**Participants:**

Steve Hollett - CalFire

Steve Wilensky – Calaveras County Supervisor

Doug Barber – Concerned Citizen

Bill Haigh – BLM Motherlode Field Manager

Pat McGreevy – Calaveras Parks and Recreation Commissioner

Jim Carroll – West Point Fire District

Shelly Blair – CA Dept of Fish and Game

Matt Waverly – Sierra Pacific Industries

Marilyn Conner – Motherlode Job Training

Teresa McClung – Stanislaus NF Calaveras District Ranger

Susan Skalski – Stanislaus NF Forest Supervisor

Susan McMorris – Blue Mountain Community Renewal Council

Kimberly Grissom – Blue Mountain GIS

John Hoffman – Consultant to Amador County

John Heissenbuttel – Heissenbuttel Natural Resource Consulting

Bob Caroll – Eldorado NF Amador RD

Rick Hopson – Eldorado NF Amador District Ranger

Paul Maben – Pacific Gas and Electric Co.

Charles Jonard – Concerned Citizen

Katherine Evatt – Foothill Conservancy

Rick Breeze-Martin - CHIPS

Amy Rocha - NRCS

Warren Alford – Sierra Forest Legacy

Gerald Schwartz – East Bay MUD

Robert Smith – Smith Grinding and ACCABU

Tim Borges – Borges Timber Company

John Romena – Buena Vista Biomass Power LLC

**Edit to notes**: Kendall Young is the new lead on the Planning Workgroup. Rick Breeze-Martin to work with Kendal on transitioning CFLRP workgroup into the planning workgroup.

**Administrative Workgroup Update:**

Training survey to be completed today.

**Planning Workgroup:**

Forest Policies – Sent a copy of the recommendation for the planning workgroup. These are the practices and policies for the CFLRP projects. We had adopted the document back in 2010. Over several meetings the workgroup looked over the CFLRP Cornerstone and the principles documents, and adjustments were suggested to reflect more accurately the groups intentions.

Two primary things. One recommended change was in the natural environment policy, and there is a bullet added that addresses wildlife corridor connectivity, habitat, etc. Adds language…see draft. Mainly relating to biodiversitry and species at risk. In the section on communications, bullet added to enhance appropriate recreational activities.

Concern was expressed about modifying principles based on projects. Projects should be evaluated against the principles. Some concen over modifying principles to fit projects. Text seems to already be incorporated in the existing principles document. Species at risk is not a defined term per statute, so it is unclear what exactly that means. We must think seriously about changing principles.

Projects should be tested against the principles, at the same time the principles are a living document, and activities or projects may further inform the principles document. Principles should be informed from practice. There was an exhaustive review of recommendations and it was narrowed down considerably.

**ACTION: Send principles back to planning WG, draw in those who were previously involved, require everyone to review and revisit at the next meeting.**

First thing was a definition of what the projects should be evaluated against. Found this somewhat difficult to use based purely on the order of things. Numerous statements on adaptive management were present for example. Two principles related to fuels reduction are included, but they are not adjacent to each other. Some changes to the organization of the principles document seemed necessary to the WG members. Redundancy and repetition is somewhat of an issue. Look at the order of the items and principles and consider the arrangement.

**ACTION: John Heissenbuttel to be included in the discussion. Kendal to reconvene the WG to address this.**

Next item is the planning workgroup workplan. Looking at the dinkey creek workplan, it was a one-pager with tables behind it. Looked also at what was required. Doesn’t have to be 100% detailed for the full ten years. Has to be done this year, and the earlier the better.

Dinkey has done ecological, community, and economic benefits separate. ACCG approach is to incorporate all aspects and portray as TBL approach. File was sent out to all participants

John Hofmann has taken the lead on developing this item, and USFS has assisted in completing the tables. The focus is on getting something out versus super detailed. We will not get CFLR funds until this has been reviewed and approved by the regional office. When we approach the end of the fiscal year, planning for next year will be a different process using a different form and different estimates.

One concern expressed, in the ecological community and ecological sections, planned benefits, one of which is stated as minimize reliance on state and federal subsidies. Not something that has been fully vetted, was not part of the overall project description. Was placed in the document for purposes of discussion.

Not sure how to characterize the issue, and it was placed there for discussion purposes. Part of the overall objective is to be self-reliant. That fact that most material is not profitable, the goal is to establish business activity around the projects, but for the time-being things may need to be subsidized.

There are a lot of different ideas about what is going on here. It was expressed that after 30 years of neglect we are getting an appropriate investment of tax dollars. The word subsidy does not seem to fit. Ultimately, the goal is to have a renewed forest economy that is locally based and diversified in such a way that it can be long-lived and profitable.

Greater levels of community self-reliance may be a better way to frame this item. We may want consider the term investment versus the word subsidy.

The White Mountains project has a goal of reducing treatment costs per acre over time, because they have developed other value-added applications.

Document should reflect what we have all agreed to and what was included in the cornerstone proposal. Its needs to embody this.

Suggest pushing it back to the planning workgroup. It needs to be looked at by the regional office prior to the next ACCG meeting.

Self-reliance should be a focal point. Edits proposed to reflect greater community self reliance and community self-sustainability.

Proposed change to implementation approach section, last sentence, ACCG project intends to use a community based partnership through an MSA. Not sure full agreement has been reach on that, plus we may not want to tie our hands to that in the document. We can still move forward without tying everything to MSA.

Some folks would like to see MSA included. If ACCG does affirm that MSA is the intent, then it should stay.

May be putting USFS in a bind in the event that the MSA is not approved.

**ACTION: Strike portion of workplan relative to MSA.**

One of the difficulties of using only a one-page document is that it may miss some key pieces. Relationship between the projects we are doing and the downstream water interests should be characterized. Is it the priority to focus on projects that create the most local jobs? Goals for early work need to be addressed, including Native American projects.

Opinion expressed that if it is not in the cornerstone proposal, they should not be included. For this document we need to stick to what we agree on and what was submitted to the CFLRP.

The things on BLM property are priorities that are downstream. What integration with BLM within this? Need to reaffirm the things we have already agreed on.

The workplan is consistent with the overall vision for ACCG. Desire to be sure that all the work includes all the pieces of the equation.

Project Evaluation Form – As projects get submitted to us (right now we only have USFS, geared towards Cornerstone) the evaluation form can be submitted by any partner to request ACCG endorsement of projects both in and outside of cornerstone. Form consists of general descriptions of projects including all basic information on location, type, how it addresses TBL. Many of the projects are simply concepts at this point, which is why the form is fairly general in nature. This form is intended to give us an idea of the project so that ACCG can consider in the context of Cornerstone. How it matches with local and regional efforts are also a consideration. How does the project meet the All-lands goal for ACCG? Some things were shifted around within the same category.

Principles are a key consideration as part of the form. Rating system proposed to evaluate projects against values and principles. The scale is 1-5, and the principles are identical to what you saw in the previous item. Order changed slightly.

This is less about a screen than it is a mechanism to help guide the design and development of a project and ensure the projects come as close to the TBL as possible.

If there are significant concerns we may need to allow for more discussion. The intent was to introduce it here and if needed send it back to the planning WG.

We have a bunch of projects that we are ready to run through this evaluation process.

The form looks similar to what is in the annual reporting requirements for USFS. May want to consider melding them together. The more we can make the reporting requirements similar the better.

Once we have a document, the question of how it is going to be used is important. It may be delegated to the planning WG, but where it is divided decision it should come to the full group. Projects will be gathered by the planning workgroup and then send them up to ACCG for full consideration.

**ACTION: Include USFS reporting requirements into form.**

Similar to RAC, ACCG will be making recommendations to USFS for CFLR projects. RAC designation makes recommendations. Benefit of that is going to carry a lot of weight. Need to be sensitive to rules and limitations on FACA.

**CONSENSUS APPROVAL ON CLFRP WORKPLAN WITH CORRECTIONS RE: MSA AND CHANGING MINIMAL RELIANCE ON SUBSIDIES REFERENCE. APPROVED NO OPPOSITION**

Operations WG – NONE

Finance WG – NONE

**Old Business:**

Status of Cornerstone Implementation

Opportunities have come to Calaveras RD. Since CFLR award a lot of interest has been generated. One to consider is a conference that is happening next week in Reno titled the Cohesive Strategy Stakeholder Workshop, on the 27th for one day. Neither Teresa McClung or Rick Hopson can attend. NGA has agreed to fund one rep to go to the meeting. The primary goals are restoring and maintaining resilient landscapes, responding to wildfires, and others.

This ties back to an earlier activity around setting direction.

**ACTION: Check with SNC to see if anyone was available.**

USFS is involved with th Civilian Conservation Corps. The recently formed Veterans Green Corps CA Region got a million dollars to put toward the VGC crew…regional office first priority is to use funding to support CFLR. The crews do forest thinning work. Work to be done on non-Federal lands. Some concern around a work crew from out of the area taking work away from locals. Explore potential for veterans from the area to join the work crew.

ID both crew members and projects.

Systematic way to approach this would be working through county veterans affairs officers. These individuals maintain contacts with all veterans organizations in the Counties. Contact those folks and see what they can do to help.

It was suggested that this be run through the ACCABU.

Big push from the administration to work with veterans.

SW encourages ACCG to work through existing channels.

**ACTION: Operations Workgroup will take this item up and will work through existing veterans channels to spread the word and generate participation.**

**SCALE:**

Meeting in Auburn primarily devoted to figure out what kind of metrics might be developed to assess the community benefits of the CFLR and other work. Jonathan Kusel has written a document for the people at Dinkey to expand their TBL representation. That draft may become available. Steve added 26 different fields of information that will allow us to establish an existing community baseline. Those include all kinds of social indicators like unemployment, income, crime, poverty, and other statistics.

Request that we provide time in the next meeting to address this item. This is something that will be key to have in place early.

In West Point, 280 households were surveyed by the Blue Mountain Coalition for Youth and Families. This was a comprehensive survey relative to health and well-being. Results are pretty breathtaking. This was in 2005.

**ACTION: Request copy of study from Steve. Place on Agenda for April. Request Dinkey document from Jonathan Kusel.**

Hope is that we will adopt these things and prioritize what we want to keep track of and what not. Need to be sure that the region 5 social scientist should be included. Deb Whitehall is on assignment in New Mexico and may not be available for some time.

Social acceptance of work done is important to track as well.

There are currently three CFLRA projects. Burney Hat Creek, Dinkey, Cornerstone. Dinkey has not formally accepted the TBL, but we should try to develop their support for this.

**Steve Wilensky DC Trip:**

Steve attended the NACO conference. One meeting with Butch Blaser, Deputy Undersecretary of Forest Service, who has taken interest in ACCG. His request was “what do we need” aside from what is always going on. He requested letter outlining needs. He will also be traveling next month with Secretary Salazar. USDOI nexus to be drawn using the Salazar visit. He also expressed interest in Native American well-being and wants to help. Being specific about the 200+ sites in the Stanislaus and the Eldorado and how we might get to working all of that early as possible seems like something he would devote a lot of effort and resources towards. Third area is how do we administer ourselves as work broadens.

**ACTION: Steve to write letter to Butch Blazer regarding these issues in cooperation with planning workgroup.**

It was recommended Steve work with Planning Workgroup drafting that letter. Planning WG is into a lot of the details so the letter may be best served as part of their work.

Tentative Planning Workgroup meeting scheduled for Friday.

Also expressed interest in nexus to downstream users and TBL issues. It was also suggested he may be key to supporting continued funding of CFLRP.

**Master Stewardship Agreement:**

There is movement on this, but it was not a key part of the discussion on the CFLR. There has not been a consensus decision to support an MSA. Early on this was brought to the group for consideration. One of the early concerns was to make the work as local as possible. ACCG wanted to do this in a stewardship arrangement, and folks have been talking about MSA. A number of folks have expressed concern that this was never vetted by the group.

RBM sent out a matrix of contracting tools and methodologies. MOA’s, service agreements, stewardship contracts and agreements.

Recommendation from USFS region 5 folks was to enter into a MSA,. It appears that to get the broadest collaboration for the ACCG and USFS it is the MSA. This will provide a legal framework to provide stewardship agreements or other details within the context of this overarching guiding document. It offers the widest ability to collaborate and move money around.

For an MSA to work effectively, we need to be very clear on the intent.

Members can reference notes from the earlier meeting on MSA, which have been distributed. Items to incorporate are reflected there.

Doris Broussard suggested on writing a statement of intent, and then she could advise on most feasible method to put forward.

Need to consider what the stewardship agreement will not do.

**ACTION: Send statement of intent to Doris Broussard and solicit feedback on appropriate contracting methodology.**

This should not hinder progress on the cornerstone project. There is some concern that we need something that will maximize the ACCG’s intent relative to collaboration and that will ensure the economic benefits stay local. Sooner this happens the more functional we can become.

Widest collaboration and the local benefits are key considerations.

Best value contracting provisions in stewardship contracting could be more of a consideration. There is a gentleman that works for Forest Service in PNW and he may be available to come down and do a presentation.

Question relative to contracting activities and options in the absence of the MSA.

USFS is held to a number of laws and regulations that must be followed.

**ACTION: Schedule follow-up meeting. Subgroup will follow-up on action items from the last meeting.**

**Mokelumne Watershed Avoided Cost Study:**

Study was originally perceived about getting investments from downstream users, but more so how do we channel the investments currently being made by understanding the costs to be avoided if the management changed or was redirected.

John Hofmann attended a recent meeting along with others from ACCG. Decided to form a steering committee. Technical group will also be formed, and they are looking for people. Consulting group will advise on this as well. An RFP will be sent out to put someone in charge of the project.

Concerns include that they want to tie this into cornerstone, could be good or bad by adding one more element to overall equation. If it conflicts with something ACCG is doing it could be problematic.

Also, brings a question into mind that SNC is a key sponsor to do the study.

Would being principal to the study be conflict with SNC being pulled in two directions. A little undefined generally, as far as whose costs they are trying to avoid and who they want to guide. Still needs some definition.

Susan Skalski and Bill Haigh attended the meeting. The funding is there to do a cost avoidance study primarily related to fire. At the first meeting folks came up with who was missing, but a lack of background shared for new arrivals. Cost avoidance form a fire perspective is the key consideration. RFP is being let; short timeframe study must be completed by end of the year.

Original draft RFP for this is focused on fire. Participants were urged to look at other stressors in the watershed and sources of sediment, for example roads. Some were not aware that the primary principle focus was fire.

**ACTION: Request Kim Carr come to do a presentation on this.**

**CONSENSUS DECISION: Support CFLR Coalition Advocacy.**

**CONSENSUS DECISION: The Nature Conservancy accepted as an MOA Signatory**

**Wilseyville Sort Yard - TSS Consultants – Tad Mason:**

Tad’s presentation and the feasibility study are available on the ACCG Blog.

**Buena Vista Biomass LLC:**

Repair of the turbine has been completed and it has been reinstalled. Generator core is being repaired and should be returning sometime next month. There is a meeting this Friday to get more information.

BV will start burning wood in the boiler to continue testing boiler and other components. April 15th they will start taking in fuel again.

CHIPS has been working at Buena Vista doing painting and other tasks.

**Steve Wilensky**

We have been talking about how we can test the pellet mill that Charles Jonard brought. Bruce Goines has contacts who are interested in potentially helping out with that.

Secondly, rather tragic event, Cathy Rodriguez who has been attending for CIMC and a big part of CHIPS has passed away following an accident about three weeks ago.

**NRCS – Amy Rocha:**

Under the new Bay-Delta initiative NRCS received combination of $28M to the area, and includes a large portion of the state. Amy put in a $500K ACCG request for ACCG area, but it wasn’t high enough priority for the reviewers. Another go around in August-September for 2013 money. It was recommended that a new proposal not come through Amy but rather through partners.

NRCS has been hearing emphasis on Mokelumne watershed and ACCG area. Feels if strong proposal comes through from this area it will compete. EQIP projects have been funded.

Amy trhing to talk with supervisor to flush out a little bit of money for workshops for conservation technical assistance on private lands, to draw in private landowners to participate.

**Rick Breeze-Martin:**

Working with Shawn Garvey (SNC Contractor) and the Grant Farm on the WBUG for technical assistance on facility at Wilseyville, and also working with ACCABU RBEG grant. That includes self loader for small diameter trees and another one is to get another processor. Third is a feasibility plan for the business investments on the greenhouse operation.

Working on a proposal to Steve doing the connections with the county and others including the Tuolumne Economic Development Authority identified in the CEDS. That would permit us to go after EDA funding.

Extension granted on partnership between forest service and BMCRC/CHIPS through June. RBM will be transitioning into other tasks as this item comes to a close. Rick Will donate time on the MSA, wrap-up stuff with CHIPS and the ACCABU.

**ACTION: Agendize backfill for RBM services in the future.**

**-----------**

**NEXT MEETING IN AMADOR COUNTY ON APRIL 18th**