

Sept 9, 2016
FSCC Meeting (Ukiah, CA)

Attending:

Pete Johnson
Jerry Rioux
Mark Andre
Meghan Reeves
Jim Robbins
Paula Randler
Tom Schott (Mondo County)
Mary Mayeda (Mendo County)
Steve Smith
Chris Zimny
Jim Bridges
Steve Jones
Laurie Tippin
Lauren Hubert
John Henshaw
Brook Darley
Patricia Hickey (ED Mendo RCD)
Phil Noya
Jeff Calvert
Mark Egbert

Action items

- **Paula** look into LSR grants for Mendo County on their multiple landownership efforts at forest restoration and education (fire management/ haz fuels is the “gateway drug” to forest management) – Mary Mayeda, mary.mayeda@mcrccd.org
- FES model from the USFS doesn’t include redwood carbon yet because the model was originally built for NFS lands, private and industrial landowners would use the model if it were available. **Steve** proposes the committee putting together a letter to push the USFS toward developing this aspect of the model.
- Do committee members have ideas about how to leverage a little bit of FSP \$ for the good of the Placerville nursery, please share with Paula. Otherwise, it may make more sense to transfer intra agency to the nursery from FSP, but we’d rather leverage.
- Patricia requesting a subcommittee of RCD Forestry programs. Great idea! RCD Forestry communicating with one another and with us. **Jerry** putting Patricia in touch with Mike Beacom. **Patricia** proceeding with her idea to survey monkey.
- Tying in to conversation from June about updating the strategic plan: Current strategic plan is 2005-2010. John Henshaw will redline the old strategic plan, send out the draft for committee to review. Apparently some action items remain undone for the last strategic plan.
- **Paula** find direction on strategic planning for this committee. Send to John Henshaw in next 10 days. **Henshaw** redlining document a few days before October committee phone call, **committee members** discussing on the call (briefly) and then redlining their own versions before Nov conf call.
- Revive forestry award program to recognize Jeff’s service?

- FY2018 Legacy project selection process: seven projects, all returning. Some of the amounts have changed.
 - Monitoring report for FY15: only concern, Chalk Mtn, Les dealing with wildlife and water quality issues on his property. He was getting a plan approved and they required a ton of road work because of the new road rules (\$250k just for supplies). Someone reported that a Golden Eagle had flown over his property, so he has to survey for Golden Eagle now. He is increasing harvest to compensate for increased costs.
 - Crummy road system needs to be recognized as a liability in the appraisal. Is it recognized? No, not yet. **Paula** check with Public Services about whether this is something we can address in the appraisal process.
 - Workshop topic: **Paula/ Brook**: land trust counseling landowners on the increasing costs of land management in California and ensuring that management costs are accounted for when the family does the math on how to afford the easement.
 - **Sept 23 is the deadline to send Brook ranking sheets**
- Paula brought up shifting the announcement of request for proposals for Legacy projects back to January or February, to ensure transparency and openness in the process. There was a general feeling that land trusts who know us and want fed money know the deadlines, but committee members agreed that an annual announcement (email) to land trust partners and RCDs would ensure transparency and encourage new partners to apply.
- Brook said he'd like to shift the deadline back to June 30, instead of July 31 each year to have more time to work with any new or returning partners in FLIS/ sharing program requirements, etc.
- Paula brought up the idea (initiated in June) of public information on a website and sharing meeting minutes/ contact info about the committee on a password-protected site. **Jerry** has been in touch with Karen Buhr and will insert a summary of progress on these efforts to the minutes for this meeting.
- Paula brought up the idea of updating the AON for CA (16 years is too old). The process for determining you don't need to update the AON may be just as onerous as updating, so let's update. Tree mortality and cannabis in the state mean that the 2000 update probably isn't fully meeting the needs of CA landowners and partners. Someone shared that the eastern Sierra counties are not involved, so there's an opportunity to reach out to counties that are not included and ask if they would like to be. Some states use the FRAP team (or equivalent) to gather data about spatial needs, and it would be reasonable to interview partners about what are traditional forest uses in the state (easements are affected by the AON in several ways, traditional forest uses are one). To a great extent, we should try to lean on land trusts that would like the opportunity to submit projects in counties to get their county to join the program. **Paula** will find out whether the AON should be reviewed every 5 or 10 years. **UPDATE: AON should be reviewed/ updated every 5 years.**
 - Moving forward, **Steve Smith, John Henshaw, and Paula** will discuss a process and timeline for updating the AON.