



IDAHO LANDS RESOURCE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Meeting Minutes

Tuesday, February 25, 2014

Idaho Dept. of Lands Staff Office, Coeur d'Alene, Idaho

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lisa Ailport, ID Chapter American Planning Assoc. (Alt)
Patti Best, Utilities / Energy Efficiency
Randy Brooks, University of Idaho Extension Forestry
Gary Brown, Payette National Forest
Elaine Clegg, Association of Idaho Cities
Susan Cleverley, Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security
Robert Cope, Idaho Association of Counties
Kirk David, Idaho Forest Owners Assoc.
John DeGroot, Nez Perce Tribe

Margie Ewing, Regions 1 & 4, USDA-FS, S&PF Janet Funk,
Idaho Tree Farm Committee
Frank Gariglio, USDA-NRCS
Mark Larson, ILRCC Chair, Idaho State Fire Marshal
Kurt Mettler, Coeur d'Alene Tribe
Robyn Miller, ILRCC Vice-Chair, The Nature Conservancy
Robert Reggear, Idaho Nursery & Landscape Assoc.
Gregg Servheen, Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game
Mike Wolcott, Idaho Chapter Assoc. of Consulting Foresters

AGENCY STAFF AND GUESTS PRESENT:

David Groeschl, Idaho State Forester, IDL
Craig Foss, Chief, Bureau of Forestry Assistance, IDL
Gina Davis, Forest Health & Stewardship Program Mgr, IDL
Dave Stephenson, Urban Interface/Planning Prgm Mgr, IDL
Craig Glazier, National Fire Plan Coordinator, USFS/IDL
Mary Fritz, Program Planning & Development Specialist, IDL

Karen Sjoquist, Forest Legacy Program Specialist, IDL
Suzie Jude, Forest Stewardship Program, IDL
Archie Gray, Forest Practices Program Manager, IDL
Joyce Jowdy, Grants/Contracts Operations Analyst, IDL
Janet Valle, Regions 1 & 4, USDA-FS, S&PF

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Mark Larson welcomed members and staff to the meeting.

Mike Wolcott is the new Inland Chapter of the Association of Consulting Foresters representative to the ILRCC.

As an ongoing feature of ILRCC meetings, two current members will provide some additional information about their regular work responsibilities, the interests they represent on the council, and how serving on ILRCC has benefited the group they represent. Frank Gariglio and Elaine Clegg shared information about their groups.

WELCOME BY STATE FORESTER – *David Groeschl*

David thanked ILRCC members and acknowledged the work they do is making a difference and is nationally recognized. Idaho has done extremely well in Competitive Grant Western State's ranking – the # 1 and 2 projects two years in a row, and this is due in part to ILRCC's input to identify priorities and landscape level project proposals. Through the FY14 Congressional appropriations bill, a single budget line item was created for competitive grants (called Landscape Scale Restoration) that combine funds from forest health, forest stewardship, urban forestry and fire; and Idaho was held as an example for why funding should be pooled from "stove-piped" pots of money. Neighboring states are looking to Idaho and ILRCC as a good model to follow.

The 2014 Farm Bill amended the Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) and allows state governors to designate treatment areas on the National Forest. IDL staff is currently working with collaborative groups and/or Idaho Forest Supervisor's offices to develop recommendations for projects on NFS lands for the Governor's consideration. ILRCC is integral to the process of tying together landscape level projects over a variety of forest land ownerships and addressing multiple objectives.

Craig clarified that IDL will not be implementing or overseeing these projects.

SUMMER MEETING ACTION ITEMS / PROJECT UPDATES – G Davis

Re: sharing success stories that ILRCC and IDL are working on. Gina provided copy of IDL internal newsletter article about the Spokane Valley-Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer project. Unfortunately this information was not shared outside of IDL; this will be corrected in future.

Re: biomass. The Office of Energy Resources developed a Statewide Wood Energy Team (SWET) to address wood use and biomass. The Dept. of Commerce is a part of this team and Mary Fritz is IDL's representative. SWET is looking for participants on regional teams in southwest, eastern, and northern Idaho. Please contact Mary for more information.

Re: Tools to Engage Landowners Effectively (TELE) workshop held in McCall this past January. Three working groups were invited, Valley County, Island Park and Big Bear. Marketing lessons learned included: tying an action you want the audience "to do" into your message; identifying target audiences and their likes and barriers; delivering the message through multiple media; and stepping back and listening to respondents. The workshop was well received and there is opportunity for the facilitators to present a webinar if desired by other groups.

IDL has redesigned its website and this year we will transition from ILRCC terrasummit webpage to an ILRCC webpage on the IDL website. There will be a public view page about the ILRCC and a members-only (sign-in) page to download or view Council-related documents, etc.

DISCUSSION ON FOREST LEGACY SUBCOMMITTEE PROCEDURES AND APPROVAL OF NEW MEMBERS – D Stephenson

Karen Sjoquist provided an update on open project grants (FY12 Boundary Connections and FY13 McArthur Lake Addition), a pending project (FY14 McArthur Lake East), and FY15 project proposals (Clagstone Meadows and Hall Mountain) submitted for national ranking. Karen will know more about these last projects once the President's budget is set in early March.

Action Item: Chair requests Karen send an update to ILRCC members regarding FY15 projects after the President's budget comes out.

The draft Legacy Program Subcommittee Procedures 2014 document was discussed with a focus on the seven membership categories. Dave noted these were selected to ensure the key partners in the Forest Legacy Program (FLP) were represented on the subcommittee.

Responding to a question on the purpose of the endowment forester on the subcommittee, Craig explained IDL's need to ensure there are no conditions within the proposed project easements that would prevent IDL from managing adjacent endowment lands.

Several members expressed a concern that they believe the IDL endowment forester and Land Trust representative categories are conflicts of interest. Discussion ensued over real conflict versus a perceived conflict. ILRCC membership concluded there were no real conflicts and that there could be perceived conflicts with any of the member categories. Robyn noted there are many land trust or conservation representatives that do not actively submit projects to Idaho FLP that can serve on the subcommittee. Mike commented having a land trust representative on the subcommittee is key. The Procedures clarify that if there is a conflict, such as sponsorship of or direct involvement with a proposed project, the member must recuse themselves from scoring and ranking proposals. Craig agreed that the endowment forester can serve as ex-officio / non-scoring member of the subcommittee. (Note: Subsequent discussion with the IDL State Forester indicates preference the endowment representative be a scoring member). Karen commented she is cognizant of perceived conflict of interest and it's something the subcommittee will work around when representatives cannot participate in scoring and ranking projects.

The Council discussed the need for members to have the necessary skills to evaluate environmentally sensitive lands and whether these skills were of greater importance than the member representations. In general, Council members felt both were important, and suggested the desired skills be added to the document.

Mark asked the Council to indicate whether they supported the FLP procedures with the addition described above. Council vote: Yes 17, Neutral 2, No 0.

Action Items: Karen will add desired skill sets of members to the Procedures document. Dave noted that subcommittee nominations were not available today, but that IDL would e-mail these to ILRCC members for their input within the next month, and the State Forester would use this feedback to make appointments.

UPDATE ON 2014 WESTERN FIRE MANAGER (WFM) & WESTERN COMPETITIVE (WC) GRANTS – M Fritz

Four 2014 Western Fire Manager Grant proposals were submitted with the Idaho County Clearwater River project and Valley County Fire project selected for funding. The Boundary County and Benewah County proposals were not selected for funding.

Four proposals were submitted for the FY14 Western Competitive Grants and the first two, Treasure Valley (ranked #1 in West) and Boundary County, Lower Kootenai Valley (ranked #2 in West) will be funded. NE Lake Coeur d'Alene (ranked #11 in West) will likely receive partial funding due to the cap on how much a state can receive (15% of total available in the west). The Valley County Changing Culture in WUI project (ranked #24) will be below the available funding level.

Congress appropriated less funds for Competitive Grants this year, and West-wide funding is expected to be ~\$4.6 million.

Susan asked if those projects not selected should apply to another funding stream like BHS. Mary commented some counties have resubmitted projects again this cycle, but Craig Glazier may be a better person to ask later in the meeting.

Mary explained the ranking committee for Western Competitive Grants has multiple program perspectives for stewardship, urban forestry, fire, and forest health and focuses on landscape level efforts. There was discussion that the collective impact was great for the Treasure Valley project and such projects tend to rank higher. When applicable, future projects should incorporate goals of the Cohesive Fire Strategy and adaptation to climate change.

Margie commented that the reason Idaho's proposals stand out is we are consistent and clear on project goals and outcomes. Meaningful scale is also very important in ranking.

Craig Foss commented that the Hazard Fuel Treatment Program, which is a major part of the Western Fire Managers Grants, is currently managed by Craig Glazier. However, IDL is in the process of hiring a new Program Manager to take this over.

PRESENTATION OF FIRE/FORESTRY PORTAL

This concept of a web-based decision-support tool was discussed by ILRCC during the June 2013 meeting. Mary discussed and demonstrated web "portals" developed by Colorado and Texas as examples of how such a tool might look. Before moving forward, it will be important for us to know what we want to communicate and identify the intended audience(s).

Colorado used the West Wide Fire Risk Assessment data for an interactive website that provides information on a coarse (30-meter) scale in separate views for the public and for professionals. The general public's access to these websites provides targeted education, but does not incorporate planning tools. The professional user's access does include high-level planning tools. The cost in Colorado to develop portal was \$100,000, but they used work already done by a developer for the State of Texas; this reduced the overall cost. Maintenance of Colorado's site is approximately \$134,000 every two years.

The Texas portal also has public and professional views. Texas has a second portal focusing on Forestry; this portal quantifies ecosystem services provided within a user-defined area and includes their Forest Action Plan.

Susan reported that BHS used the West Wide Hazard Risk data when developing the state hazard mitigation plan. BHS does have a viewer for counties to use, but it includes more hazards than just fire. It focuses more on risk managers rather than on public education. Counties will have opportunity to update their local conditions and risk through the BHS tool. BHS is currently working with Tim Frazier at U of I on a structural hazard layer and mapping multiple hazards.

IDL has met with the Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security, Boise State University, and the University of Idaho to discuss the concept of an Idaho Portal.

There are many considerations in moving forward with this project idea including partners, the type of portal, potential benefits, static versus interactive and a data collection tool, targeted users, needs assessment, risks and costs. Discussion followed regarding the opportunities and challenges to planning and maintaining an Idaho portal. Margie commented on a parallel process on the federal side for access to a new urban and community forestry portal and suggested moving forward on a small scale and to research portal platforms that may be less expensive or already developed.

This idea is not ready for the FY15 grant cycle. IDL encourages and supports another group developing this idea for a future grant cycle. It was suggested that the Department of Commerce would be a likely project lead.

The next steps moving forward:

A Motion by Greg Servheen; ILRCC supports the concept of developing a vision for the portal and identifying who it serves, seconded by Bob Reggear. Council Vote: Yes 18, Neutral 0, No 0.

Action Item: Susan Cleverley suggested ILRCC develop a subcommittee to pursue and collaborate on the portal vision. Members interested in participating are Susan Cleverly (subcommittee Chair), Janet Valle, Bob Reggear, Greg Servheen, and TNC representative. Lisa Ailport offered to be a resource and provide names of folks that would be helpful to this effort.

FY15 WESTERN COMPETITIVE & WESTERN FIRE MANAGERS GRANT PRE- PROPOSALS – *M Fritz & C Glazier*

IDL reviewed the decision to only submit four Western Fire Managers Grants that would complement objectives of submitted or ongoing Western Competitive Grants. Since last year, the western effort to combine complementary WFM and CG grants has been dropped. The review committee for this program focuses on HFT projects, rather than the more strategic approach Idaho has taken. This being the case, Idaho is reducing opportunities for additional funding to counties by only submitting four proposals. Beginning this FY, IDL will submit up to the maximum 10 WFM grant applications allowed. Six proposals were submitted to IDL for FY15 and all will be submitted for consideration. These are Boundary County, Bonner County, Kootenai County, Shoshone County, Valley County and Fremont County.

Elaine would like to see applications that are more replicable to ensure long-term forest health. In the past, IDL has tried this approach but ended up hurting counties on fire grants. Craig Glazier commented funding for the WFM grant requires HFT components. If there are comments to strengthen applications, please submit them to Craig for WFM grants and to Mary for WC grants.

Five Western Competitive Grant pre-proposals were submitted to IDL and two projects were deemed competitive by staff: Boise State University's (BSU) Community Based Hazards' Planning and City of Boise/Ada County Wildfire Risk Map.

Brief discussion ensued about the Idaho portal and whether it should be part of the Ada County pre-proposal.

The BSU Community Based Hazards' Planning project was initiated through discussions with Brad Cramer, ID Chapter American Planning Association (APA), Dr. Tom Wuerzer from BSU, and Elaine Clegg, Association of

Idaho Cities (AIC). Folks felt this is a good opportunity to further develop education for planners. Elaine reported that the Idaho Smart Growth has been contacted by Dr. Wuerzer regarding this pre-proposal. Lisa reported APA discussed it at their last meeting. If draft ordinances were developed through this project, APA would support.

Mary noted that Dr. Wuerzer has relationships with the communities listed in the proposal. Council members observed that smaller communities and Tribal communities are and suggest they be included to strengthen the application. The involvement of U of I Law School was discussed along with the need for a professional legal organization to vet or provide oversight to model ordinances. There is a need to work with partners outside of the University. It was suggested that interested partners—APA and AIC especially—need to get together to further develop this project proposal.

The council compared and discussed the pre-proposal evaluation process used last year and this year. Several council members favored the process used last year where there was more discussion and ranking of pre-proposals by the council. Last year's process allowed for more feedback that could be used for later projects and a better understanding of the components of a well-developed proposal. Conversation between ILRCC members and various interests adds value and benefits to our process and part of our success.

Council members inquired about resubmitting projects not previously funded to fill all four slots allowed for WC grants. Craig asked committee to consider just submitting two grant applications as staff are very busy on other grant workloads.

Mary commented she was surprised so few project pre-proposals were submitted this year.

FOREST ACTION PLAN (FAP) UPDATE—NEW INFORMATION AND NEW TIMELINE – *D Stephenson*

IDL learned the full GIS analysis and revision of FAP is required every ten years (next due in 2020) and only needs to be updated after five years. For the five-year update, there is a new element required in the FAP—Link to National Trends table—which has three overarching national themes and a table of specific objectives to measure accomplishments. It is a tool to help states focus on specific critical issues, strategies and objectives to address each critical issue over the next five years. It also includes a process of identifying resource needs over the next five years to achieve identified objectives. The USFS may use this table in the future for “flexible” funding decisions related to base level program funds. The Cohesive Strategy and FLP AON will be incorporated into the FAP update.

IDL needs input on how best to move forward with the FAP update. When the FAP was developed, there was a core team in place. Should IDL resurrect a similar core team for this update, should ILRCC serve this role, or are there other ideas? Comments of previous process:

Frank – Keep same process protocol with core team.

Mark – Sees ILRCC filling the role of the core team.

Robyn – The core team is good place to start and encourages participation by other ILRCC members. The individual outreach to communities first time was huge, but not sure that level of effort is needed at the five-year update. This outreach effort should be saved for the ten-year re-write. Keep the five-year effort lean and focused.

Elaine – Commented on her experience with transportation plan efforts. It's important during interim to look at what has been determined to be priorities, determine if they are the same now, and what has been implemented so far.

Cope – Compare with Cohesive Strategy Western Regional Action Plan to see if there are missing elements in FAP. Know the ownership in various counties; some are largely USFS and they must be on board.

Members suggested possible breakout groups within ILRCC to address each separate FAP issue (include agencies, biomass, geothermal)

Approaches to communicate the FAP update statewide include broad agreement that for public feedback IDL could approach targeted groups and participate in their meetings; IDL should develop “talking points” for ILRCC members to take to their constituents; and to use existing collaborative groups to strategize with USFS lands. Susan reported this strategy worked well for the State Hazard Mitigation Plan.

Susan suggested a priority column for the various objectives in the matrix table, and Elaine suggested this is an opportunity to identify what are the most sought after goals. Prioritization within FAP will better direct projects and focus efforts of groups to implement the FAP, such as Statewide Wood Energy Team (SWET).

Greg commented that the accomplishment report card is a key component of this update. This will help assess accomplishments, inform various interests around the state, and serve as a springboard for future efforts. Reporting of accomplishments should be spatial and IDL intends to do this for projects implemented from this time forward.

<p>Action Item: IDL will prepare talking points about upcoming revisions for members to take back to constituency and go from there.</p>

Questions to consider for the FAP update are:

Are priorities realistic and how do we best implement actions? Who’s using FAP? Are there analytics on the FAP website? Develop an accomplishments-to-date layer. Does having an accomplishment layer help to facilitate partnerships or other connections?

The FAP update will need more discussion at the next meeting.

Cope referred members to the Cohesive Strategy website:

<http://www.forestsandrangelands.gov/strategy/index.shtml>. Cope commented on strategic project work and stated the lack of funds in the Treasury to fire-proof the country. However, economic markets could get this effort going.

Bob Reggear commented on the need to connect the profitable use of wood products (like biofuels and jet fuels) to forest treatments. More cooperation is needed on the economic front rather than putting funds toward treating forest land. There is no support and education to move this effort forward.

Craig informed the Council that the Governor’s Office of Energy Resources is working on clearer strategies statewide for education about utilizing forest waste. Contact Matt Wiggs, Energy Specialist at the Idaho Department of Water Resources, matt.wiggs@oer.idaho.gov. Matt is the lead for the Idaho Statewide Energy Team (SWET). The Office of Energy Resources (OER) website <http://energy.idaho.gov/renewableenergy/biographies.htm> is a clearing house for information on SWET, data/studies, and upcoming events.

Robyn sees ILRCC’s role as a resource and starting point for discussions about wood waste utilization efforts and moving ideas forward.

MEETING FEEDBACK, WRAP UP, NEXT MEETING – Mark Larson, All

The council would appreciate more extensive discussion of grant projects. IDL should bring all projects to the council next year, even those proposals that are not considered competitive by IDL. This would provide more transparency of proposed projects. ILRCC discussions on projects are educational for the council in order to understand what makes projects competitive and what’s missing from those that are less competitive. In the request of pre-proposals, IDL provides links to prospective applications of highly-ranked past projects and how to request assistance from IDL staff. It’s important to recognize the cost/benefit of IDL and ILRCC time spent on making all applicants rise to the top. The timeline of the next round of pre-proposals is an announcement and guidelines released in September, with a deadline for submission in December.

The next ILRCC meeting will be in McCall. Council members will be polled for a June 2014 meeting date.

Agenda items for next meeting include:

The FLP project deadline is May and sponsors could give presentations.

Discussion of project priorities for the FY16 Competitive Grant cycle.

Action Item: Council members will review FAP and be prepared to help identify project priorities at the next meeting.

Janet Valley noted the FS and IDL would complete a review of IDL's State and Private Forestry programs this year (due every five years); she suggested this as a topic for the next meeting. The review will likely wrap-up in October or November. One consideration during the review is how well this group is working and meeting the needs of the various S&PF programs.

Consider having the ILRCC Winter 2015 meeting in conjunction with the Idaho Forest Restoration Partnerships conference to better connect with Collaborative groups or the OER biomass group. The OER SWET will be attending the Eastern Idaho Wood-to-Energy Workshop at Lost Trails Ski Resort in June. Would OER SWET lead Matt Wiggs be willing to come to ILRCC meeting and speak?

Action Item: Doodle poll to members for a range of meeting dates in June.

Adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Suzie Jude

List of Action Items:

Action Item: Chair requests Karen Sjoquist send an update to ILRCC members regarding FY15 Forest Legacy projects once the President's budget is released in early March

Action Item: The FLP subcommittee procedures document will be updated to include desired skill sets of members. Dave Stephenson will send out a list of proposed FLP subcommittee members for council input.

Action Item: Susan Cleverley will lead an ILRCC subcommittee to pursue and collaborate on the portal vision. Additional members interested in participating are Janet Valle, Bob Reggear, Greg Servheen, and a TNC representative. Lisa Ailport offered to be a resource and provide names of folks that would be helpful to this effort.

Action Item: IDL will prepare talking points about upcoming FAP revisions for members to take back to their constituency for feedback and input.

Action Item: Council members will review FAP and be prepared to help identify project priorities at the next meeting.

Action Item: Doodle poll to members for a range of meeting dates in June.