**Meeting Participants**

Steve Wilensky

Susan McMorris

Dennis Lewis

Addie Jacobsen

Jim Carroll

Eric Kleinfelter

Johanna Atmann

Amy Rocha

Kathy Hardy

Susan Skalski

Rick Hopson

Bill Haigh

Peter Zaragoza

Kent Smith

Tim Tate

John Heissenbuttel

Teresa McClung

Matt Waverly

Katherine Evatt

John Hoffmann

Rick Breeze-Martin

Gerald Schwartz

Jan Bray

**Admin Workgroup** – None

**Planning Workgroup** – Planning workgroup meeting took place recently. Asking for concurrence on two projects that were run through the planning group. Hemlock Landscape Restoration Project and Native Plant Enhancement at Big Meadow.

Native Plant/Habitat Restoration Project – Small meadow restoration on Big Meadow. Reducing encroaching conifers and reducing wildfire risk. Due for implementation this fiscal year under Cornerstone. Project is not to exceed 20 acres. Some work with Native American crews has already been done.

The other project is more complex. Hemlock Landscape Restoration project is in the early planning phase of a landscape scale restoration incorporating numerous prescriptions across varying conditions. Early in the planning stages of this project. Looking for concurrence on the planning operations. Scheduled for 2014 implementation, two year NEPA process. Seeking concurrence, planning group is recommending.

**CONCURRENCE** on both projects.

Monitoring was discussed during the meeting. Tentative monitoring meeting on July 5th. Kendal will send out announcements. Craig Thomas and Becky Estes will participate and Kendal will initiate.

ACCG/Forest Service Field Trip – 25 participants, of which more than half were ACCG members. Talk with other members to get updates on the project. This was for the West Calaveras Plantation Thinning, the first project where ACCG is in place on the front-end of the project.

Next Meeting is scheduled for July. Kendal will coordinate the meeting for July 25th.

**Finance Workgroup** – Did not meet

**Operations Workgroup** – Jan and John met this morning. Not a whole lot to report. One of the things committed to was following up with Dylan Thomas at CCC to define private lands adjacent to public lands. John has a call into him and will follow-up. Pre-Fire Engineer at CalFire is updating the information in the fire plan for the West Point Battalion. Will coordinate with Kendal to incorporate ACCG components and information. Once we have some projects identified within our area they would like to get together with Forest Service to take a look at them and gain an understanding of what needs to be done.

**Discussion on Master Stewardship Agreement – RBM**

Review workflow graphic, solicit feedback, and wrap-up with next steps.

Cornerstone Initiated in 2010. We decided to go after it, doing a lot of work over the holidays which resulted in a proposal being submitted. Talked with Region 5 regarding back-end details, which included discussions on ensuring local benefit, maximizing collaborative component. Teresa McClung provided material relative to MSA. RBM and Jim Junette developed a draft using the current template. This was in place back in June. In the fall of 2011 we received word that Cornerstone would be funded.

There is an MSA workgroup that has been meeting with Region 5, both forests, and ACCG members. The workgroup developed key principles and a workflow to move it forward. ACCG approved a preamble to the MSA at a meeting earlier this year. Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation had liability issues under MSA relative to fire that needed to be addressed. Trinity RCD had the experienced that the work did not end up staying local, and this was attributed to the RCD not being explicit in stating this as a requirement. There were also concerns as to whether or not this is the proper instrument. MSA is the only agreement forest service has that will go past five years. The downside is that the concept of MSA is new and there are very few models to go by.

One of the desired outcomes was extensive collaboration on project design and monitoring, as well as ensuring local benefit in terms of the work made available.

SNC currently working through technical issues and hope to provide further understanding as to any potential role.

USFS Region 5 is also key principal partner.

MSA is an instrument that permits moving money from project to project, enabling more of an enterprise approach. Over time, the MSA has no project; it is simply a legal framework for how projects will be done. Each project would be covered under a Supplemental Project Agreement (SPA). The SPA could be any number of methods, including stewardship contract, service contract, timber sale etc.

Best value is understood as highest balance of triple bottom line. Forest service staff and the ACCG planning workgroup would identify and start planning the work. Next step would be addressing NEPA. Once those are in place the planning workgroup would review and adjust the plan as needed. Implementation plan would follow consistent with the NEPA document.

If capacity is not available, cooperator would seek out resources to complete the project. This could relate to contractor availability or technical capability.

Implementation would be followed by monitoring and reporting out under the agreed upon framework.

MSA Draft has been made available. Kellie Hamilton at R5, Rick Breeze-Martin, and John Hoffman are the commenters.

Burney-Hat Creek may have some input in to the discussion.

Need to define how we proceed, solicit feedback, take in comments and define next steps. Next USFS meeting on MSA is July 10th. ACCG MSA meeting will take place prior to this meeting. The desired outcome is to provide the forests with a working document before July 10th.

Some concern expressed relative to having a State Agency as the principal. Desire to establish ACCG as a formal organization. Also noted was that someone with administrative capacity is necessary.

Planning and budgeting has to include an administrative component. We are being looked at as a model for CFLRP projects, Burney Hat Creek is looking to ACCG and interested in how this works out.

Looking at the scope under the preamble, we may not want to bring up other agencies as this agreement would not apply to BLM or other USDOI lands. Reiterated that this agreement is forest service/cornerstone, while the USDOI entities would have a companion MSA. There will be projects where coordination across jurisdictions is required.

CalFire thousand acre demonstration forest may be of interest in terms of inter-jurisdictional projects. Possibilities are presented relative to multi-ownership, that various agencies and organizations can reciprocate agreements. This is something we have come across relative to the NEPA work. This gives us a whole new set of possibilities, so the agreement should be written broadly enough to provide the maximum level of opportunities.

This reflects a ten-year plan, but only a conceptual list of projects. SPA documents will address specific projects. May not be appealable but there are separate actions available. NEPA can still be appealed, but protests for contracts take a different method.

Formal ranking system is necessary to avoid any conflict among contractors under the MSA.

ACCG and ACCABU have equal standing under MSA.

Important to note there are a lot of different methods under the agreement. There will be numerous avenues to access work, including some conventional contracting. Adding choices, options and flexibility under the umbrella agreement.

Clarify how entities gain membership. Interested parties should remit a letter requesting membership, and the group will endorse at which point the MOA must be signed.

There are two out of county operators that are interested…how do they get access. ACCABU is centered in Amador and Calaveras, but will access out of area operators on occasion and as needed. Question raised as to why out of area operators cannot access work when El Dorado County is partly contained in Cornerstone Project area. Group decided early on to focus the work in Amador and Calaveras, centered around the Mokelumne and Calaveras watersheds.

Forest service has a lot of discovery to still do, and local forests need to understand this more specifically. Concerns expressed over excluding out of county operators. Trying to support local industry needs to consider out of area operators. If we have crossed county lines we need to take a look at things affecting or possibly impacting out of area operators.

Suggested that out of county work be made available to not only ACCG contractors but also out of area work where another County has capacity in terms of contractors.

K. Evatt reads MOA language relative to Membership.

Definition of local needs work…seems to exclude others who are seen by some folks as local. “lives or works” is clarifying statement. Planning, operations and ACCABU need to address governance, and separately once there is work available what we consider local must be defined.

Pointed out that over the last few years there hasn’t been enough work available to keep local contractors busy. Now with projects coming up it is problematic to open the door to all operators.

Bottom line is if contractors are interested then tell them to join ACCG.

This is an ongoing process….Forest Service will continue working through the details. Also need to determine if CFLR funding goes in under MSA or does it go elsewhere for distribution?

Send comments on the MSA to Rick Breeze-Martin.

**SCALE - Wilensky**

Working to find a date that there could be a joint meeting with BHC and ACCG. There have been some interesting developments. They ran out of administrative funds for Kusel’s role in the BHC process, although he took on a new job on a 14 million acre consideration for the northern spotted owl, and has been contracted to introduce the social and community impacts of such a move, and has a short timeframe to get that work done. Therefore he asked for postponement in late July. He made a presentation to RCRC, with the goal being as we talked about TBL, this is discussed in all such considerations.

Kusel and Wilensky are working up a draft, which was sent to Dinkey, which is to add a social and community piece into their work. Also working to incorporate metrics into a baseline report which would be presented to all three collaboratives (Dinkey, ACCG, and BHC.) If we do this right, the policy around TBL will be supported by actual measurable items. Anticipate completion in August.

Question of Dinkey, BHC and ACCG coming together under SCALE. No formal response from Dinkey at this point, but BHC is interested in exploring that level of partnership and cooperation. We have also asked if the MSA draft can be sent out to the other collaboratives. BHC has the document, will be transmitted to Dinkey. Each of these groups were founded on different things, with Dinkey resulting from ESA and Fisher. BHC developed TBL approaches but they are predominantly focused on a private-public series of projects across jurisdictions. Each of these will have a different take on MSA. Discussion continues relative to monitoring and evaluation of projects under CFLR and other avenues. What are the monitoring requirements and where will the funding come from?

ACCG has been provided with information from Dinkey relative to their monitoring approaches. Trying to integrate.

ACCG does not have a draft monitoring plan at this point. It is a required component of CFLR and will eventually be developed. Something will be available for the group in august.

**NFF Funding**

Matching Awards Program. Problem relative to providing match funds in the form of a check. Rick Breeze-Martin is working with Vance Russell, and has a contact relative to the Coca Cola foundation.

**Mokelumne Cost Avoidance Project**

Met recently, and John is getting clarification on where they are headed. They are focused on criteria for evaluating grants. Somewhat unclear as to how that criteria would be utilitized, at least at his point they are developing criteria. Potential for evaluating projects. Relates to an environmental benefits accounting structure. Pairing projects with funders who derive some form of benefit. The environmental benefits group and cost avoidance projects are separate efforts with some overlap. End game is to match up dollars to projects.

Cost Avoidance Group is developing models to establish some degree of scientific certainty. The main item is sediment deposition…developing models to determine how much sediment would come from a wildfire, compared to sediment from a treated area post fire. Models are in development, and these are not on the ground measurements. Second set of models are relating to fuel treatments, which show how fuel treatments relate to a high probability fire area. Have already developed and are refining high probability and high risk areas for fire. An area that has low probability of burning would therefore rank lower. What kind of fuel treatments would protect certain areas are also being incorporate into the models.

Suggest that the group contact others in the country who are doing this week. Some think they still have a good understanding of the national efforts. Suggest there be more cross-pollination between the groups. There is some nexus between us and them now. When we look at the maps and models it may help guide the work of ACCG.

**SPI/CBD/BV**

Steve received a letter regarding SPI piles being used for Buena Vista.

SPI wishes to sell 935 BDT to BV biomass. This is generated from tops and small diameter trees produced in 2011 in an operation designed to produce a shaded fuel break on Shake Ridge Road.

Tim Tate requested a delegation from ACCG to inspect piles.

Craig Thomas referenced an acreage limit, but that is not the case. CBD has been contacted and advised ACCG to proceed under its preexisting framework for pile inspection. Multi-disciplinary team for pile inspection needed.

**CONSENSUS DECISION**: Form group. Members to include Steve Wilensky, Katherine Evatt, Brianna Creekmore, Arvada Fisher as alternate, Rick Hopson going to assign Amador RD staff. Peter Zaragoza

**Forest Supervisors – Budget for FY2013**

Budget direction for FY13. Good news there is some funding identified for each of CFLR projects, although this is coming out of the forest budgets. Region was generous in the redistributing of funds out of the forests’ budgets. Two more weeks to provide initial response to the regional office to relay concerns. Response from the forests will reflect the understanding upon which the Cornerstone project was entered into.

EDNF feels like they can fund some level of contracting out of their budget,. This is just the first budget, and there will be multiple rounds of dialog before a final budget is arrived upon. Forests are beholden to congress generally for funding.

Both forests have been talking. Kathy and Susan delivered at a regional meeting the statement the collaboratives don’t exist simply to fund forest service staff, but to create jobs locally. Former budget officer retired, and new person is in place. Instructed forests to provide all this feedback in the response to the budget proposal. One idea was whether or not a letter from ACCG would be appropriate. Suggest holding off on that until further understanding is made.

Seen by some as a breech of trust and violation of existing agreements. Seen as inconsistent with most conversations that have taken place. We all need to be ready to move as one in support of the ACCG’s values, supporting existing agreements and advocating for adherence to previously established goals.

QLG has been looking for further funding. There has been some movement in congress relative to this and there has been talk of recent actions by congress. We may want to check in with CFLR collation to see of this is happening elsewhere. Katherine talked with TNC and they have not heard about this happening nationally.

There is a lot we can do together and with our allies to make this right. We do see these kinds of things periodically, and assuming that its true one thing to consider that CFLR cannot be spent for NEPA, so if the forest has full funding for CFLR, but no NEPA, which has major implications for out year projects.

FY 2013 budget is still in the congressional process, and the initial budget could be reflective of specific members of congress trying to direct allocations of funding. Region 5 may be able to help ACCG to understand where the political pressure is originating.

This is a regional approach, and there is no indication that this carries over to all CFLR projects throughout the country. Do we want to delegate ACCG members to be available for drafting a letter?

Lassen NF is in the same place. It seems as though the Sierra NF is in the same boat.

Potential increase in FY 2013 budget nationally to address hazardous fuel reductions.

ACTION: Delegation assigned to be available for response letter. Members include Heissenbuttel, Katherine, and Wilensky.

Should also determine where CFLR funding for FY2013 stands in congressional process.

**Partner Updates**

Calaveras RD – Kendal Young to address NEPA/CEQA crosswalk on JKuly 25th.

Coca Cola Grant Project – Meadow restoration in Indian Valley. Pass through funds to NFWF to do pond and plug project with Plumas Corp.

Bill Haigh taking temporary assignment in DC. Jim Eicher will be acting as BLM Motherlode Field Manager.

CFLR Coalition is working on annual report, Cathy Koos-Breazeal to be profiled in the annual report.

Kent Smith – Over the next few months DFG is rolling out the concept of updating strategic plan, current plan is from 1995. Series of legislative actions for DFG, a lot of good direction that came out of that.

Product yard in Wilseyville moving forward, walk around with CCWD and surveyors. ACCABU addressed a variety of folks that have asked to join, accepted everyone except Tim Borges, as he is in El Dorado county, although there is an understanding they will work together.

Institute for Conservation Leadership 2012 award program. Get literature from Rick. Fall event Thursday September 15th. June 29th submittal deadline for award nominations.