



IDAHO LANDS RESOURCE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Meeting minutes
Tuesday, February 17, 2015
Riverside Hotel, Boise Idaho

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Lisa Ailport, ID Chapter American Planning Association	Ken Knoch, ILRCC Vice-Chair, City Foresters / Idaho Parks & Recreation Association
Patti Best, Utilities/Energy Efficiency	Tim Maguire, Urban Forestry Collaboratives / Bioregional Planning
Gary Brown, Payette National Forest (alternate)	Robyn Miller, ILRCC Chair, The Nature Conservancy
Elaine Clegg, Association of Idaho Cities	Robert Reggear, Idaho Nursery & Landscape Association
Susan Cleverley, Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security	Knute Sandahl, State Fire Marshal
Kirk David, Idaho Forest Owners Association	Gregg Servheen, Idaho Dept of Fish and Game
Madeline David, Idaho Tree Farmers (alternate)	Janet Valle, Regions 1 & 4, USDA-FS, S&PF
John DeGroot, Nez Perce Tribe	Mike Wolcott, ID Chapter, Assoc. of Consulting Foresters
Dan Dinning, Association of Idaho Counties	
Frank Gariglio, USDA-NRCS	

AGENCY STAFF & GUESTS PRESENT:

Craig Foss, Chief, Bureau of Forestry Assistance, IDL	Margie Ewing-Costa, Region 1, USDA-FS, S&PF
Gina Davis, Forest Health & Stewardship Program Mgr, IDL	Gordon Sanders, IFOA (alternate)
Dave Stephenson, Urban Interface Program Mgr, IDL	Becky Johnstone, Payette Forest Coalition
Mary Fritz, Program Planning & Development, IDL	Ellen Berggren, US Corps of Engineers
Karen Sjoquist, Forest Legacy Program, IDL	Mark Larson, past-Chair ILRCC
Suzie Jude, Forest Stewardship Program, IDL	John Roberts, Idaho Forest Restoration Partnership
Craig Glazier, National Fire Plan Coordinator, USFS/IDL	Dale Harris, Idaho Forest Restoration Partnership
Tyre Holfeltz, Community Fire Program Mgr, IDL	

WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS

Chair Robyn Miller welcomed members and guests to the meeting. New members Knute Sandahl, Dan Dinning, and Tim Maguire were introduced and provided biographical information.

Chair requested questions and/or comments regarding last meeting's minutes. There being none, minutes from the June 25, 2014 meeting were approved.

Dave Stephenson provided a tour of the new ILRCC public and member web pages. Several members reported they've been unable to access the secure member page. IDL staff will continue to work with those affected to find a solution.

FOREST ACTION PLAN (FAP) UPDATE

Dave Stephenson provided a review of the FAP update and noted IDL is required to do a review and revision of the original plan at the five-year (2015) interval. At the 10-year (2020) interval, the plan will have a complete update. The timeline for the 2015 revision is to complete a draft by mid-April and send it to members for review and input. The plan will be updated to near-final draft before the June ILRCC meeting. When approved by the council, the final revision will be submitted to USFS State & Private Forestry by the November 2015 deadline. The 2015 revision format will include a summary page listing revised items within this plan version.

Dave noted that per ILRCC advice, this revision will be kept very simple. For the full 2020 update, IDL will visit key groups within 2-3 PLAs in each of the next five years to review and update strategies as needed. That full update will also include a new geospatial analysis utilizing best available data at that time.

Dave explained that during the initial assessment work in 2008, the stakeholder group decided not to include Juniper-Sage areas in the southern part of the state. However, since then sage-grouse habitat and fire issues in this geographic location have become increasingly important, and a Cohesive Strategy project is being planned in this area. Discussion followed regarding inclusion of this area in the FAP as a “special landscape area (SLA)” consisting of important and core sage-grouse habitat areas identified by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

Discussion followed with the following key points:

- The decision to not include sage-juniper lands was made based on the area’s inability to grow timber; it was not included in the geospatial assessment (not all stakeholders agreed with this decision)
- Some state funding for sage-grouse will come through the Idaho Fish and Game, but most through Federal agencies such as BLM
- Sage-grouse is a state action item in the State Hazard Mitigation Plan
- Most of this new area is a mix of federal, state and private ownership
- US Department of Interior has designated this area a priority
- Juniper encroachment is a significant issue
- Threatened and endangered species are included in the assessment (benefit to wildlife & biodiversity)
- Concern was expressed that including this area could result in funds shifted to this area at the expense of other areas

ILRCC members agreed more discussion was warranted, and this will be an agenda item for the June 2015 ILRCC meeting.

FOREST ACTION PLAN – Report Card

Dave provided information about the intent of the FAP report card; it will be a stand-alone document and incorporated into the 2015 FAP revision. It will summarize information about FAP, ILRCC’s involvement, projects implementing FAP strategies, and national strategies/priorities and state goals that tie to them. Full page highlights will be included for projects that exemplify work areas addressing the national priorities. Trend lines over time will be incorporated in the report card for selected projects. Funding for various projects will be identified from multiple sources/partners.

Feedback provided by members about the report card:

Design:

- An executive summary is needed for policymakers;
- Information must be simple to read and not overwhelming;
- Identify the geographic area within a PLA by county name(s);
- Bigger map associated with the project descriptions was suggested;
- Excited about graphs to be developed for the report card;
- Sub-watershed accomplishment totals without ownership boundaries were suggested;
- Report card can be helpful to applicants wanting to submit project proposals, policymakers and others

Content:

- Economic impacts in small communities will be important, as treatments represent long-term savings (may be difficult to quantify);
- Acres and/or communities protected is important to include, in addition to treated acres;
- Demonstrate how treatments have reduced threats in terms of the investment;

- Identify where funding has been invested through maps;
- Include photos;
- Tie projects to FAP goals through icons and to national indicators in a visual, straight-forward manner;
- Time lapse mapping of treatment areas was suggested, but concern the data would be very coarse unless the viewing area is expanded;
- Can ‘keeping forest lands working’ be measured in terms of conservation easements through the Forest Legacy Program?;
- Harvest information is available for various FLP project areas (Karen S);
- For FLP, the increase in number of acres or board feet might be a good graph (is likely board feet sustained rather than increased);
- Include state and federal ownership in McArthur Corridor map;
- Caution was suggested so as to not shift funds away from projects to a substantial mapping effort

Other comments:

- Projects are now required to be geospatially mapped;
- IDL is working on making this mapping effort easier through an online mapping tool;
- Rolling-up data to the national level will inform national leadership about where funds are being spent and for what
- It was suggested that a PLSS layer is a quick and easy way for anyone to enter data online;
- Sub-recipient grantee partners will need to report accomplishments both for general information and also for reimbursement purposes

If members have more questions about or suggestions for the draft report card, please contact Mary Fritz.

FOREST LEGACY PROGRAM (FLP) Discussion

Karen Sjoquist updated the Council on recent and future FLP activities. The McArthur Lake Addition conservation easement (CE) (8,000+ acres, \$5.461 million) closed in December, and one of the Boundary Connections easements (~1,000 acres, \$800,000) will close next week. Including these two CEs, 14 are in the program with one additional CE that will close shortly, for a total of over 72,000 acres.

Idaho has competed very well at the national level—receiving funding for two additional projects (Clagstone Meadows and Hall Mountain), and the second phase of the Hall Mountain project ranked third in the President’s FY16 budget, though with reduced funding. Because of the number of pending projects in Idaho, the National Ranking Committee is reluctant to consider additional projects. Likewise, we are at capacity with workload on these projects; most of these projects have multiple landowners, which means more work. For these reasons, IDL will not solicit additional project applications for FY17. We may consider resubmitting the part of the Hall Mountain project not funded—we will wait to see what progress is made on pending projects before deciding.

Discussion continued regarding the state’s responsibility to enforce FLP CEs. FLP partners lack the funds and capacity to conduct annual monitoring of future FLP projects. Landowners currently donate funds at closing to an existing stewardship endowment fund, which supports IDL’s monitoring responsibilities.

UPDATE ON 2015 LANDSCAPE SCALE RESTORATION & WESTERN FIRE MANAGERS GRANTS

Tyre reported on FY2015 Western Fire Managers (WFM) projects. Seven proposals were submitted with three (and possibly four) applications selected for funding: 1) Kootenai County – Spirit Lake & Twin Lakes Corridor project; 2) Shoshone County – Forest Health & Fuel Reduction; 3) Bear Lake County – Paris Hills. If funded, the fourth project will be part of the Bonfire program, located in the southern part of Bonner County, and funded with ‘adjacency funds’, which are intended for private ownerships next to federal forest lands.

Tyre noted that the education elements were integral to project proposal development for the Kootenai and Bear Lake County projects. If the remainder of the grants that were submitted, but not awarded, would have

included more detail about the location of the project work and defined deliverables it is likely they would have been funded.

Mary provided information about the three awarded FY2015 Landscape Scale Restoration (LSR) projects: 1) NE Lake CDA Tributaries Watershed Action Plan; 2) Ada County Wildfire Risk Mapping; 3) Community Hazard Planning and Mitigation (Statewide).

Funding for the NE Lake CDA project will fully fund the remainder of this project, which was partially funded in FY2014.

The Ada County Risk Map project has multiple partners, focuses on the highest priority areas, will develop an assessment tool that identifies potential project work and will be used for education. This could be a model for a statewide portal. The use of Lidar data for this project allows for data analysis in very fine three-dimensional resolution.

The third project is Boise State University's (BSU) Community Hazard Planning & Mitigation project, which will provide a comprehensive review of land-use policies that reduce WUI fire risk, and development of a resource guide. This guide will be helpful to smaller communities lacking this knowledge in the face of high rates of development. Land use policies will not be mandated for communities, but the guide will be a resource for at-risk communities. Mary then discussed the recent notification that BSU's Community Regional Planning Program may be dissolved, and Elaine noted that further discussion about the future of the program is underway. If the program is ultimately dissolved, the University of Idaho could potentially step-in as a partner to support this LSR project through their Bioregional Planning program. BSU and UI will need to decide how to proceed and let IDL (Craig Foss) know as soon as possible. Elaine offered to explore whether this project could go forward with BSU as the lead. A telephone conference will be planned once a project path is determined and participants will include Mary Fritz, Elaine Clegg, Lisa Ailport and possibly others.

POST WILDFIRE COORDINATION

Susan Cleverley (Idaho Bureau of Homeland Security (BHS)) and Ellen Berggren (US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)), provided background on the role of the Idaho Silver Jackets in coordinating mitigation of flood risk following wildfire events. They do not coordinate assistance beyond mitigating the initial flood risk, such as for land restoration or noxious weed control, and feel there is a need for an organization to facilitate/coordinate the various resources available to those affected. They asked whether the ILRCC could serve in that capacity, or explore what organization may be best able to do this.

After substantial discussion, ILRCC members expressed that this isn't the purpose of ILRCC. Members felt updating the existing "After the Fire" resource guide (currently underway) will be a great tool for affected counties and landowners in identifying appropriate resources. Some members felt that providing this type of coordination is also likely a responsibility of county risk managers. Last, some expressed that it may make more sense to enhance the scope of the Silver Jackets to achieve the "one-stop" concept.

FY2016 LSR & WFM GRANT PRE-PROPOSALS

Mary Fritz provided background information about the IDL grant pre-proposal process and updated grants web page. She noted that feedback received from the grants subcommittee resulted in better pre-proposals this year. IDL received four LSR and seven WFM proposals.

NOTE: Prior to discussion of pre-proposals, members Mike Wolcott, Dan Dinning, and Robyn Miller recused themselves and left the room due to their involvement with a number of projects.

An initial comment by ILRCC members was the need for additional time to read and review pre-proposals. Throughout the discussion, ILRCC members explored the role they wish to have for pre-proposal review, and what assistance is most helpful to IDL staff.

Western Fire Manager Grants

Tyre confirmed that because all WFM projects will be forwarded for western competition, ranking them is not necessary. He noted that 1) project justification, 2) defining a clear project area, 3) consistent and measureable outputs and outcomes and how the project is connected to other efforts, and 4) identifying project collaborators and how they are involved, are the areas where Idaho applications tend to score poorly. Discussion continued about requirements for landowners to maintain practices and how it is done. Members asked Tyre to first work with applicants to improve these areas. After this, it may be appropriate for members to review and comment. Tyre asked members that if they did have feedback on any of the proposals, to provide to him by the end of March. Members suggested that WFM pre-proposal include the cumulative effect of proposed activities on the landscape and be specific about treatment locations.

Landscape Scale Restoration grants

Mary reported fewer LSR pre-proposals were received this year than in years past. Mary requested general comments about the LSR pre-proposals by the end of March. It isn't necessary to rank the LSR pre-proposals as a whole; IDL will use member comments to make an internal decision about project ranking. Thereafter, Mary will continue to work with partners whose projects IDL will move forward.

Comments on the **Island Park** application included:

- Measurable outcomes need to be identified
- Some homeowners have a fire hazard problem related to concerns other than vegetation
- Under the Cohesive Strategy project for Island Park, non-vegetation issues will be addressed and worked on
- Concern that this is an ongoing effort already funded, and that it may be premature to request additional funding until current funding is used

Comments on the **Teton Collaborative Watershed Restoration** pre-proposal include:

- Project partners are working with the Office of Species Conservation for items not covered in grant authorities such as road work, culvert replacement, etc. It isn't clear whether grant funds are being requested for these activities
- The application should clearly show other work done in the area
- Its assumed treatments will be on private forest land, but this is not clear. Is there discharge by other communities? Are metrics and outcomes tied to TMDLs?
- Is there an education component or partners that can participate along those lines?
- Currently reads like a fisheries proposal; needs better connection to forestry

Comments on the **Lower Clearwater Forestry Enhancement** Include:

- Where is the technical assistance coming from? Listed partners don't really have that expertise.
- Not much detail in terms of the collaborative partners. Frank Gariglio will make inquiries about the network.
- Education element needs to provide more detail
- Where are project treatment areas within the proposed project area map (this is a huge area)?
- Grant administration of over 3 years needs more clarity as to what the entity will do.
- More information needed regarding trees climate change resilience

Comments on the **Forest Density Management Monitoring Network** include:

- This is a multi-state initiative that will be used to develop recommendations for thinning to improve forest health
- Frank Gariglio has cooperated with this group and expressed the need for the resulting data
- More clarity needed about model to be used

- It was clarified this is not a research project, but means to develop a resource guide for forest landowners to make better management decisions
- Highlight an end document and tools that will be produced
- NRCS could use this data in ecological site description recommendations. Frank volunteered to work with applicant to further develop this aspect of the pre-proposal.

PRESENTATION OF FIRE/FORESTRY PORTAL CONCEPT

Tyre Holfeltz and Susan Cleverley provided background on the portal idea. The portal subcommittee viewed other state and BHS web sites and developed a list of what they'd like to see included in a proposed portal. Tyre collected the information and developed a grant application for FY2015. The project application was submitted and scored 29 out of 45 points. Most points were lost because information on maintaining portal data over time was lacking. Maintenance costs are unknown at this time with the expectation that server space is needed for 5-7 years. Tyre plans to resubmit the proposal this year.

Additional discussion points for improving the proposal and purpose of a portal:

- The data in the portal needs to be updatable at the county level
- Individuals need to know their specific risk
- We need a long-term answer on how to keep it going
- A similar portal in Oregon will be funded long-term through BHS
- Is this idea of an Idaho portal of value to the State of Idaho or community hazard mitigation organizations? The portal would integrate with the State Hazard Mitigation website, maintained by UI and Idaho BHS.
- County all hazard plan updates should inform the portal.
- What about technical abilities/limitations of smaller counties? Clearwater and Valley counties are building small-scale risk assessments like this.

Members are requested to provide input to Tyre. Tyre noted this application is not taking away from other applications counties could submit. He further noted that in Texas this idea was developed and used as a public education tool; however, it's not being used by Texas firefighters.

OUTCOME: IDAHO 5-YEAR REVIEW OF STATE & PRIVATE FORESTRY PROGRAMS

Craig Foss reported on the results of the 5-year USFS State & Private Forestry review of IDL's programs that took place during summer and fall 2014. There were many commendations and some suggestions for program tweaks, but no big changes recommended by S&PF. Margie Ewing Costa reported the final report is not yet published. She provided favorable comments about Idaho's programs and the formation of ILRCC. There will be some action items for IDL to work on over the next 5-year period. LSR project funding is a budget line item now and funding for this has come at the expense of base level program funds; this has negatively affected the Urban & Community Forestry Program. Craig explained base level program funding and the need to include funding for administration expense as part of LSR grant projects.

******Craig Foss recognized and thanked retired ILRCC members, Gary Brown and former ILRCC chair Mark Larson during the afternoon break******

FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT (FLM) & THE IDAHO FOREST RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP (IFRP)

IFRP members Dale Harris and John Roberts were introduced and welcomed ILRCC members to Boise for the upcoming conference.

Craig Foss provided background on this topic leading up to today. Healthy Forest Restoration Act (HFRA) provisions in the 2014 Farm Bill authorized Governors to designate areas of Forest Service lands where management is needed to address current and future risk of insect and disease. Discussions between the Governor's office and two USDA Forest Service Regional Foresters resulted in IDL being charged to work with

Forest Service and forest collaborative groups to compile proposed treatment areas on National Forest System (NFS) lands in Idaho. The process was transparent and communicated to the public on the IFRP website. All designated NFS treatment areas fall within FAP PLAs, except the Sawtooth National Forest. The Governor's office submitted the proposed designated treatment area document to the Secretary of Agriculture, who approved the designations. This has resulted in continued discussions about Idaho's role in management on federal lands.

A Master Stewardship Agreement (MSA) was proposed for IDL to partner with national forests to get on-the-ground treatments done, following what the State of Montana has done. The Idaho State Forester and IDL's Director do not believe the MSA is a good model for IDL. Discussions are ongoing among IDL, federal land managers and other stakeholders, with a smaller task group (of nine people) developing a non-profit concept model.

Craig Glazier reported that meetings have taken place with non-profit groups and legal representatives regarding the non-profit concept. If a non-profit group concept is pursued, a strong mission statement and charter will be very important in the initial stages of developing the non-profit. The non-profit would assist with the implementation of the forest plan.

John Roberts reported IFRP operates as a non-profit under the Society of American Foresters charter. A challenge for the statewide non-profit concept would be agreeing on the specific priorities to be addressed. It won't be one size fits all for all Forests. Using private funding on national forest lands will require a very broad-based board of directors to avoid undue criticism. It was suggested that perhaps the Quincy Library Group might be a model to follow, although on a much larger scale. Craig Foss clarified the State of Idaho would not be running the non-profit or entering into MSAs. There are more questions than answers at this point in time depending upon the federal authority being discussed. The timeline proposed for getting something up and running is January 2016.

The goal of gathering comments today is to talk to as many groups as possible in order to get feedback. ILRCC may not want to get heavily involved in this effort, but does need to know about its existence. At the very least ILRCC needs to receive periodic updates.

Rural schools funding is going away and there's a need to replace this funding to communities in some way, perhaps through a more traditional sales process. IDL endowment forests and foresters will not be involved with this effort on federal lands due to their own fiduciary duties on state endowment forest lands. IDL involvement will be limited to the Bureau of Forestry Assistance and the Idaho State Forester.

There's also a need to meet with local collaborative groups to identify potential LSR or WFM projects adjacent to NFS projects. IDL does not have the answers and is looking for solutions through involvement during the IFRP conference and with attendees over the next two days, including ILRCC members. Other federal land management issues exist and need to be resolved at the federal level.

MEETING FEEDBACK, WRAP UP, NEXT MEETING

Feedback on today's meeting:

- Craig Glazier suggested developing a process for groups or individuals to bring proposed agenda items forward to ILRCC. An idea is to request a one-page document with background information and the reason to bring the concept to the council, and send that to IDL (Craig Foss) for consideration as an agenda item at the next meeting. The timeline for this to happen is two months in advance of the next meeting. It was suggested that a request be sent out by IDL planning staff to solicit agenda ideas.
- More direction is needed about what ILRCC is being asked to do as part of the pre-proposal review for Western Fire Manager and LSR grant proposals.

- Margie Ewing Costa commented there is no cumulative assessment of where in Idaho ~\$100M in grant funds were spent over the last eight years. There's a need to know where in Idaho the money has gone and what's been accomplished over the past eight years. This might help with the overall discussion; specific accomplishments should be included in grant proposals. A county breakdown would be helpful for project work being done; perhaps call it the "landscape portal."
- Agenda items for next meeting: Success story for LSR—the Best Management Practices (BMP) manual and video project, and provide more information about sage-grouse habitat as a special area in FAP.
- Lisa reported there will be an APA Idaho Chapter conference in Sandpoint, in October 2016; she will solicit requests for proposals.

In terms of the location of the next meeting, the group favored Moscow over southern Idaho. IDL will send out a Doodle poll to determine best dates for the meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted by Suzie Jude

List of follow-up items:

- Webpage access for council members
- Comments back to Mary on FY2016 LSR pre-proposals by March 31, 2015
- Comments back to Tyre on FY2016 WFM pre-proposals by March 31, 2015
- Proposed agenda items such as project proposal ideas to be submitted to Craig Foss two months prior to the next meeting
- Doodle Poll to determine best dates for the June meeting