



## IDAHO LANDS RESOURCE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Wednesday, February 21, 2018  
Panhandle Health District 1 Conference Room, Hayden, ID

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lisa Ailport, Idaho Chapter, American Planning Assoc.	Robyn Miller, Land Trust Organizations
Gerry Bates, Urban Forestry – At Large	Knute Sandahl, ILRCC Vice-chair, State Fire Marshal
Glen Burkhardt, Bureau of Land Management - Fire	Gordon Sanders, Idaho Forest Owners Association
Rita Chandler, National Forest System-Fire Management	Hannah Sanger, Urban Issues
Don Ebert, Idaho Association of Counties	Chris Schnepf, UI Extension Forestry (alternate)
Janet Funk, Idaho Tree Farm	Kirk Sehlmeier, Natural Resources Conservation Service
Jeff Handel, Nez Perce Tribe (alternate)	Gregg Servheen, Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game
Bob Howard, Idaho Emergency Managers Association	Janet Valle, USDA-FS, State & Private Forestry
Brian Jorgenson, Green Industry Organizations/INLA	Mallory Wilson, Idaho Office of Emergency Management
Ken Knoch, ILRCC Chair, City Foresters/Idaho Parks & Recreation Association	Mike Wolcott, Association of Consulting Foresters
Tim Maguire, Urban Forestry Collaborative Groups / Bioregional Planning	Norris Boothe, Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Forestry

### AGENCY STAFF & GUESTS PRESENT:

Ara Andrea, Bureau Chief, Forestry Assistance, IDL	Jennifer Russell, Project Coordinator, IDL
Tom Eckberg, Forest Health Program Manager, IDL	Karen Sjoquist, Forest Legacy Program Coordinator, IDL
Mary Fritz, Stewardship Program Manager, IDL	Mark Eliot, Fire Prevention Specialist, IDL
Tyre Holfeltz, Fire Prevention & Risk Mitigation Program Manager, IDL	Suzie Jude, Forest Stewardship Program, IDL
Dave Stephenson, Urban Interface Program Manager, IDL	Andrew Mock, Tech Services GIS Analyst, IDL

### Welcome/Introductions

Chair Ken Knoch welcomed returning and new members and guests to the meeting. Members and staff introduced to the group. New members received Council binders. Please contact Mary Fritz or Suzie Jude if you need a Council binder.

### Review of ILRCC purpose and expectations

Mary Fritz provided a background on the Council's formation from its prior advisory groups to its current joint membership configuration and activities. Providing program oversight, collaborative strategic planning, communication and coordination of funding among member constituencies are priorities for the Council. IDL serves as the secretary for the Council by organizing meetings and project visits, preparing agendas and meeting notes. Council members participate in the development of the Forest Action Plan and its implementation through review of State & Private Forestry competitive grants proposals and recommendations to the Idaho State Forester. Council members also provide oversight and serve on Council sub-committees including the Forest Legacy Program subcommittee and the Forest Action Plan Revision Core Group.



## **2018 Landscape Scale Restoration, Western State Fire Manager (WSFM) & Hazard Fuel Reduction (HFR) Grants**

Tyre Holfeltz provided a statewide map handout showing the location of 2015-2019 WSFM and HFR project proposals. Grant funding for HFR projects takes place in the current federal fiscal year (FFY) and funding for WSFM takes place in the next FFY18. FFY17 (or CY18) HFR funded projects are located in Boundary, Bonner, Valley and Teton County (new cooperator). FFY17 WSFM funded projects are the Fernan Lake project in Kootenai County, the Winchester Area project in Lewis County, and the South Victor project in Teton County. Late year, FS Washington Office provided funding for the Shoshone County project, located in Cataldo (originally slated for WSFM). In addition, excess returned funds from a past Bogus Basin project was approved for use on two other local projects. In total, nine projects were fully funded last year for a total of ~\$2.1M. No member questions.

Jen Russell summarized the three LSR projects submitted in 2017 for FFY18 competition. Of the three projects submitted, the Healthy Communities project did not score high enough for funding. The Forest Economics project scored number 7 and is within the funding range. The Firewise Parks project has been revised over time. Originally submitted as a proposal to develop master operating plans for all State parks, the project now focuses on developing Firewise parks. The proposal did not score high enough in the project ranking to receive funding, but additional work is taking place to increase its competitiveness. We will discuss additional ideas during the meeting today as part of the next round LSR project preproposal submissions.

Council questions:

Regarding the Healthy Communities project application, adding additional partners and better explaining health benefits of trees from a medical perspective may strengthen the proposal. These conversations are ongoing in Idaho. Dave Stephenson explained that a new synthesis of information about the health benefits from trees is under development that he will share with the Council.

## **2020 Forest Action Plan Revision – Next Steps**

Tom provided a handout of FAP 2020 issues—threats/benefits, data collected to date, and a summary of the FAP 2020 revision process. The Farm Bill requires a full revision every ten years for states wanting to continue receiving USFS funding for Forestry Assistance programs. FAP has two components: 1) the statewide assessment of the forest resources, which identifies threat and benefit issues and Priority Landscape Areas (PLAs); and 2) resource strategies that address issues in the PLAs, focusing efforts for the most efficient use of limited resources. Currently, the Forest Assessment Core Team (FACT) is working on the assessment component.

Question: Are definitions of threats and benefits in urban areas evolving and part of the conversation? Yes, as data change, benefits and threats also change. Some threats identified in urban areas include air and water quality, WUI threats, and development and recreation pressure. There are economic costs associated with not addressing these threats.

Tom reviewed a schematic of the initial FAP geospatial assessment using statewide data. Many data sets are available but not all have statewide coverage—that's important for FAP. The process creates separate threat and benefit maps, combines them, and scores each subwatershed using a matrix. The matrix is skewed to the benefit issue side (that is, areas of high benefit but low risk are a higher priority for work than areas of low benefit but high risk). Areas masked out include wilderness areas as no management occurs, and non-urban areas without forests. Urban areas in southern Idaho are included as they are artificial environments with irrigation, and have substantial benefit to the city. In 2015, we added a Special Landscape Area for sage-steppe habitat. While not the same as a PLA, the area is included due to its impact on fire. Tom briefly discussed other GIS assessment methods previously considered.



Question: How is a weighted overlay influenced by a particular group? It depends a lot on who is assigning the weights; this methodology works well for similar issues, but not so well with fairly different issues. For example, if a room full of air quality experts are weighting 7-8 key issues, they would likely weight air quality as most important. For this reason, in the original assessment, all threats and benefits were ranked equally. However, some sub-issues within a particular threat or benefit issue were weighted; for example, because Mountain Pine Beetle risk areas were considered the most serious pest problem in Idaho in 2010, we weighted this sub-issue higher than other forest health sub-issues. This works better as the subject matter experts are all familiar with forest health issues.

Within the 25 cells in the matrix, each represents a combination of threat level and benefit value. The lowest priority areas are those that are low threat and low benefit, and the highest priority areas are those with both high threat and high benefit.

The Forest Assessment Core Team has met three times prior to today's ILRCC meeting and recommends to the Council the threat/benefit matrix utilized for the 2010 FAP.

Additional Council discussion: Subject matter experts (SMEs) have been identified for each issue. How much the matrix is influenced by local sentiments depends upon the issue and if there is consensus or disparate views. Threats and benefits in urban areas will need to be looked at more closely as there is a lot more data about the health benefits, air quality, carbon sequestration, and hydrologic issues. There may or may not be statewide data with appropriate resolution available for some issues, but at the very least they should be touched on in the assessment narrative. Many states have chosen to separate urban from rural issues within the assessment and some issues can be difficult or impossible to model. Tom discussed how sage-steppe lands will be addressed as Special Landscape Areas; as these areas adjoin forested areas, there are additional considerations for juniper woodlands. The 2020 revision will consider other forested areas located within riparian areas previously masked out.

It was suggested that today's meeting be an opportunity for Council members to provide feedback about suggested issues in the FAP 2020 revision. The Council will defer initial decision making about data sources and modeling to the assessment core team, with a report to ILRCC at a later meeting.

Wildfire: Tom explained the renaming of "Risk to Communities and Ecosystems from Uncharacteristic Wildland Fire" to "Wildfire." The core team identified current uncharacteristic stand and climate conditions, availability of new data and modeling, and incorporating the restoration benefits of fire depending upon where in Idaho it takes place. Should climate be included as a sub-issue or separate from wildfire? Should the core group consider community wildfire plans and fire condition class as sub-issues? Modeling of wildfire is available, but it is also very complex.

Council discussion/questions: Can IDL simplify modeling to be understandable? Should the assessment continue to use 20-year average for fire vegetation condition class, or 10-year average? While modeling changed for fire condition class, it was more robust. Should we shorten the average interval in order to capture climate change effects, with the caveat some landscapes take a long time to rehabilitate? IDL's Wildfire Risk Model was discussed. This is different from LandFire data that covers western states. What are the inputs to IDL model? LandFire is 100 acres or larger vs IDL's model that includes smaller fires. What about the occurrence of fire? Modeling should reflect 10-year plan. What's driving climate to be included in wildfire? Primarily no statewide data available in 2010. Consider the difference between fire as a risk to communities and the benefits of fire for restoration. Also, consider fire data that shows departure from a resilient condition, change in fire regime, and change in housing density within WUI. WUI is defined (and incorporated into modifiable community wildfire protection plans) as "the interaction between developed and non-developed land and the infrastructure people rely upon for their existence." Post fire impact areas are identified by utilizing the ridgelines above WUIs as boundaries. Since the last assessment, the WUI layer has been redrawn for about ½ the state with input



from local communities and counties, and are included in the IDL community fire risk map. What's driving the inclusion of climate conditions in wildfire threat issue for 2020? In 2010, there was no available statewide data. The challenge will be which climate model to use. It will be important to consider both the risk/threats and restoration opportunity/benefits derived from wildland fire in the 2020 revision assessment.

Forest Health: Tom explained this threat issue was renamed from "Relative Threats to Forest Health" to either "Forest Damage Agents" or "Forest Decline." Statewide Forest Inventory & Analysis (FIA) data is available for this issue at a (coarse) 240-meter resolution; 30-meters or less is our goal. IDL may be able to refine the FIA data. Forest stand conditions drive fire and bark beetles. There may be stand condition data available on industrial ownerships, but it is proprietary and not statewide coverage. LandFire has canopy coverage that might be useful. The core team recommends keeping climate change as a forest health sub-issue. In the 2010 assessment effort, Mountain Pine Beetle was the biggest threat and weighted heavily as a sub-issue; it's now a much lower threat and recommended to be weighted equal to the other forest health sub-issues. Other forest pest and disease sub-issues included Balsam Woolly Adelgid, White Pine Blister Rust, Tussock Moth, noxious weeds, and climate change (Rehfeldt et al, data). Should the 2020 revision keep climate change as sub-issue or treat as a stand-alone? There are more data sets available now for climate change with future projections to 2080.

Council discussion/questions: What about root disease as a forest health sub-issue? There is a root disease model, but no statewide coverage—it stops at Salmon River. To facilitate future policy-making decisions though, the root disease sub-issue should be included in the assessment narrative. IDL has aerial detection survey data on beetle infestations going back to 1997. Subject matter experts will look at these issues and dig down into data and models to extrapolate additional insights. Can specific percentage of forest species composition be used as proxy to extrapolate root disease statewide? FIA data includes individual species data, density and other information to help inform this issue. The Council recommends keeping Forest Health as threat issue.

Development & Recreation: Originally entitled "Potential Loss of Canopy to Development, Urbanization and Recreation" it incorporated canopy loss due to land use or zoning impacts, urbanization, and gateways to recreation where pressure would be greatest. This threat also needs to address urban tree canopies and look at the benefit side of canopies and recreation in terms of the economics.

Council discussion/questions: Roadway development/widening take out significant numbers of urban trees. This particular loss of urban trees is being mapped in 10-12 communities and could be utilized in a model. Population density may also be a proxy for negative pressures to canopy. Housing density can focus on 'fringe' canopy loss. Is it possible to capture non-motorized recreation impacts in modeling? There is data for snowmobiles and ATVs, but what about bikes and pedestrians? Consider changes in land ownership from a single large ownership parcel to multiple smaller ownerships. The fracturing of forest acres may be attributed to older landowners disposing of assets, but it affects long-term management. The challenge of utilizing county parcel information is that not all counties may have this available. The American Farmland Trust has methodology for annual assessment of farmland under threat to urbanization or change that might translate to privately-owned forestlands. All Trails and Straba.com websites have tracking data on recreational hiking trail use. Also, the Idaho State Tax Commission should be able to provide data about how many acres are in a particular timber category from year to year and inform trends over time. Is soil erosion part of the threat to canopy loss? This could be a potential sub-issue.

Following the morning break, Tyre requested that during the discussion about remaining FAP benefit issues, those members wanting to discuss data sets and modeling, please contact the core team issue



leads. This will allow Council members sufficient time to provide recommendations (thumbs-up, -down or neutral) on specific issue inclusion, or not, in the ongoing revision work by the core team.

There was concern expressed about this suggested Council decision-making process because the council is a large and diverse group taking in a lot of complex information; many do not feel comfortable making recommendations about which issues to include or exclude and want to defer this decision making to the core team. The discussion so far has been beneficial in terms of sharing information.

As background, the 2010 FAP was overseen by a large stakeholder group. ILRCC serves in this capacity for the 2020 revision. The first stakeholder group met often and participated in an iterative process with the core team. The challenge now is ILRCC only meets twice a year. The requested role for the council today is to approve which key issues the core group will include in the revision moving forward, followed by GIS analysis/modeling. Some members are more comfortable deferring to the core team in determining key issues and then coming back to the council for more in-depth discussion and recommendations. Some members are comfortable with providing approval of key issues, but may need to discuss and understand underlying sub-issues in order to provide input.

Sustainable Forest-Based Markets: The core team recommends keeping this issue. Travel time to mills for timber and biomass utilization were the focus of 2010 FAP. Biomass is still an important issue, but not as much as in 2010. Consolidation of mills over the last 10 years has changed distance to mills making travel times much longer. The UI Policy Analysis Group has completed a study for IDL and data from that study will inform this issue. Additional sub-issues to consider include carbon as part of forest economics or as stand-alone, hunting, fishing, wildlife, small-scale mills, urban wood, and non-traditional wood products (greenery, post and poles, juniper wood products).

Council discussion/questions: If a valuable timber stand is far from a mill, it remains a valuable timber stand as a natural resource. It is valuable because it is isolated. This issue relates primarily to stumpage value of timber and the correlation to mill location. Because a timber stand is far from a mill, it is more expensive to go get it in the context of traditional timber harvesting. What other opportunities are there for money? Thumbs up to include this issue in FAP 2020.

Water Quality and Quantity: The core team recommends keeping this issue. It looks at the benefits to water quality and quantity from forest canopy. Previously, this issue looked at 303(d) impaired streams, water supplies, TMDLs, and impervious surfaces. For the revision, the core team is considering additional areas and issues as sub-issues not included in prior assessment. More data available on forest infrastructure (culverts and fish passage), Forests to Faucets data, and USGS data. Suggest sub-issues include flood reduction, analysis of impacts of flooding in urban areas and watersheds, and loss of riparian shading effects on water temperature. Suggested data sets: Norwest on outdoor stream temperature projections, and climate shield from Rocky Mountain Research Center. Thumbs up to include in FAP 2020.

Air Quality: The FAP core group recommends keeping this issue. Carbon sequestration identified as a very important sub-issue for air quality. Carbon markets would help inform this sub-issue. There are urban benefits from cooling impervious surfaces and reducing smog. Past and current data sets include DEQ non-attainment areas, smoke impact areas, impervious surfaces, FIA, LandFire, and tree canopy for 25 Idaho cities.

Comments: Keep climate change and sequestration as separate issue as it is believed this will evolve very quickly over next couple of years. If not kept separate, there is concern about not being able to react to evolving research and data. Thumbs up to include in FAP 2020.



Wildlife/Biodiversity: The Assessment Core Group recommends keeping this issue and incorporating the State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP) into FAP 2020. The Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game and the Nature Conservancy were heavily involved in 2010 assessment and will be again. SWAP also addresses sage-grouse. Thumbs up to include in FAP 2020.

Climate: This is a suggested new stand-alone threat issue. Related sub-issues include forest damage agents, beneficial managed wildfire, water quantity and quality, snowpack. There is recent climate projection modeling available from USFS for Idaho forests through year 2080 for temperature, snow and water.

Comments: There is concern about the potential to double count climate if a stand-alone issue and in modeling for climate specific sub-issues related to other threat and/or benefit issues. Some suggest climate as a stand-alone issue is difficult to address in a political sense, whereas it may be more acceptable if climate is a sub-issue to another issue. If used as sub-issue, explain how climate projections are used in the narrative. It might be possible to use climate projections as a final weighting factor in places where things are changing in significant ways for temperature, snow, and water; looking at the climate projection model and how it is built will inform this. To what extent are we looking at how current resource conditions have been impacted by past climate or alternatively looking ahead to anticipate future conditions from climate impacts? Is this reactive or anticipatory exercise? It might help to focus on future climate. For example, planting trees appropriate to future predicted climate. Is it a prioritization of where we do work? Maybe look at climate as a strategy? Climate is a risk and an opportunity. Can we do the same proactive or reactive work with the data under a different issue like water quality and quantity? Northwest stream data will help with the benefit side of resilience. Can it be a strategy rather than a threat or benefit? Yes. Generally, it's strategic to limit the use of data to not dilute other data or double count. In Idaho, some dispute if climate change exists or not; suggest using hard and fast data that is indisputable showing trends in Idaho. Does this data exist? Keep as strategy and change name to climate adaptation.

Recreation/Connecting People to Forests: This is a suggested new stand-alone benefit issue. Recreation in the forest is a benefit and some communities rely on this income. This could be sub-issue in Sustainable Forest-Based Markets issue or standalone. Data now available to model and inform this issue. Thumbs up to include this as a stand-alone benefit in FAP 2020.

All council members are invited to participate on the FAP assessment core team. Please contact Tom Eckberg if interested. The core group meets again prior to June's ILRCC meeting where they will report progress on the revision.

### **Forest Health Update**

Tom reports IDL has a new Forest Health Specialist, Erika Eidson. Currently, IDL is engaged in MCH pheromone application to keep Douglas-fir beetles out of scorched trees following 2015 fires in Clearwater Valley and Riggins vicinity. In addition, a MCH project in Kamiah treated 400 acres in 2016 and 2017 in areas near fires, and in Eastern Idaho, a 2018 MCH project will treat 250 acres. Drought weakened trees were susceptible to bark beetles due to low precipitation during 2015, 2016 and 2017 growing seasons causing pine engraver to move in. Also, IDL is seeing issues with pine engraver movement to adjacent trees that were next to slash piles—don't winter log pine! Western pine beetle gets going during drought within susceptible dense stands. Fir engraver has scattered mortality during dry years with scattered impacts near Coeur d'Alene; more expected in 2018. Idaho Western Spruce Budworm in Southern Idaho. Douglas-fir Tussock Moth (DFTM) defoliation is on track for 2020 in Idaho. Defoliation in Southern Idaho expected on the Sawtooth and Boise NFs and in the Owyhees. DFTM is probably peaking.



IDL Forest Health has fact sheets for the usual suspects (insects/defoliators, diseases, bark beetles) that include management recommendations. Fact sheets are available on the [IDL Forest Health website](#).

### **Forest Legacy Update**

Karen Sjoquist provided a fact sheet and maps and presented background information on the Forest Legacy Program. Since the last ILRCC meeting, Karen has worked with two landowners to close eight conservation easements (CEs) covering about 5,400 acres (Hall Mountain CE—317 acres; Hancock Timber Resource Group & the Nature Conservancy CE—2,520 acres). Karen is currently working on building additional CEs to the Hall Mountain project and another north of Bonners Ferry in the Cabinet/Purcell Mountain corridor. There are also two project applications IDL is awaiting federal program ranking and if funded, would be granted in 2019. The FLP subcommittee roster was reviewed. Karen requests a nomination from ILRCC to replace a vacancy left by Frank Gariglio, now retired from NRCS. Karen requests any council members interested in serving on the FLP subcommittee contact her.

### **2019 WSFM & HFR Pre-Proposals**

Western States Fire Manager's (WSFM) grants: Tyre provided a map of year 2019 project preproposals. The Idaho Parks preproposal will move from Landscape Scale Restoration (LSR) to WSFM application. The Idaho Firewise Committee is putting together an application to support the planning and development of County Wildfire Protection Plan (CWPP) updates by Idaho counties. A 2019 application by the Idaho Dept. of Parks and Recreation would expand previous work near Boise that includes chipping and open space management. The 2019 Squaw Creek SWCD will not be submitted at this time in order to consolidate work by many entities. The work within the 2019 Adams County pre-proposal focuses on the Meadow Creek area (located on private forest ownership) and updates their CWPP. The 2019 CPTPA pre-proposal will complete their work on constructing a continuous firebreak in Clearwater County. IDL will accept additional applications until June 2018. Only four applications will move forward to WSFM competition at this time. Applications cannot include maintenance.

HFR: There is a 2018 pre-proposal in Bonneville County by Palisades Reservoir for a continuation of fuel break work. There is a continuation of (fuel break) work on the West Side project in Boundary County.

Comments: Council members expressed disappointment that pre-proposals lack pertinent information. *Tyre will be working with applicants to further develop applications. Is this time well spent? Yes, Tyre goes through a process of negotiating the on-the-ground work that will occur, which is influenced by many variables. One additional application would be good, but not necessary.*

Tyre summarized his application review process: Initial pre-proposal announcement, webinar for applicants about process, pre-proposals received, recommendations from ILRCC, Tyre continues to work on applications with the applicants, submission of application for national review, application approved or not, followed by funding.

### **2019 LSR Project Pre-Proposals**

Jen provided background information about ILRCC review and solicited member input on the five LSR pre-proposals. Please email any written comments to Jen on pre-proposals.

Firewise Parks – Tyre will separate the active hazard mitigation work from the LSR demonstration project and submit as WSFM grant. Leverage of adjacent project work will be important in this pre-proposal of 10 park areas.



Comments: Proposed activities will take out reduced hazard fuel loads and fuel breaks. Asking for less funding or reallocating? *Reallocating to other areas such as education or to increase the number of parks, to do more with additional funding.* Clarify “plans” mean CWPPs at the county or community level. Will pulling mitigation work from LSR application diminish the proposal? *This will build turnkey projects for other states; Idaho serves as the flagship to other state agencies and/or states.* This idea should be strengthened in the narrative. How will the Firewise idea be marketed to others? *Through storytelling of Idaho Firewise parks. Definitely build this idea into the application. The proposal will speak to sustainability.* As far as education, is work on the ground part of that education through pruning, planting, etc., or is it a media type of education? *Each park has an official day of workshops and opportunities for the community come and learn about Firewise. Leverage is adjacent work within the last three years.* Will there be mitigation work for state parks to become Firewise? *Yes. It is important to recognize a piece of the application will be a WSFM project, but the underlying message will remain. Concurrent to Firewise education, hazard fuel reductions will take place.* Is anything built in for ongoing maintenance for kiosks? *Upkeep and maintenance of state buildings are already in the state budget and are the responsibility of the entity requesting LSR funding.* What is exportable to other states? Does this speak to demand in other states? *This needs to be more clearly defined and articulated in the deliverables.* Is there an opportunity to partner with another state? *There are no other programs like this in any other states. Any state agency with buildings can be a Firewise building.*

Eastern Idaho Shade Tree project—this is an extension of a funded LSR project where Idaho Power has facilitated a shade tree planting project to reduce energy consumption. There is a desire to have similar efforts around the state and communities in Eastern Idaho. The overarching themes will need to be addressed. Comments: Like that the project is being developed outside of Idaho Power. If Rocky Mountain Power were involved, it would cover entire south Idaho. Tim Solomon would be a good contact. What about partners like Lowe’s and Home Depot donating trees or shovels? *Dave clarified Idaho Power previously used ratepayer funds and cost benefit analysis to determine it is a cost saving effort for them. The local nursery and landscape association participates by providing trees. Idaho Power previously examined programs in other parts of the country to couple a few ideas together for a successful effort. Kudos to Patti Best at Idaho Power for her good efforts.* Is this a model program and looking to see if it will work the second time around? *The initial funding was with 2012 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Avista Utilities has a similar program.* Master Gardeners are not listed as partners, but as collaborators. Why is project length 2 years and not 3? *Jen will follow up. The length of a proposed project does not factor into its score.*

Teton River Restoration—this is a standalone project application born out of some of the partnerships developed as part of the applicant’s first LSR project. The leverage from the City of Driggs is the purchase of an 80-acre flagship parcel for Teton River recreation access for boaters and fishing. They are working with the cattle growers association to determine their needs. They will restore riparian forest as functional for water quality and fish habitat. Collaboration with cattle association is good. If there is erosion and rehab is needed, could this be considered a forest activity? *No stream alteration permit will be needed with this project; no need for special DEQ funding.* Is spring runoff with peak flows present within project area? *It is on Teton Creek proper that has water year-round; the main stability issue is cattle grazing impacts.* Will the project area be considered forestland after the work finishes? *It is most likely that the project area will remain classified as agricultural.* Some concern as the FPA Shade Rule applies to forestland. Similar project was done by Merrill Beyler. Trout Unlimited is part of another partner. A created riparian forest will need to establish vegetation (grasses, forbs and trees) and then protection from cattle with fencing. The historical forest in this area is aspen and cottonwood. The





project aligns with the Forest Action Plan to improve water quality. Russian Olive as an invasive is not a problem in this area.

Cove Road—The impetus to start this project was the Nez-Clearwater National Forests' End of the World (EOTW) project. This area has not had a LSR project and this will be an opportunity to develop partnerships. Tyre reports the EOTW project (3,000 acres of categorical exclusion) was objected to and eventually ended up in the Governor's Office. The Courts decided that NEPA was sufficient and the project could proceed. It's anticipated that a Record of Decision will be signed in January 2019. Comments: How much is IDL involved the Clearwater Basin Collaborative (CBC)? *Some indirect involvement through Eileen Rowan with the SCD. The project area is adjacent to Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) project work. Should it include thinning and site preparation? It makes sense to keep it in the future project pile for now and wait for the litigation to settle. It's a good project with good people, but ILRCC support for it might tip the scale. The scale of the work proposed is outstanding and will have a meaningful effect. Things are starting to move in the CBC and many groups are working together to collaborate on project work. Could private landowners seek out EQIP funding assistance? Where will seed source come from to grow seedlings? How will they stop sediment delivery? This isn't documented. On map, priority place 1 and 2, is not clear. Very rough application with a lot thrown into it. Could it be more than one project?*

Lewis County, Clearwater Complex Restoration-- This is a mirror to Idaho County LSR project for same 2015 fire.

Comments: More important project than Cove Road. Is this project located on very steep ground? *No. A recent Tools for Engaging Landowners Effectively (TELE) workshop trained many more partners in this community to target and engage landowners. The SCD will take the lead on this effort. Concern expressed about using high elevation pine and larch seed source on low elevation locations. There is same elevation, appropriately sourced Douglas-fir seed available. Add narrative to locate appropriate seed source for these areas? This is a separate project due to time delay locating seed source and growing seedlings. There's an opportunity to develop projects around this issue. There is an explosion of demand for seedlings and LSR funds must be used within 4 years. SCDs don't have the ability to purchase seeds and wait to be reimbursed beyond a few weeks or months. It was suggested that Jen talk to IFOA seedling project folks for potential partnership. This project is about planning and planting trees and funding on the partner side for weed control. Is there critical habitat restoration in this area? There are listed fish and Farm Bill funding is used on private lands for this restoration work. Erosion due to fire effects is a big problem on Highway 12.*

It was recommended to move forward the following as full proposals to WFLC: Firewise Parks, Eastern Idaho Shade Tree, and Lewis County Clearwater Complex Restoration, and to reconsider Cove Road and Teton River in the future.

### **Treasure Valley Forest Carbon Effort**

Tim Maguire reports The Nature Conservancy (TNC) proposed this project. Many ILRCC member organizations are partners within this project. The assessment helps us better understand how the current community forest mitigates regional carbon impacts and how future investments in tree planting, care and recycling can sustain more resilient natural resources and economies with the region. Climate trends indicate its changing. The number of days above 80 degrees in Treasure Valley are increasing. The existing canopy stores 1.4 million metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub> valued at \$29 million. The group, City Forest Credits, links urban tree owners with carbon credit buyers. Rural trees are less valuable than urban trees (\$5 vs \$20). Idaho companies are buying these credits. Tim provided a City of



Boise worksheet example for the Releaf Program. Releaf Boise is a volunteer tree planting program started 30 years ago, with 100 trees/year purchased by the City of Boise and given away to be planted in public rights of way. Eighty percent of the value (forest credits) occurs by year 6 and benefits continue exponentially over time. MOUs are needed for trees planted as part of shade tree planting program and this may not be a good fit for this project. This is a better fit for community tree planting in places like Julia Davis Park. The next step is to demo a project where City Forest Credits will a link buyer for credits.

<http://www.tvcanopy.net/forest-carbon/>

<https://www.nature.org/ourinitiative/regions/northamerica/unitedstates/id>

<http://www.cityforestcredits.org>

### **Meeting feedback, wrap up, next meeting**

Ara reported on all the hard work by Tyre Holfeltz to initiate and update long overdue CWPPs statewide (41-42 counties). Karen Sjoquist has been responsible for bringing on between 36-37,000 acres under the Forest Legacy Program. Tom Eckberg, along with a small group of partners, has completed 400 acres of MCH pouch treatments. Jen is moving forward with many great project proposals.

Ken provided kudos to IDL staff for work to put together grants and meetings.

Jeff Handel commented about the need to form a subcommittee to address Fire Plan Working Group prior grant work. Tyre explained the history of how this used to work. More funding is available now due to size of applications (up to \$300K) and more acres are being treated. Some concern voiced about the need for more applications to access all available grant funds. This is a long term process by cooperators to get up to speed and make partnerships happen. Tyre would appreciate any ideas how to do this grant work better. In addition, the formation of the Idaho Fire Response Committee (IFRC) is complete. Administratively, an email will go out with the IFRC charter that address fire response. Tyre will remain the point of contact and liaison for this group. The first IFRC technical group will meet in early March 2018 and will include NFS Fire, BLM, IDL, and anyone who does anything for fire response in Idaho. Feedback to ILRCC from IFRC will take place on project work done under LSR, WSFM and HFR grants.

Regarding FAP 2020, should sage-steppe remain as special landscape area? Comments: If subcommittee is making recommendations, advise in advance of the ILRCC meeting. More time may be needed to have discussions if recommendations/feedback are needed, or alternately advise if information is only being funneled to the group. Once data is modeled, more feedback and meaningful conversation by ILRCC members and staff will take place. If necessary, consider having an additional Fall 2018 meeting to discuss FAP progress. Ara requested if Council members have data that they feel should be included in the revision, to pass it along to your Subject Matter Expert or Suzie Jude, even if it doesn't necessarily apply to identified threat and benefit issues. Please read discussions in the meeting notes of FAP 2020 core group meetings and provide your feedback.

### **Suggestions:**

- Summarize the previous meeting at the beginning of each ILRCC meeting, and use this as a kickoff of what has happened with issues since last meeting.
- Provide a list of meeting benefits to and accomplishments for Fire, Urban and Stewardship programs. Post to ILRCC webpage and to respective constituencies.
- Share the Idaho Fact Sheet and Accomplishments with Council members. This is on the website but can be sent out separately to Council members. There is too much information to sort through on the IDL website.



- Circulate the IDL Annual Report.
- Add links on the member page for these items.

The next ILRCC meeting will take place in Idaho Falls, on Wednesday, June 20, 2018, with the meeting location TBD. A field tour on Tuesday, June 19, will view urban projects in Idaho Falls, riparian restoration in Driggs, and hazard mitigation projects in between.

Meeting adjourned 3:45 pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Suzie Jude

List of follow-up items:

- Dave Stephenson provided the following link to information on new synthesis of information about health benefits of trees to humans. [Urban Nature for Human Health and Well-Being : Vibrant Cities Lab : Resources for Urban Forestry, Trees, and Green Infrastructure](#)