



IDAHO LANDS RESOURCE COORDINATING COUNCIL

Tuesday, June 20, 2017
Riverside Hotel, Cinnabar Conference Room, Boise, Idaho

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patti Best, Utilities/Energy Efficiency	Ken Knoch, ILRCC Chair, City Foresters/Idaho Parks & Recreation Association
Randy Brooks, UI Extension Forestry	Tim Maguire, Urban Forestry Collaborative Groups / Bioregional Planning
Glen Burkhardt, Bureau of Land Management - Fire	Bob Reggear, Green Industry Organizations
Susan Cleverley, Idaho Office of Emergency Management	Gordon Sanders, Idaho Forest Owners Association (Alt)
John DeGroot, Nez Perce Tribe	James Tucker, National Forest System-Fire Management
Janet Funk, Idaho Tree Farm Committee	Mike Wolcott, Association of Consulting Foresters
Frank Gariglio, USDA-NRCS	Janet Valle, USDA-FS, State & Private Forestry
Bob Howard, Idaho Emergency Managers Association	

AGENCY STAFF & GUESTS PRESENT:

Ara Andrea, Bureau Chief, Forestry Assistance, IDL	Lance Davisson, Treasure Valley Canopy Network
Tom Eckberg, Forest Health Program Manager, IDL	Jaap Vos, University of Idaho, Bioregional Planning & Community Design Program
Mary Fritz, Stewardship Program Manager, IDL	
Tyre Holfeltz, Fire Prevention and Risk Mitigation Program Manager, IDL	
Dave Stephenson, Urban Interface Program Manager, IDL	
Jennifer Russell, Project Coordinator, IDL	
Suzie Jude, Forest Stewardship Program, IDL	

Welcome/Introductions

Chair Ken Knoch welcomed members and guests to the meeting. ILRCC's newly appointed member Bob Howard, representing the Idaho Emergency Managers Association, provided his professional background—welcome, Bob.

Review of follow-up items last meeting

Tyre discussed the Community Assistance Grant Sources spreadsheet he's compiled and requested additions to list:

- Forest Legacy and Forest Stewardship categories/information (Janet Valle)

Discussion followed regarding additional details needed in the spreadsheet, i.e. how wide in scope should grant type be (DEQ 310 grants, Idaho Fish and Game, etc.)? Community assistance is the overall category the group is trying to address. Should grants be listed by the source or category type? What's available to a specific group like private landowners? The grant purpose should have a consistent set of categories like stream, forest health, etc. Should sample project types or eligible project types be included? It was suggested to change wording "who is eligible" to "who can apply." Also, some grant sources that benefit private landowners must be applied for by city or county governments. It was agreed the web host will be IDL on the grants page under category "other funding." Please contact Tyre with any additional grants that should be added.



Forest Stewardship Survey – Preliminary Information

Mary Fritz provided background on the survey by the University of Idaho Policy Analysis Group (PAG).

- ◆ The survey's purpose is to enhance IDL's landowner stewardship outreach and to provide IDL partners with current landowner data. In total, 2,800 landowners were surveyed which resulted in 1,000 completed and returned surveys, 39.1% equally distributed by region (North Idaho, North Central, Central, and South & East). Preliminary findings show most landowners are in their 60's, many are college educated. The reasons for owning forests varied, but beauty and scenery, nature protection, and wildlife habitat consistently ranked as most important. Investment income, privacy, and family legacy also ranked high. Most landowners, especially in southern and eastern Idaho, lacked a forest management plan guiding future decisions. They struggle to implement actions due to cost, age, having the right tools, or finding the right contractor to do the work.
- ◆ Forthcoming analysis will look at differences in behavior. Other findings include family and peers are extremely important to landowner decisions. Parsing the survey answers within groups will assist with messaging to these groups and to changing behaviors. Discussion continued on bias in the answer to the question "Do I have a plan?" Is it about getting a tax exemption only or actually using the plan?

IDL Grants GIS Database Roll-out

Tyre provided members with the user guide that will be rolled out to cooperators. This independent platform lives in the cloud, and collects data with GIS tools. It does not have the ability to model and has limited editing functions. Cooperators need to decide who will report their information and, thereafter, credentials will be issued to that person/entity. Information captured will include plans (LSR, Forest Stewardship One Plan, CWPP), assessments (watershed, fire risk and home), and treatments (restoration or vegetation manipulation). Some differences between the two databases are lines vs polygons and points for education (county fairs, HOAs, etc.). The cost to cover this activity is part of the grant agreement and this process will reduce the amount of paperwork required for reimbursement requests. It will capture high quality data and make good use of funding provided to Idaho. It will also be used as a decision support tool that will help IDL button-up efforts and work more efficiently. Frank Gariglio commented on the opportunity to share information with and between agencies like IDL and NRCS. Would it also be possible to import information from the Forest Service and BLM?

Tyre provided a demo of the database utilizing hypothetical data (where and what plans/treatments were done). Tyre demonstrated how to create a link and send to a cooperator. Once received, the cooperator opens the link to log in with credentials and zooms to a project area. The cooperator creates treatment area(s) within the project area and the corresponding attribute table is then populated.

Member questions/clarifications:

- Can the two databases be viewed together? If technology improves but, for now, they live in different places in the online world.
- Regarding pre-planning dollars and contacts, they will go in as GIS points.
- Will IDL enter past grants? Yes, as time and funds allow.
- Multiple treatments can be tied to one reimbursement request.
- Will attribute table functionality be available to the public? Only project polygons due to privacy issues.
- Associated costs of treatments are in the database.
- IDL has a verification process to review information entered into the GIS database.
- Is there an IDL page for grantees, or is only a link sent? Just a link.



- Cooperators who have multiple projects (LSR/WSFM or HFR) will have to log into each system separately; they will not be able to toggle between them. For Cooperators who have multiple WSFM or HFR projects, they can zoom in and out of the various project areas without having to log in and out to input data.
- What is the implementation date? For 2016 agreements. Currently, IDL is conducting beta testing, but it's anticipated to go live in fall 2017.
- This would be a good presentation for the annual Soil and Water Conservation Commission meeting in Lewiston in November 2017.
- For 2016 grants, IDL will look at how much effort will be needed by each cooperator and adjust the level of assistance needed through customized training.

CWPP Planning Guide

Jaap Vos, University of Idaho, Bioregional Planning & Community Design Program, was introduced. Tyre referred council members to the link for Best Management Practices for community planning:

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2845046

Some “golden nuggets” from the guide include:

- There's no one-size-fits-all to wildfire planning.
- Defining WUI is contextual.
- Collaboration beyond the fire community.
- Planning is an adaptable process that should go beyond the county level.
- Regulation and incentives without support are meaningless.
- Maintenance and enforcement are hard.

Jaap provided a discussion example about his work with the community of Idaho City in Boise County. Jaap explained the melding of an informal with a formal decision system. Decisions made in small communities are not always made by government and it's critical to determine who the decision makers are and how their decisions are made. It's important to ask who the gatekeepers are and how to get them to think about fire.

Jaap's suggestions:

- Best way to reach communities is to wait until they come to you.
- The most effective way is to gain community trust and wait until they are ready.
- The more efficient way is to do a quick scan of the community, base your approach on that, and hope for the best.
- An easy approach is to simply work with professional and non-profit organizations.

Council members provided input on moving forward in an efficient and effective way on this effort:

- Identify community leaders looking ahead to planning.
- Consider government concerns about limitations for a particular aspect of grant funding they object to.
- It's necessary to build relationships with community members.
- Provide resources to the community to assist in this effort like Idaho Smart Growth. This works in some places, but not in others.
- Communities have sophisticated systems of making decisions, but they may not be formal systems.
- Many communities have very effective networks that are informal.
- Many communities and citizens believe in the idea of freedom to live a certain way.



- Limited funding and limited time runs at odds with efforts that require time to build relationships.
- Identify those communities that are ready to go.
- Idaho Rural Partnership would be a good resource to work with, but not on fire issues.
- Identify community or county that has formal and informal networks that work to serve as example or as trainers for others who trust them. Who are these trusted groups and what are their networks? Extension staff, community-supported student activities, local churches or places where folks are congregating, tribal communities.
- Identify and tailor efforts to your audience.
- In rural communities, it's difficult to get through to folks about why they need County Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPPs). Conversely, those communities that have CWPPs and All Hazard Plans (AHPs) have their ducks in order and are ready to go when fire occurs.
- Visiting a community once is not effective. There is a need for multiple visits.
- Is the goal to increase capacity for CWPPs or AHPs, or both? There's an absence of fire in community economic threats and impacts.
- Changing behavior is difficult even when you want to change. Give the community an opportunity to determine how to get it done.
- Mixed ownership is a challenge with private, state and federal lands. There may be ignorance of funding being spent on fuel breaks and fire mitigation efforts. This may play into the idea that others will take care of fire.
- Is the problem too overwhelming for small communities? What are the small, simple steps they can take? Cultural change may take years to accomplish.
- Suggest peer-to-peer conversations between communities of like decision makers. Use practitioners in short videos to talk about things that work.
- Find someone in community who wasn't bailed out by the fire community or their insurance company to share their experience.
- Involve the insurance industry in the community discussion.
- Town hall meetings.
- Surprised at the lack of engagement by (80% of small) Idaho communities in fire planning. For those counties that do participate in fire planning, it's due to suppression funding impacts.
- There are three county WUI coordinators statewide.
- Suggest using stories of loss or testimonials to engage communities

Federal Budget Update for 2017 & 2018

Dave Stephenson provided an update on the last federal budget cycle. Overall, in FFY17, the Stewardship program had a 13% cut in the funding. Under the FFY18 proposed Trump Budget, there would be a 50% cut in S&PF funding, elimination of LSR, Legacy, and Urban/Community Forestry funding, and a 2% increase in Stewardship. Hazardous Fuels funding has been moved to National Forest System. There is some question whether National Forest System (NFS) funds will stay on NFS lands. Jim Tucker commented on B (base) code and P (fire) code for NFS personnel. Many national forests count on P code funding to supplement base funding. Effect is to reduce the P code savings. Not sure how this will affect non-federal agency staff working on a federal fire. Reduced funding to state fire assistance and volunteer fire assistance will be by 11% each. IDL has a S&PF funding buffer of 2-3 years, but decisions will need to be made soon given the reduced future federal program funding.



Consulting Foresters Association

Mike Wolcott provided background information about Idaho's chapter of the Association of Consulting Foresters (ACF). He explained the separate technician and forester educational requirements for ACF members. Members only represent their client's best interests, adhere to a strict code of ethics, work to meet client objectives, available on a fee basis, and have a unique niche from other foresters. Nationwide, the ACF has over 700 members that promote sound stewardship of forest resources, and maintain and enforce high ethical standards for members. Many members are Certified Foresters (CF) with the Society of American Foresters (SAF), Certified Tree Farm Inspectors with the American Tree Farm System (ATFS), and Technical Service Providers (TSPs) through NRCS Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP). Services provided include preparing forest management plans, timber cruising and appraisals, timber sales, conservation easements, estate planning, forest improvement projects, NRCS program assistance, forest taxation, absentee owner representation, expert witness, and hazardous fuels management. The tie-in between ACF and ILRCC takes advantage of knowledge and experience, landowner concerns and priorities, Hazard Fuels Management (HFM) and CWPP plans, Legacy projects, liaison between agency and landowners, forest stewardship, and wildfire suppression. ACF assists with agency contract work and industrial forest owners. They are interested in and watching Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) work in Idaho. Janet Funk commented on the assistance ACF foresters provide for educational outreach at the annual Edge Creek Farm teacher's tour and the Idaho Forest Products Commission (IFPC)-led opinion leaders tour.

Wildfire Response Committee (WRC) Formation

Tyre reviewed the Idaho State-wide Fire Response Committee briefing paper and charter to develop a Wildfire Response Committee (WRC). The proposal will be to "develop a collaborative fire response committee for Idaho with the purpose of improving communication and coordination between the customary wildland agencies and all other agencies and partners across the state that have an interest or stake in the management of wildfires."

Because ILRCC will continue to have an interest in WRC, ILRCC representatives (Tyre, Knute Sandahl, and Jim Tucker) will participate on it. Tyre explained that fire response is divided in Idaho into two separate geographic organizations (Regions 1 and 4) in terms of moving fire personnel, equipment and other resources. WRC has been developed to foster understanding of the geographic issues, but also to oversee the leadership function that will serve to foster ideas and solutions to problematic fire issues such as local, statewide or regional cooperator agreements. Regarding guiding principles, the past Idaho Fire Plan Working Group (IFPWG) served to nurture cooperation between fire response groups. This was lost when IFPWG disbanded. WRC will pick up where IFPWG left off. Tyre went on to discuss the WRC Charter and the mission statement "enhancing state wide fire management practices through communication and partnerships" to improve efficiency. This is where there is an overlap between the WRC and ILRCC—to keep information flowing between these two groups and to advocate for fire protection.

Concern was expressed about funding needed to support the WRC. Does this have the potential to divert funding away from programs/grant projects overseen by ILRCC? Tyre reported that staff time for working on WRC will be paid by (staff) home units, and an oversight committee will oversee any needed assistance to statewide response initiatives and/or implementation advised by WRC. There are fire response funding sources that are unique to firefighting efforts to address response capacity and provide equipment, communications and training that ILRCC does not advise nor oversee. There's no intention of taking away fire assistance funding to private landowners.



Response Preparedness Discussion

Discussion followed about how WRC will work to achieve an efficient and functioning fire response effort. Gary Brown has been working on the WRC charter that will hopefully have agency leadership sign-off this fall. It's all about communication and staying informed. There are holes between what was done previously under IFPWG and what WRC will address. WRC will coordinate state-based efforts for fire response on many levels i.e. county, state agency, and federal agency. To make it perfectly clear the WRC will not be tracking where mitigation projects are located, this is something that ILRCC will still need to discuss to formulate a suggestion of how to move forward so that effective coordination and collaboration can occur.

Discussion followed about WRC enacting standards for controlled burns. Will this be their responsibility? Tyre answered not likely as this falls outside of the mitigation realm and is more part of the response realm. Jim explained there are already well-established rules and procedures in place for prescribed fire at the agency level. What about for private forest landowners? Even though there are good management objectives that come from prescribed fire, under Idaho Code (for DEQ) all fire is considered "nuisance." Does this need to be changed in Idaho Code?

It may be helpful to form an ILRCC subcommittee to look at mitigation topics/projects and report back to the larger ILRCC group. No mitigation coordination has taken place at the state level. There's no platform for sharing information between fire agencies, NRCS, and private landowners. As an aside to the discussion, Susan discussed having an "enhanced" fire mitigation plan that would increase funds available to the state when disaster declarations are made, but it will need to capture mitigation efforts taking place statewide and not just within the Idaho Office of Emergency Management.

Tyre informed the group that there's mitigation information available from other agencies, but it needs to be consolidated. There's a need to set an (online) platform, send information to the appropriate people, collect the data and consolidate it. The new IDL databases could potentially support this as a decision support tool, but formal mitigation discussions are still needed at a larger level, outside of WRC and ILRCC. The discussion turned to what kinds of projects would be considered. Tyre noted that, in terms of projects that mitigate fire, it would include other types of restoration projects that address wildlife habitat, water quality, etc., not specifically identified as fire mitigation projects, but activities which have beneficial fire mitigation effects. These other types of restoration projects would need to be part of a mitigation database as well. It was suggested that ILRCC consider forming a sub-committee to work on WRC communication strategy/issues.

Tyre also wanted the group to understand that the WRC will not undertake fire prevention/education efforts for human-caused fires. Jennifer Myslivy is currently working to share information across agency boundaries to deliver a prevention message. Many of the current prevention messages available have a large number of agency logos which often makes it difficult to transfer and use in other locations. So Tyre suggested that to ensure universal use of prevention messages that a single logo be used to brand the various messages so that they can be used by anyone anywhere in Idaho. There is a current logo but it may not be the right logo so some investigation will be done to determine its applicability. Rolling this all together brings us to one of the greatest issues prevention faces in Idaho: there is no state level organization to coordinate or create collaboration. In other states, there are various structures to address prevention efforts. In Utah, there are state mitigation and communication groups formulated under the interagency fire managers. Should Idaho look at replicating what other states are doing? Tyre will look into this further and discuss at next ILRCC meeting. A suggested structure would include



separate mitigation and prevention efforts. It was also suggested the prevention piece have a unified logo similar to the Idaho Silver Jackets.

Community Forest and Open Space Conservation Program

Janet Valle explained the Community Forest and Open Space Conservation Program started in 2012 to create community forests¹ meeting certain criteria. Program match is 50%, the community forest must be open to public. Currently the program is at 10,000 acres nationwide. Community forest benefits can include financial (timber and non-timber), recreation, public access, clean air and water, reduced erosion, and educational outreach through demonstration forests and learning classrooms. Eligibility is open to local government and communities, non-profits with certain IRS designations, and federally-recognized tribes. The program does allow for timber sales by title holder. Federal funds are for acquisition only, but match funds can be used for other improvements. Applications must be for projects greater than 5 acres with a minimum of 75% forested. Three Region 1 projects are located in Montana—Alvord Lake near Troy, Mt. Ascension by the City of Helena, and Foy's Community Forest in Flathead County, near Kalispell. Application deadlines to the State Forester are January 15th each year, and then passed along to Janet Valle in Ogden. The program can fund up to \$400,000 for each application. In Idaho, the Pines Street Woods Project in Sandpoint has been approved. Once funding is available, Janet will meet with project organizers. A second project in Post Falls that was not approved this year was encouraged to re-apply for 2018 funding. If there are questions about this program, go to online link: <https://www.fs.fed.us/spf/coop/programs/loa/cfp.shtml>.

Legislative Proposals of '18/'19

Ara reported her observations regarding upcoming legislative proposals:

- The federal budget, once approved by Congress, rarely looks like the President's budget.
- There are indications that Hazardous Fuels Reduction (HFR) grant funds may come to the states through the National Forest System, rather than through State & Private Forestry.
- Forest Service funds received by IDL to start the Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) program in Idaho came from Cohesive Strategy grants.
- Ara is looking at contingency plans moving forward; in particular, state legislative enhanced budget to S&PF programs which may suffer under the federal budget.
- At the recent Western Region Forest Legacy and Stewardship meeting, Ara had discussions with USFS S&PF staff and is encouraged about collaborative work on restoration projects in the Clearwater River Basin, with grant projects on private forestlands as well as GNA work on the Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest.
- Secretary of Agriculture Sonny Purdue visited Idaho recently and viewed GNA efforts underway. He wants to replicate these efforts in other states.
- Governor Otter proposed new funding in his budget for additional positions to work on GNA efforts in Idaho; the Idaho Legislature approved this item.

Ara reported the fire suppression administrative rule change is coming along through negotiated rule making. The Idaho Forestry Act requires water and equipment on site during harvest operations to demonstrate preventative measures to reduce liability. Regarding the streamside retention rule under the Idaho Forest Practices Act, the University of Idaho has developed a way to measure effectiveness of the rule. This effort is looking for an additional 15 sites to be part of the study. A second study will look

¹ Note that "Community Forest" is defined differently for this program than it is for the Urban and Community Forestry Program.



at what people are doing with the new rule. Based on these two studies, a determination will be made if changes are needed to the streamside retention rule.

Forest Legacy Program Update

Mary provided background on the University of Idaho, PAG review of the Forest Legacy Program. There will be three Legacy closings taking place this year. New applications have been received from Schweitzer Mountain (5,000 acres) and Boundary Connections II (2,000 acres). Both applications are for \$5M. IDL is moving forward with Legacy applications even though the President's Budget did not provide for any Legacy funding.

Crafting the Proposal for the FAP Update

Ara provided background on the effort to update the Forest Action Plan (FAP) and some of the proposed ideas about how to get this done. The datasets used in the first State Assessment of Forest Resources (SAFR) effort were discussed. Given the current federal budget environment, does Idaho want to change the original process? The current FAP is very robust. It's appropriate to ask whether FAP is currently meeting user needs. Does it utilize all relevant data sets? Those using FAP include ILRCC members, their constituencies, and grant applicants. FAP is also tied to Idaho Fish & Game's State Wildlife Action Plan (SWAP).

Discussion followed about North Dakota's FAP-update survey to determine priority issues, identify implementation challenges, identify new data sets, develop a framework for the next five years, and identify programs tied to the FAP. North Dakota comments were positive and validated their present process, identified emerging priorities for the next five-year cycle, looked at existing S&PF programs, working with other partners and funding sources, and identified new data set needs.

Council member comments:

- Idaho's first SAFR effort was done well and a survey like North Dakota's would be a useful effort to determine answers to these other issues. Regarding a geospatial online support tool for the FAP, when the budget allows it would be helpful to have this for Idaho.
- Idaho's FAP has been utilized by other agencies outside IDL including Idaho Fish and Game (for SWAP) and NFS. The NRCS utilizes FAP to prioritize project applications for forest treatments and inform an NRCS risk assessment.
- Tree Nutrition Cooperative folks are a good group to incorporate into the FAP update effort. Many NFS forest plans are in the process of being updated and could be incorporated.

Discussion followed about the forest health data used in FAP, acronyms for groups that are out of date, web links that no longer work, out-of-date aerial survey information, and on-the-ground conditions that have changed (dead trees). There is also a new root disease model available that could be utilized. Tussock moth defoliation is currently taking place. Other inputs to consider include digitized aerial photos, remote sensing, noxious weeds (2014), climate change, relative fire risk, canopy loss, recreation pressure, fish distribution models, SWAP (2015), ecoregions (from The Nature Conservancy), sage grouse, public drinking water (from Idaho Department of Environmental Quality), smoke impacts, and others.

Discussion followed that IDL is thinking about following a similar process as the last effort, but utilizing a smaller ILRCC core group to work on the assessment, make recommendations, and report back to larger ILRCC group.

Questions to consider:



- What if the new data shows changes to Priority Landscape Areas (PLA) locations? Do we want to change them?
- Should the assessment continue to weight benefits more than threats?
- Regarding a user group survey, should it report results back to ILRCC?

The goal is to get the ILRCC core group working later this year and provide recommendations to the full ILRCC in February 2018. ILRCC participation in a FAP core group will help to determine strategies. Subject matter experts will also be needed in addition to the core group. The timeline: finalize who will do the work (internal IDL vs. RFP/contractor) late summer or early fall; organize the FAP core group; present findings at February 2018 ILRCC meeting which will drive the assessment process in mid-2018; update other portions of the FAP document; submission of document in 2019 for (ILRCC) comments; final submission in June 2020.

ILRCC members interested in serving on the core group are Tim Maguire, Janet Valle, Chris Schnepp, Norris Boothe, John DeGroot, Gregg Servheen, Robyn Miller, Glen Burkhardt, Janet Funk, Susan Cleverley and Lorrie Pahl. Tyre requested council members please send him any useful information that would be beneficial to inclusion in FAP. Depending upon the federal budget, assistance will be needed supporting a contractor or IDL staff. The process will include determining who will be important to include in the FAP review.

Natural Capital Resource Assessment – South Platte River Watershed

Tim Maguire provided background information on the Natural Capital Resource Assessment in Colorado and his work with Urban Waters Partnership (UWP) stakeholders. Natural capital is also known as green infrastructure (GI). Because there is a lot of work being done in the South Platte River watershed, UWP wanted an assessment of the natural capital and its ecosystem services. The National Land Cover Database was utilized in the assessment to show vegetation; in total there were 40 datasets utilized in the assessment. There were differences identified about what's important to green infrastructure within three project areas. A word cloud informed by stakeholders identified assets within a functional watershed. Meta-analysis was done by project area and prioritization categories. Among questions asked: what do stakeholders want the data to inform, and what GI is important to stakeholders by project area? The mapping effort identified natural assets of importance with weighting of categories (quartile distribution of 5 values). The first map output was reviewed and revised to reflect current conditions. A final map informed everything else. The economic analysis was done with Earth Economics using their Ecosystem Valuation Toolkit. Starting with land cover layer, they determined what attributes to use and modify according to criteria. For each ecosystem service, there was an economic study to plug in values for each land type in the study region. Meta-analysis was the starting point utilized to identify stakeholder goals and determine priority areas.

Questions:

- Is this assessment more of a cost-benefit analysis? No, but the assessment can be beneficial when comparing where to do work, current GI conditions, their values, and the outcomes of projects. Tim is not proposing a full GI assessment for Idaho but instead an economic analysis would be beneficial to ILRCC to evaluate the value of project proposals.

Meeting feedback, wrap up, field tour logistics

- Janet Valle enjoyed all presentations, especially the South Platte River presentation. Analysis was done at a 30-meter scale. How do you get this information to city planners? When talking about urban areas, was human health considered? (Tim: Urban air quality was evaluated along



with clean water, that can infer human health. There will be a web link to this data eventually but it's currently in development. Stakeholder group in Colorado was pre-existing prior to the project.)

- More report outs during this meeting and not so much discussion.
- Focused discussion was beneficial.
- Like outcomes listed in the agenda.

The next ILRCC meeting location will be in the Spokane-Coeur d'Alene vicinity, in February 2018, followed by IFRP conference. The summer 2018 meeting is tentatively set for southeast Idaho where Jen and Tyre will have project work to tour.

Meeting adjourned 4:45pm

Minutes respectfully submitted by Suzie Jude

List of follow-up items:

1. Should Idaho look at replicating what other states are doing to address fire mitigation and education statewide? Tyre will look into this further and discuss at next ILRCC meeting.