent involvement from all stakeholders
16. Amplifying success through outreach
17. Ground rules are agreed upon and followed
18. Collaborative members have authority to make meaningful decisions on behalf of their organization
19. Meeting regularity, frequency, means of communication
20. Clear scope and goals

Discussion

- Legislation including “collaboration” is becoming more common so we want to be involved in how collaboration is defined
 - o Some of these characteristics essential, some desired, what make a collaborative vs what makes a good collaborative
- Decision tools vs. decision support tools
 - o There is a disconnect between big data picture and local interests
 - Need an agreed-upon baseline
 - Local knowledge most powerful: GIS and other tools used to clarify boundaries etc., more to inform because the people using it already conceptually know it
 - o Forest plan can be a spectrum of decision/decision support, and gets outdated quickly
- Charter, core values, process
 - o Allow group to function and work through conflict
 - o Takes a long time but worthwhile to codify why everyone is there
 - o Sharing foundational documents could expedite process
 - Using as examples rather than templates allows group to still go through process and maintain ownership/buy-in
- Pace and scale and risk
 - o Tasks at hand are daunting, not moving at pace and scale necessary
 - o People responding because state is in emergency affecting them personally
 - Some want to understand more, some want to get something done
 - o Learning from mistakes is important but when future funding depends on success spending a little extra time might help to get total buy in and make best decision
- Facilitation

- Skilled, neutral facilitation helpful
- Alternative model: rotate facilitation among members, can improve cooperation
- Small group meeting to prep facilitator
- Facilitator should craft agenda for desired outcomes

Engaging Private Landowners in the All-Lands Approach to Forest Restoration (Erin Kelly, Humboldt State University)

- Why do landowners do what they do?
- Background
 - ALM (all-lands management)
 - Landscape scale across ownerships, shares common problems e.g. firescapes
 - Considers conditions on neighboring ownerships
 - Shared responsibility by stakeholders with interest in common landscape
 - Different from public land collaboratives which focus on FS or BLM land, ALM specifically brings in private (and state, tribal, etc.)
 - Malcolm North paper showed huge backlog of treatment but only included recommendations for public land
 - ONC checkerboard lands in CA perfect example of how management on one ownership affects other ownerships
- Study
 - Surveyed hundreds of non-corporate private land owners in Klamath, Ashland, and East Face
 - 5 types: federally-organized large scale (e.g. CFLR), locally-organized large scale, WUI focused (no larger ecological purpose but landowners thinking about other landowners), Public lands focused small scale, private lands focused small-scale
 - Landowners more likely to engage if:
 1. Had large land ownerships, landowners tended to be older (some didn't participate because felt they were too old), tenure length didn't matter
 2. Perceived wildfire risk as high, more concerned about family landowner neighbors than larger neighbors, more likely to be willing to work with neighbors if think that they are also doing management work
 3. Had conducted previous management, 86% said had managed in last 5 years
 4. Had received technical or financial assistance in past
 5. Had coordinated with neighboring public or private landowners (more likely to participate when hear about study from neighbors)
 6. Biggest factor was awareness; outreach included door to door, landowner organizations, depends on available resources and organizations
 7. Other constraints: incompatible land uses like cannabis, suspicion of gov't agencies
 8. Benefit to landowner must outweigh cost
 - Local variation is important, compiling data erased some distinctions between areas
- Survey can be made available if any collaboratives interested in conducting a similar study

Stories Connecting Collaboration and Restoration (Todd Sloat, Fall River RCD and Pit RCD)

- Pit RCD testing the mechanism of an outside entity adding to FS capacity by writing NEPA for the Modoc NF Cove Fire salvage project
 - o Produced an Environmental Assessment in 4.5 months
- Used private money (e.g. RCD) to identify local partners and fundraise for NEPA
 - o Revenue would reimburse partners; use of private funds led to community buy-in
 - o Modified an existing stand-alone Stewardship Agreement between Pit RCD and Modoc NF, hoping to do 10 year MSA soon
- Internal disagreements about the use of retained receipts for NEPA
 - o Went to the Washington Office, which denied use of retained receipts
 - o Project management reimbursed (possible due to RCD's flexible procurement), but anything before contract signed cannot be reimbursed
- Involvement in NEPA gives an appreciation for level of detail required/litigation pressure
- Benefit of MSA over stand-alone: Stand-alone ends up being modified repeatedly
- FS involvement can vary: lowest level is review and ROD, arrangement is flexible
- Third-party analysis is inefficient if the FS ends up re-writing specialist reports
 - o Trust develops over time with presence in the community and local knowledge
- LOs need to prioritize third-party NEPA capacity: other agencies regularly contract
 - o Creates more family-wage jobs *if* there is a suite of work, rather than one-off jobs
- Concerns about third-party NEPA threatening agency jobs: some involvement needed to reach pace and scale
 - o Agency culture shift is occurring; trust and relationship building are critical

Day 1 Closing Thoughts (Sheri Elliott)

- SCALE began by addressing more trivial issues, some of which have been overcome and some of which are still being discussed due to their complexity and require collective effort, but has paved the way for rich conversations
- The original vision of a collaboration of collaboratives is being practiced, helping groups avoid the same mistakes and be solution-oriented in addressing challenges; need to stay engaged
- The regional approach creates a space for fewer groups to come together and dive deeper into issues, increasing SCALE's involvement with smaller groups, engage with Forest Supervisors

Day 2

Introduction of Day 2

- Recent RLF meeting convened political actors, practitioners, researchers, and others to generate a forest health-related message to the incoming governor
 - o Focus on safety and public health, climate change, built infrastructure
 - o Create a governor's office czar to direct and coordinate agencies
- *Barriers*: siloed agency staff; limited FS active mgmt.; lack of interagency coordination; lack of on-the-ground capacity; limited understanding of harvesting economics; lack of infrastructure; lack of a unified voice for action
- *Potential solutions*: more broad-based spending of GHG funds (e.g., small-scale bioenergy facilities); workforce development/youth involvement in active management
- Next steps are to generate a policy frame that address these issues, incorporate solutions
- CAL FIRE convening stakeholders regionally to synthesize management practices and policies to feed into the Governor's Forest Management Task Force (FMTF)
- Is there a link between the RLF meeting effort and the FMTF?
 - o Not currently, policy is a critical next step to maintain momentum
 - o Processes are new, collaboratives have to help keep things moving
 - o Distrust toward agencies and urbanites still exists in rural communities
- Lessons learned from Governor Brown's Tree Mortality Task Force: partner groups should hold agencies responsible to evaluate past progress

Integrating Economic, Environmental, and Community Interests for Triple Bottom Line Projects

- Triple bottom line = ecological/environmental, social/equity, economic
 - o American West After the Timber Wars has some good papers about this
- Equity involves generational approach, requires educational component
 - o Camptonville's Forest Biomass Business Center working to get youth from disappearing family pot farms into forest related work
 - o 34 North started competition in Sierra Nevada where students produce ideas about creating economies and restoring forests (different from state-wide Forestry Challenge)
- Infrastructure to economize by-products ecological restoration not there
 - o Northwest Economic Adjustment Initiative invested in worker re-training but not land so no jobs. Now there is investment in land but no infrastructure or human capital.
 - o A lot of money now so there is an opportunity to do it all and avoid the same mistakes
- Local difficult for FS to determine, workforce lacks capacity to do the work needed
 - o What is local?: folks live/work/shop within sphere of benefit
 - o Difficult to take advantage of money coming in, have solid core of people but hard to build on when infrastructure is gone, forced to hire outside of area because lack capacity in own communities

- Best value: FS conceptually appreciates local benefit but reality is migrant crews do work for less than half the price of paying local crew a living wage, FS still figuring out what it means in context of agency culture
- Need agency to commit to time scope that allows for investment in professional jobs
 - Vulnerable to agency budget, AQM have not succeeded despite regional forester's letter supporting local
- RCD mechanisms and contracting
 - Placer RCD has contract where they can sub-contract to get CEQA done
 - North Coast RCDs working on MOU to share limited resources, would allow FS agreements with one RCD to contract regionally, dispute over administrator RCD could be a potential challenge
 - A subcommittee will explore this to present at the next SCALE meeting
 - Comment: political will is at a point that is allowing conversations of longer term collaborative sustainability
- Funding
 - A little consistent funding for basic equipment and a small staff would be more beneficial than big pots of money to do specific and limited projects
 - Gaps: collaborative process, ongoing monitoring beyond project time and area
 - Possibility of using retained receipts for collaborative facilitation
 - FS starting to build in monitoring, maintenance e.g. prescribed fire 5 years down the road
 - Agencies can be limited in getting funding out the door in time, collaboratives can help forests develop long term plans that build credibility and encourage funding from agency, and reduce turn-around time
 - E.g. integrated multi-year plan on Six Rivers
 - 2018 Appropriations Bill requires budget restructuring

Connecting Forest Restoration to Community Development Innovations and Opportunities for Landscape Scale Restoration

Mike Senn (Deputy Regional Director, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, USFWS)

- Recent MOU between FS, Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI), NFWF
 - Emphasis on fuelbreaks/fuels management and shared resources (e.g., surveys)
 - Together, FS and SPI own 90% of land base in the Sierra Nevada
 - SPI mapped all in-progress and planned fuelbreaks in service of this effort
- USFWS will make a listing decision on the California spotted owl (CSO) in 2019
 - Greatest threats to the CSO today are barred owl and catastrophic wildfire
 - Agreements committing to on-the-ground work can be considered in listing decision; NFWF will release an RFP to fund NEPA in areas important to CSO
- USFWS also working on a programmatic biological opinion for the Klamath NF
 - Targets activities likely to impact northern spotted owl (NSO)

- Analyze treatments ahead of time (shaded fuelbreaks); only actions not covered in the biological opinion would be analyzed for individual projects
- Should decrease time needed for consultation (depending on intensity of impact)
- Important to implement a project quickly under this to demonstrate success
- The task of forest restoration at pace and scale exceeds Federal agency capacity, USFWS leadership role decreasing; collaboratives critical in helping agencies meet missions
- No Landscape Conservation Cooperatives (LCC) in California currently, money invested in pre-listing conservation efforts
- Other USFWS successes: statewide programmatic biological opinion for Southern California Edison covers the majority of utility line maintenance actions
 - Mitigation actions no longer vary by office which expedites implementation

Scott Russell (Forest Supervisor, Shasta-Trinity National Forest)

- Scott Russell is the former Chief Executive, Four Forest Restoration Initiative (4FRI)
- 4FRI is a collaborative effort to restore northern AZ forests on a large-scale, 20-year effort from initial conversations
 - Followed impactful fires and political will for restoration
 - FS primary funder, partners supplemented, awarded CFLR funds, success attracted funds
 - Included six FS coordinators, planning team, and 65 organizations
 - Collaborative members helped ID goals and complement capacity, had conversations at every level to avoid conflict
 - Strategic plan defined roles and responsibilities, actions for each element of work
 - Used FS short and long term plans and data layers to inform prioritization
 - Goals to treat 2.5 million acres and increase public engagement in forest management; treat 50k acres mechanically and additional 100k with prescribed fire for 20 years
- Challenges
 - Operating at a landscape-scale required standing up multiple pieces at once
 - Industry capacity lacking and needed to be expanded dramatically
 - Economics of material value and haul distances
- Successes
 - Developed strong social consensus crucial for collaborative effort
 - Large-scale NEPA: 1 million acre EIS completed, 1.5 million acres in progress
 - 130-150k Rx fire/year, shifting views to perceive fire starts as opportunities
 - Strong multiparty monitoring implemented with sound structure using CFLRP funds: social focused on variables that needed to be assessed to maintain consensus, treatments intensified in second EIS to produce desired stand conditions
- Takeaways
 - Landscape scale requires more than extrapolating status quo operations; approaches have to change fundamentally
 - Collaborative efforts require long-term thinking and commitments

- There was not a handful of critical people: FS created capacity outside regular scope of work but time and energy limiting; some partners hired full-time staff for 4FRI
- Focused on sustaining organization involvement regardless of personnel turnover

Landscape scale group discussion

- Congressman Huffman's (CA) lands bill: 500k acre area
- Scale at which fire is
 - Carr Fire may have redefined this and may be unpredictable in the future; fires don't stay at the watershed level anymore
- Hour and a half driving time for anybody attending meetings
- Counties artificial boundaries to coordinate across
- Nested levels: large-scale conversations narrow down into specific regional work
- Eco-region, keystone species' ranges
 - Efficiencies and economies of scale
- Haul distance is always an issue
- Definition of landscape scale may differ between planning and implementation
 - From an implementation POV, every acre is critical in reducing susceptibility
 - Landscape scale view assists with planning, but projects are always place-based
 - Common vernacular is important: a "project area" could be quite large (e.g., a County) with discrete "treatments" (traditionally thought of as "projects")
- How can we touch the treatment backlog by operating at a small scale?
 - Collaboratives struggle to define how many acres need treatment and at what pace
 - Need to consider capacity in planning goals and landscape objectives
 - Groups should be cognizant of the scale at which they can build social consensus
 - Efficiencies emerge when planning at large scale, but also need more people, communication, coordination

California's Investment in Forest Health and Fire Prevention (Joy Tucker)

- Joy works in the CALFIRE region headquarters in Redding,
- There is \$119 million in grants available for northern region (above Santa Cruz/Amador)
 - When CCI started there was \$9 million available statewide
 - \$155 million per year for the next 5 years is already approved
 - California Climate Investment (CCI) new name for Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund started with cap and trade funding
 - Forest Health grants and Fire Prevention grants funded from same pot but have different applications
 - No designated proportion of funds for each type of grant, no limit per project
 - 5 million for Urban and Community Forestry Program, 3 million for research only including grad students
- Forest Health program: fuels reduction, fire, pest management, biomass utilization, research (includes additional application), and Forest Legacy Program/easements – big picture focus

- Greenhouse gas emission must be ready when application is submitted, concept proposal no longer required
- Generally looking for larger projects
- Fire Prevention: fuels reduction, education, planning – integration is encouraged
 - Must impact State Responsibility Areas but work can be done on other land
 - Projects generally smaller than Forest Health projects
 - Application process less rigorous and expensive than Forest Health
- Applications include request tracking ID, scope of work, timeline, budget, narrative, maps: answer the who what when where why
- Timeline
 - Fire Prevention application due Dec. 19th, Forest Health application due Jan. 29th
 - CEQA must be done within 12 months of grant execution
 - Last day for implementation March 15th 2022 for Fire Prevention projects, March 30th 2022 for Forest Health projects
 - Last invoice and final paperwork due 30 days after
- Tips/recap
 - Overbudget for CEQA so leftovers can be used for project administration
 - CALFIRE crews may not be available for work so budget for private contractors
 - Projects can be divided into phases with separate grants to stay within timeline i.e. first planning, then implementation
 - SB901 may preclude CEQA on federal land, Secretary of Natural Resources must sign each year
 - A percentage of funds must be spent in designated Disadvantaged and Low Income communities, this will not be the deciding factor in grants being awarded either way
 - Environmental compliance: if applicant is public agency, assumes lead role, if not CALFIRE is lead agency
 - Progress report required with every invoice, will likely be simple template
 - Next round there will be support for greenhouse gas calculations and will go back to concept proposal to help distribute number of applicants in each category; right now calculations being done by CALFIRE for fire prevention project

Meeting Wrap-Up

Sierra Institute action items:

- Synthesize reflections from the “defining a collaborative” conversations
- Convene a subcommittee to examine the Cal Fire/Placer RCD contracting mechanism
- Create materials/information sharing opportunities related to financial management/funding
- Explore the issue of workforce development and potential deliverables in this realm
- Explore opportunities for use of retained receipts for non-traditional applications