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**Previous meeting notes:** Two changes to previous meeting notes: Remove statement relative to SPI joining the group once work becomes available, and replace the word ‘re-characterize’ with understood under the MSA discussion thread.

**Admin Workgroup** – Set the agenda. Nothing further.

**Planning Workgroup** - 9:00am in Jackson on the 25th for the planning workgroup meeting. Meeting will take place at the Amador GSA building on Airport Road.

**Finance Workgroup** – Did not meet

**Operations Workgroup** – Discussion and determination that “local” should be defined by the contractors. Local would be determined by a ranking checklist based on a number of factors, including experience and equipment capabilities. Priority contractor areas would include Tuolumne, Calaveras, Amador, El Dorado, and Alpine Counties.

As a group we need to work through the mechanism to include contractors from other counties. It was discussed however 100% consensus was not reached within the workgroup. Need to assess this matter in the context of the ACCG principles.

Robert Smith feels this issue should be addressed by the contractors’ workgroup. The original premise was to restore contractor capacity in Amador and Calaveras counties, and there is some concern about expanding this out to other counties.

Rick Breeze-Martin reiterated that any decision on contractors being included will definitely incorporate ACCABU. Steve Wilensky suggested that each group meet individually and present options to the full group at a later date.

Contractors’ group needs to be involved in the operations workgroup.

**ACTION**: Jan will summarize the discussion in the Operations group and distributing via email.

Concerns expressed about all the work going to Tuolumne contractors and defeating the original intent of keeping the work local and reinvigorating the timber operator economy within the Cornerstone Project area.

It was noted that Tuolumne contractors will often spend money in the county, including on fuel, supplies, lodging and materials.

Amador and Calaveras stakeholders have been the ones here since the beginning three and a half years ago. There will be other work in other areas of the forests that will be available for contractors in those counties. There is concern that now work is becoming available, people from out of the area are now coming around without having made any contributions to the process over the past 3 plus years.

Concerns expressed over how little work in taking place on the Stanislaus NF. When talking about limiting logging contractors, both Mokelumne watershed logging firms are kept pretty busy by SPI. Suggestion to utilize local operators first and then once they are at capacity seek out contractors from other areas. With the amount of work expected we will quickly reach beyond the two counties. Another thing to keep in mind would be to urge the forest service to make more work available.

Important to remember how all of this came about. There was never any intention for the CFLR dollars to reduce the amount of activity in other areas of the forest.

Amador and Calaveras Ranger Districts have seen the least amount of activity when compared to other areas of the two forests. We can’t lose sight of the root purpose, and need to stay focused on increasing the positive economic impact in Amador and Calaveras.

There is no desire to go back to old paradigms, and the economic challenges in the area are consistent throughout the Sierra and not necessarily limited to Amador and Calaveras Counties.

Concerns expressed over exuding a sense of exclusivity.

Definition of local framed by the operations workgroup is fairly consistent with ongoing discussions. This includes a ranking mechanism. When there are not local contractors available, it is apparent that we would need to look outside the ACCG to get work done.

Discussion needs to be characterized as more of a prioritization as opposed to a limitation.

Contractors feel they should be in a lead role on the projects, and the contractors take the initiative on seeking out additional resources as needed. If the contractors group doesn’t have a say in projects the purpose overall comes into question. Amador and Calaveras county operators need to have a say in how the work rolls out, and they acknowledge that they will not be able to do all the work themselves. Contractors group needs to have some level of control, along with ACCG, in putting the work out there.

Need to reconcile ACCABU and ACCG principles and polices, MOA’s, MOU’s, etc. ACCABU is a signed member of ACCG and has endorsed the MOA. New members have been signed on, including the Oneto Group and Vicini Brothers Green Material Recycling. There are still many issues to discuss and this needs to be addressed at length in the Planning/MSA/Operation workgroups combined.

Encourage the forest service to send contractors to the ACCG and ACCABU. Two solutions needed, one of which is to get contractors to sign the MOA and define local.

We need to be sure that work taking place within the project area does not have a negative impact on what is going on outside the project area. Need to develop a better understanding of how we tier the contractors issue to be ACCG members, in-area contractors, and out of area contractors.

Concerns expressed by Forest Service about excluding in –county contractors who may not have signed the MOA. Any work inside the master stewardship should be focused on local contractors.

There are potentially four signatories to the MSA, Eldorado and Stanislaus forests, Region 5, and ACCG.

Two forests met last week and will meet again on the 23rd regarding the MSA. SPI sent comments in on the MSA and those will be addressed at next week’s work session. Hoping the July 23rd forest service meeting will provide more detail on the MSA and where the forests stand on that. Rick Hopson explained there are still a number of discussions that need to take place within the Forest Service. Next step is seen as going back to the original principles and be sure we are still aligned.

Collaborative and Cornerstone project are the central components, with MSA being a secondary item. We cannot lose sight of the importance of these central items.

Forest service is still reviewing the MSA language. Local issue is one of the more challenging components. Forest service is moving forward, but cautiously. Don’t anticipate being finished with this on the 25th.

Question on Davis Bacon and whether or not it needs to included. It will likely not be in the MSA but will be included in the SPA’s.

**SCALE**

Jonathan Kusel is working on a report relative to the community impacts of the spotted owl issue, and has completed that document. Brandon will locate that document and make it available to the group. Local considerations are a focal point in the study.

Burney-Hat Creek and the Dinkey collaborative have had some conversations, with Dinkey being primarily focused on fisher habitat. They are trying to development a community component. All three CFLR projects are ready to start working together on the community impacts. Potential for Dinkey to combine with a similar effort in North Fork, which could result in the Dinkey group looking more like ACCG.

Joint meeting of the three groups proposed for September. Steve Wilensky is asking for concurrence on hosting this meeting, as the ACCG area is somewhat midway between the other two groups. This meeting could possibly correspond with the ACCG meeting in September. The purpose would be to define SCALE and the metrics associated with it.

The other piece is Jonathan and Steve have gotten over forty different categories and indicators for community well-being. Hope is to be able to set a baseline for all three CFLR projects. Some efforts have already taken place in the form of surveys.

Baseline development will be key to assessing impact from Cornerstone Project. Geographically based approach. This will likely be based on census tracts.

Kusel’s work is seen to be more locally specific than the work that Chico State had done for Chips many years ago. Center for Regional change may also be a resource. Potential for CRC to assign some grad students, and possibly have a student do their thesis on this activity.

**Community Review Committee**

Recent site visit on the 29th of June to SPI’s fuelbreak to review 8 slash piles. Piles themselves complied with the agreement between BV and CBD, although the projects themselves didn’t directly fit the framework in the agreement. CBD agreed to allow and exemption for these piles. Potential for recommending some slight changes to the agreement in the annual report.

Many folks agree that revisions will need to be made on the CBD/BV agreement to reflect the realities on the ground. Annual report is the avenue to propose changes. Suggested changes relative to CFLR, as this was not in play at the time of the agreement. This should include fuelbreaks. There is another piece to look at, we originally thought it would take a few years to reach the goal, but the 15% forest-based limitation is something that we will be up against quickly. Annual report is due in the fall.

Craig Thomas and Sierra Forest Legacy had some concerns about the percentage, so there would need to be some discussion and information sharing.

Relative to private lands, SPI is seemingly outside of condition 2 in the agreement. There are differences in the agreement relative to public vs. private lands. We need to remember that agreement is between CBD and BV, and ACCG is not party to it.

If the group is okay with it, Steve will prepare for the September meeting a set of proposals to amend the agreement, which would include the annual report. Will include the 248 piles that have been reviewed and approved.

Suggested that a workgroup be assigned to develop suggested changes. The review committee will be addressing this issue.

**Mokelumne Environmental Benefits Initiative/Cost Avoidance Study**

There was a 30-person field trip recently. TNC thought it was important to have a field trip in the watershed, with particular focus on how the hydro project is influenced by the watershed conditions. Foothill Conservancy contracted to organize, and visited several PGE facilities. Amy Rocha took the group to a private timberland owner’s property to discuss forest management. Following this the group went to Pardee and met with EBMUD.

Team had a meeting about potentially changing direction on the project. After the tour there was a cost avoidance project meeting. The environmental benefits meeting seemed to focus on the lower watershed. Main purpose of the environmental benefits project is to quantify the value or ecosystem services. Most of the funding available now is related to habitat. EBMUD states that sedimentation isn’t really an issue, especially in the lower watershed. In areas where temperature is an issue, there are few restoration opportunities or if there are they won’t have enough of an impact. Forest service providing assistance relative to modeling of fire and sediment.

It was good for the group to get out in the watershed and be able to see conditions first hand. EDF brought a photographer on the tour. There is a flickr account. Amy will send this around.

This has been a very educational process for everyone involved.

**CFLR Coalition**

There was a group of folks who volunteered to figure out who was pulling the strings behind the budget requests from Region 5. No firm understanding yet at where the budget issues are coming from and why.

American Forests, TNC, SAF, Forest Service, Sustainable Northwest are all involved on the coalition.

Cathy Koos-Breazeal will be profiled in the annual report for CFLR. 200 word biography was allowed, which was not nearly enough. Also four photos, with some of the field trip and Robert Smith working at Big Lily Gap.

High Country News has an interesting article on forest management, and includes an article on CFLRP and collaboratives. Website is hcn.org

Clarification sought on whether or not an appropriation will be made for the next year on CFLR. Nobody is all that clear on where exactly it is in the process. It is understood by some members of the group that the appropriation for 2013 is currently in place, but caution has been urged as it is an election year and the budget process still has a long way to go.

Forest service may see an initial budget in September.

**External Communications**

Initial response by delegated contacts when Cornerstone was awarded. There are now rumors floating around, including statements like Cornerstone is a money laundering activity by the Forest Service, which is obviously not true. There is a need to get clear and accurate information out to the community, including updates on projects, events and activities.

Opportunity for distribution of information, in the form of a flyer or bookmark, at the Amador County fair next week. Potential for revisiting talking points that were originally developed.

If we could have forest service personnel involved in the development of the talking points. The forest service will be participating in the fair also. It could be beneficial to the communications delegates to have forest service available and participating in the development of the flyer. Also, the Indian Valley project which was funded by Coca Cola is being worked into an outreach piece by the Forest.

Need to be sure folks realize the CFLR funding is not a grant. It was a nationally competitive process, and we won. Plain and simple. This is a good example of the Forest Service fulfilling their commitment and statutory purpose to steward our public lands.

**ACTION**: Reestablish TBL communications delegates.

Work on the blog, including putting a page for cornerstone. Communications folks will start to develop some informational pieces and working with Frank Mosbacher.

**IRWMP**

Plan that is required by every region in the state to get funding for water preojcts. There is an update underway, which is being headed up by the UMWRA. Mainly water agencies, but Foothill Conservancy and forest service participates. Everyone has submitted their list of potential preocjts. Calaveras has a project for restoration of ponderosa way. The Stanislaus has included the Hemlock landscape restoration project.

A number of months ago a delegation was sent to DWR, including Steve and Jim Branham. DWR is not seemingly linked up with anyone other than themselves, and don’t necessarily see the linkage between forests and water. They have put serious funding into the region over the decades, and they will not pay for anything that is not in an IRWMP. Anything outside of IRWMP will not be funded by DWR, so if we want projects to be funded by them we need to get our projects in the mix. It may be too late to submit projects.

Looking at allocating what remains of Prop 84, and there is not a lot of money left in that fund. That is a statewide funding pool, and the IRWMP has way more projects than there is Prop 84 funding.

Forest service is concerned that CEQA could be a hindrance to completing projects with State funding.

We need to start working for funding for other partners, including BLM, CalFire, now that we have funding in place for the forest service. Encouraged to explore possibility for including other partners’ projects into the IRWMP.

**NRCS** – Program money comes through the farm bill, and it is expected to pass before the election. The bill does not look great for conservation programs, with cuts being made to both programs and funding. Last year Amy talked about the Bay-Delta initiative, and Bay-Delta is called out in the EQIP program. Sustainable Conservation is already putting in proposal including environmental benefits and to do projects in the upper and lower watershed. Opportunity for funding is upcoming…Amy will forward the funding opportunity when it becomes available.

**AFSC** – Has some small projects. Also the Tiger Creek RAC project is funded and moving forward.

**CCC Veterans Group** – Definition of adjacent lands is pretty much the same definition, which is that there has to be a benefit to public lands. Also interested in potentially doing some mentoring, so we should hear back on that.

Ponderosa Way restoration is currently in the planning phase at the county.

**CalFire** – Hazardous Fuels treatments taking place on roads throughout the county. Jesus Maria, and Ponderosa Way will get treatments. Moke Hill WUI fuelbreak was funded at CalFire. DFG and Calfire went out and viewed the project. Follows an old road below the town. Combination of mastication and handwork. A lot of historical aspects to deal with. 3 CFIP projects are moving forward in West Point RR Flat area.

**SPI** – Calaveras FSC meets in West Point at 6pm on the 19th.

Calaveras RD – Expects decision on Prather Medusa Landscape project next week. Hope to have an ACCG field trip for the hemlock project in September. Calaveras RD IDT will attend a future planning workgroup. Teresa is going on detail to the regional office to serve as the acting deputy director for ecosystem services. Jim Junette will be acting District Ranger. Barney Gant has taken Dan Jiron’s position.

Cornerstone dollars arrived. Two projects on FedBizOpps. East West Arnold Shed. Bailey Project is also going live.

Contractors Group added the Oneto Group and Vicini Bros. and some others including a native plant professional. Exploring the potential of forming a legal entity. CHP WBUG is submitted, with a lot of help from SNC. Another grant was sent in to RBEG for equipment and feasibility study work. Product yard negotiations with CCWD are moving forward. Meeting with them on the 19th to deal with terms and conditions. Also working since December 2010 to meet the threshold for an EDA grant. Rick Breeze-Martin making a presentation to the August 9th meeting regarding the Wilseyville project to EDD EDA. EDA looking for a model on biomass utilization.

MLJT and probation is sending AB 109 folks to CPR and fire training. A couple of them are actually working.

Bill Haigh is in DC on a detail. BLM staff are mostly on the robbers fire.

Frank Mosbacher – Indian Valley project, there has been an ongoing desire to improve a meadow between multiple stakeholders. NFWF funded a portion and Coca Cola matched the project. What is going to happen Coca Cola will be hosting a check signing at the San Leandro bottling plant. Looking to use this as an ecosystem restoration story with ongoing activities. Along the way in the story are people who live in the watershed and people in the bay area should be interviewed and involved in telling the story.

August 9th field trip to Callecat to see the marking that has been done and review the project in the context of GTR220. Trying to tie the field trip in with the comment period for the preliminary EA.

Power Fire was the big project for the Cornerstone program of work. It is not a timber sale, it is reforestation. It is a large area, of about 14000 acres, most of which is forest service lands. Met internally and talked about it. RAC project is going to the CHIPS crew. August timeframe. Bids on View 88 thin came in, but none of them were local.

Need to add contacts in the contractors group to the distribution on project solicitations.

Secure Rural Schools was reauthorized a couple weeks ago.

**Next Meeting in Amador County on August 15th at the Amador County GSA Building**