



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Terrell Swofford, 1st District
Robert A. Meacher, Vice Chair 2nd District
Sharon Thrall, 3rd District
Lori Simpson, Chair 4th District
Jon Kennedy, 5th District

**AGENDA FOR MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 13, 2011 TO BE HELD AT 10:00 A.M. IN THE
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ROOM 308, COURTHOUSE, QUINCY, CALIFORNIA**

www.countyofplumas.com

AGENDA

The Board of Supervisors welcomes you to its meetings which are regularly held on the first three Tuesdays of each month, and your interest is encouraged and appreciated.

Any item without a specified time on the agenda may be taken up at any time and in any order. Any member of the public may contact the Clerk of the Board before the meeting to request that any item be addressed as early in the day as possible, and the Board will attempt to accommodate such requests.

Any person desiring to address the Board shall first secure permission of the presiding officer. For noticed public hearings, speaker cards are provided so that individuals can bring to the attention of the presiding officer their desire to speak on a particular agenda item.

Any public comments made during a regular Board meeting will be recorded. The Clerk will not interpret any public comments for inclusion in the written public record. Members of the public may submit their comments in writing to be included in the public record.

CONSENT AGENDA: These matters include routine financial and administrative actions. All items on the consent calendar will be voted on at some time during the meeting under "Consent Agenda." If you wish to have an item removed from the Consent Agenda, you may do so by addressing the Chairperson.



REASONABLE ACCOMMODATIONS: In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting please contact the Clerk of the Board at (530) 283-6170. Notification 72 hours prior to the meeting will enable the County to make reasonable arrangements to ensure accessibility. Auxiliary aids and services are available for people with disabilities.

STANDING ORDERS

10:00 A.M. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN REMEMBRANCE OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001

INVOCATION AND FLAG SALUTE

ADDITIONS TO OR DELETIONS FROM THE AGENDA

PUBLIC COMMENT OPPORTUNITY

Matters under the jurisdiction of the Board, and not on the posted agenda, may be addressed by the general public at the beginning of the regular agenda and any off-agenda matters before the Board for consideration. However, California law prohibits the Board from taking action on any matter which is not on the posted agenda unless it is determined to be an urgency item by the Board of Supervisors. Any member of the public wishing to address the Board during the "Public Comment" period will be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes.

ACTION AGENDA

Convene as the Plumas County Board of Equalization

1. 10:10 BOARD OF EQUALIZATION

Sitting as the Plumas County Board of Equalization set hearing dates for assessment appeals

Adjourn as the Plumas County Board of Equalization and reconvene as the Board of Supervisors

2. 10:20 AUDITOR/CONTROLLER

Adopt a **RESOLUTION** adopting the Basic Tax Rate for Plumas County and the rates for the Beckwourth Community Service Area, Plumas Unified School District and Plumas District Hospital Bonds for FY 2011-2012. **Roll call vote**

3. 10:30 BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

- A. Approve and authorize the Chair to sign letter to Regional Council of Rural Counties regarding coordination with the U.S. Forest Service
- B. Discussion and possible action regarding funding for economic development
- C. Correspondence
- D. Weekly report by Board members of meetings attended, key topics, project updates, standing committees and appointed Boards and Associations.

4. CLOSED SESSION

ANNOUNCE ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED IN CLOSED SESSION

- A. Conference with Legal Counsel: Significant exposure to litigation pursuant to Subdivision (b) of Government Code Section 54956.9
- B. Conference with Legal Counsel: Initiation of litigation pursuant to Subdivision (c) of Government Code §54956.9 – one case
- C. Conference with Labor Negotiator regarding employee negotiations: Sheriff's Department Employees Association, Operating Engineers Local #3, and Confidential Employees

REPORT OF ACTION IN CLOSED SESSION (IF APPLICABLE)

ADJOURNMENT

Adjourn meeting in memory of September 11, 2001 to meet again on Tuesday, September 20, 2011, Board of Supervisors Room 308, Courthouse, Quincy, California.

2

RESOLUTION NO. 11-

**A RESOLUTION ADOPTING THE BASIC TAX RATE FOR PLUMAS COUNTY
AND THE RATES FOR THE BECKWOURTH COMMUNITY SERVICE AREA,
PLUMAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT AND PLUMAS DISTRICT HOSPITAL
BONDS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010/11**

WHEREAS, Government Code §29100 requires that the tax rates be set and approved by the Board of Supervisors.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Supervisors, County of Plumas, State of California, as follows:

The tax rate for Plumas County is 1% of the assessed value (\$1000.00 per 100,000 of assessed value) for the 2011/12 fiscal year, tax year 2011, with the bond rates to be ADDED to the 1% rate as follows:

The tax rate for the Beckwourth Community Service Area Bond are affixed at .02252% of the Secured assessed value (\$22.52 per 100,000 of assessed value) and .01976% of the Unsecured assessed value for the fiscal year 2011/12, tax year 2011.

The tax rate for the Plumas Unified School District Bond are affixed at .03132% of the Secured assessed value (\$31.32 per 100,000 of assessed value) and .02494% of the unsecured assessed value for the fiscal year 2011/12, tax year 2011.

The tax rate for the Plumas District Hospital Bond, as calculated and approved, by resolution, by the Plumas Hospital District's Board, are affixed at .01510% of the Secured assessed value (\$15.10 per 100,000 of assessed value) and .00% of the Unsecured assessed value for the fiscal year 2011/12, tax year 2011.

The tax rate for the Plumas Unified District and Plumas District Hospital Bonds is affixed at .03346% (\$33.46 per 100,000 of assessed value) of the assessed value of the Unitary/State Board Roll for the fiscal year 2011/12, tax year 2011.

The foregoing Resolution no 11-_____ was duly passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Plumas, State of California, at a regular meeting of said Board held on the 13th day of September, 2011 by the following vote:

AYES:

NOES:

ABSENT:

Chair, Board of Supervisors

ATTEST:

Executive Clerk /Board of Supervisors

Debt Service-Measure A School Bond

2011/12

	2010/11 bond debt service requirement	Unitary portion of debt service	
1/2	1,104,243.75	128,289.16	(b) & (c)
	Total Debt	1,104,243.75	
3	Total left in fund measure for	(14,435.02)	(a)
	Unitary Portion	(128,289.16)	
	Unsecured Portion	(18,377.55)	
	Total Debt for Secured	943,142.02	
4	Total Unsecured Value	85,384,758.00	
	Minus 13.7% delq rate	(11,697,711.86)	
5	Unsec rate (prior y' secured)	0.0002494	
	Unsecured's portion	18,377.55	
6	Total Secured/Unitary Value	3,101,368,154.00	
7	Plus HOE	34,136,716.00	
	Minus 8% delq rate	(124,054,726.16)	
	Total Value to collect on	3,011,450,143.84	
	Secured Debt Svc	943,142.02	
	Secured Bond Rate	0.0003132	
			1,104,243.75 Needs to equal total debt requirement

PLUMAS HOSPITAL DISTRICT

RESOLUTION No. 2011-4

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE
PLUMAS HOSPITAL DISTRICT
GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS SERIES A
PROPERTY TAX RATE 2011/2012

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the President and Secretary of the Board, of the Plumas Hospital District Board of Directors are hereby authorized and empowered to take all actions necessary or appropriate:

1. To authorize the Plumas County Tax Assessor's office to set the 2011/2012 Property Tax Rate for the Plumas District Hospital General Obligation Bond Series A at \$0.0001510.

AYES: Valerie Flanigan, John Kimmel, Mark Safford, Jr.

NAYES: none

ABSENT: Kathleen Price
Bill Wickman

Valerie R. Flanigan

President, Board of Directors
Plumas Hospital District

ATTEST:

Secretary, Board of Directors
Plumas Hospital District

Debt Service - Plumas Hospital District 2011/12

2011/12 bond debt service		Unitary portion of debt service
	188,645.00	0.00
Total Debt		
Total left in fund from last FY	188,645.00	
Unitary Portion	(113,835.00)	
Unsecured Portion	0.00	
Total Debt for Secured	74,810.00	
Total Unsecured Value		
Minus 13% delq rate	31,932,793.00	
Unsec rate (prior yr sec rate)	(4,151,263.09)	
Unsecured's portion	0.000000	
	0.00	
Total Secured/utility Value		
Plus HOE	526,822,213.00	
Minus 8% delq rate	10,899,416.00	
	(42,145,777.04)	
Total Value to collect on	495,575,851.96	
Secured Debt Svc		
Secured Bond Rate	74,810.00	
	0.0001510	

as provided by the Hosp.

Plumas County
Calculation of Unitary Average Tax Rate
Fiscal Year 2011-12

2011-12

2011-12 A/V Secured	3,277,865,576.00
Plus: Utility	452,188,991.00
HOE	34,980,916.00
Total Secured, Utility, & HOPT	3,765,035,483.00
Times the 1% Tax Rate	1%
2011-12 Gross County Wide Tax (less unsecured)	37,650,355.00
Divided by Secured AV (see above)	3,765,035,483.00
Unitary Rate - county wide tax divided by Secured A/V-R&T Sec 98.9 (b) (1)	1.0000%
PY Unitary Debt Service Rate	0.06185%
Countywide Secured (including HOE) Debt Svc Levy 10/11 (immediate prior fiscal year)	809,480.18
Countywide Secured (including HOE) Debt Svc Levy 09/10 (second prior fiscal year)	1,496,490.69
Percentage of diff. between 2 preceeding years	0.54092
Final Unitary Debt Service Tax Rate	0.03346%
Current Year Unitary Value	448,966,832.00
Current Year Unitary Debt Service Levy	150,205.61

3A

Plumas County Coordinating Council

AGENDA REQUEST

September 6, 2011

To: Honorable Board of Supervisors

From: Plumas County Coordinating Council

Subject: Agenda Request for the September 13, 2011 Meeting
of the Plumas County Board of Supervisors

Consideration of Draft Letter to Regional Council of Rural Councils (RCRC)
Coordination

Background:

On July 12, 2011, the Plumas County Board of Supervisors submitted a letter of comments to RCRC in response to a previous e-mail request soliciting comments on a Draft MOA between RCRC, CSAC, USFS and BLM.

Soon thereafter, the County received a copy of the "Meeting Summary" for a June 22, 2011 Joint Meeting sponsored by the USFS and RCRC. Following review of the meeting summary, the Plumas County Coordinating Council voted on September 2, 2011 to recommend that the Board of Supervisors authorize the Chair to send the attached, draft letter to RCRC.

In summary, the letter focuses on the obvious unwillingness of the Forest Service to accept "coordination" as a statutory requirement imposed by Congress

Recommendation:

That the Board of Supervisors authorize the Chair to sign the attached letter to RCRC.

Attachments:

June 22, 2011 "Meeting Summary"
Proposed Letter to RCRC

D R A F T (9-1-2011)

September 13, 2011

Greg Norton, President and CEO
Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC)
1215 K Street, Suite 1650
Sacramento, CA 95814

SUBJECT: Commentary Letter on "Coordination"

Dear Mr. Norton:

On July 12, 2011, the Plumas County Board of Supervisors submitted a letter of comments to you in response to a previous e-mail request soliciting comments on a Draft MOA between RCRC, CSAC, USFS and BLM.

Soon thereafter, the County received a copy of the "Meeting Summary" for the 6-22-11 Joint Meeting Sponsored by USFS and RCRC.

Following review and discussion of the "Meeting Summary" by the Plumas County Coordinating Council, and considering the recommendation of the Council, the Plumas County Board of Supervisors is submitting this letter of comments to RCRC in order to address certain topics that were the subject of discussions at the June 22nd Joint Meeting as well as to further reinforce efforts of several rural counties in Northern California in regard to the obvious unwillingness of the Forest Service to accept "coordination" as a statutory requirement imposed by Congress. The resulting effects of this position have been the disastrous results of various Travel Management Project decisions in various National Forests throughout Northern California. The continuing opposition to coordination is apparent in the recently released USFS Planning Rule, which only seeks to diminish the coordination requirement.

To begin with, it is important to note that efforts by any agency or local government to enhance and improve the working relationships between the Counties and the various National Forests are encouraged by the Plumas County Board of Supervisors. At the same time, however, such efforts are not productive if the significant issues of disagreements are not directly addressed.

D R A F T

Mr. Greg Norton
Regional Council of Rural Counties
September 13, 2011
Page 2

Officials in Plumas County believe that many opportunities exist for the National Forests and the Counties to work together productively. The monthly meetings of the Plumas County Coordinating Council are attended regularly by representatives of our two National Forests, and similar interactions are happening in other counties. Examples like this can be reinforced through the statewide MOA, but at the July 8 meeting of our Coordinating Council the Council was informed the Forest Service that the existence of the draft MOA had not yet been made known to the local forest staff. We hope Region 5 is intending to seek feedback from the local forests on existing processes for coordination and will support those processes in the MOA.

There are many significant challenges that need to be resolved in regard to access to the National Forests, timber production, watershed assessments, biomass demonstration projects, water utility fees, sustainable yields, illegal drug cultivation, illegal dumping and utility land purchases, not to mention the need to re-visit and properly coordinate with Counties on several of the recently decided Travel Management Projects (Subpart B).

As difficult as the above issues may seem, Plumas County officials are convinced that sincere federal commitment to effective coordination activities offers all agencies the best chance of success.

Sincerely,

Lori Simpson
Chair
Board of Supervisors

cc: Paul McIntosh, CSAC



June 22, 2011 Meeting Summary

Overview: On June 22, 2011 from 9:00 – 11:15 am a joint meeting sponsored by the Regional Council of Rural Counties (RCRC) and USDA Forest Service, Pacific Southwest Region was held at RCRC's office in Sacramento, California. The meeting was intended to provide county representatives an update on national forest restoration activities and the important role of biomass in forest management. USFS staff also discussed and solicited input on some of the strategies they are implementing to fund forest restoration projects. The roundtable also included an update from USFS staff on the plan revisions discussed at the March roundtable meeting held in late March, 2011.

Attendance: The following individuals participated:

Sacramento, California (in-person):

- Supervisor Kim Yamaguchi, Butte County
- Supervisor Kim Vann, Colusa County
- Supervisor Gary Evans, Colusa County
- Supervisor David Finigan, Del Norte County
- Supervisor Ray Nutting, El Dorado County
- Supervisor Jennifer Montgomery, Placer County
- Bruce Springsteen, Placer County APCD
- Supervisor Terry Swofford, Plumas County
- Greg Hagwood, Plumas County Sheriff
- Supervisor Peter Huebner, Sierra County
- Supervisor Lee Adams, Sierra County
- Supervisor Randy Hanvelt, Tuolumne County
- Staci Heaton, Regional Council of Rural Counties
- Greg Norton, President, Regional Council of Rural Counties
- Patricia Megason Executive Vice President, Regional Council of Rural Counties
- Cyndi Hillery, Regional Council of Rural Counties
- Randy Moore, Regional Forester, Region 5, USFS
- Ron Ketter, Deputy Regional Forester, Region 5, USFS
- Mike Chapel, Region 5, USFS
- Joe Stringer, Director, Ecosystem Planning, Region 5, USFS
- Bruce Goines, Ecosystem Services Group Leader, Region 5, USFS
- Christine Nota, Regional Forester's Representative, Region 5, USFS
- Austin McNerny, Facilitator, Center for Collaborative Policy

Conference Line:

- Supervisor Ted Novelli, Amador County
- Supervisor Richard Forster, Amador County
- Supervisor Brian Oneto, Amador County
- Supervisor Merita Callaway, Calaveras
- Supervisor John Viegas, Glenn County
- Supervisor Linda Arcularius, Inyo County
- Supervisor Jack Hanson, Lassen County
- Supervisor Larry Johnston, Mono County
- Supervisor Byng Hunt, Mono County
- Supervisor Jon Kennedy, Plumas County
- Larry Lees, Shasta County CAO
- Supervisor Marcia Armstrong, Siskiyou County
- Supervisor Debra Chapman, Trinity County

Welcoming Remarks: On behalf of RCRC, Colusa County Supervisor and RCRC Vice Chair Kim Dolbow-Vann welcomed everyone to the meeting and thanked USFS for working with RCRC to hold these roundtable discussions. She observed that through these discussions, dialogue between rural elected officials and the USFS will continue to improve and opportunities for working together can and will be identified.

Regional Forester Randy Moore apologized for being late and explained that since the last roundtable meeting, many activities both internally and externally have occurred. The USFS Pacific Southwest Region is looking to realign budgets to focus on restoring the landscape. Mr. Moore explained that of the approximately 20 million acres managed in the region, 6-9 million acres are unhealthy and at risk of catastrophic fire. To protect and improve these acres the region needs to complete restoration activities on about 500,000 acres a year.. However, only 250,000 acres were treated last year with 60-80,000 acres treated in previous years. While the amount of treatment is increasing, we need to be at approximately 500,000 acres per year and non-traditional approaches are sought to meet this goal. The USFS needs to find partners to help invest in these efforts. In areas where there is high employment there are opportunities for improving situation. Biomass is an opportunity. Currently, biomass is mainly a fuel for big fires and we need to increase the value of biomass so it can be extracted. USFS would like to see biomass collected and used to generate power and, thus, is working to develop demonstration projects across state showing how this can be done. The California Public Utility Commission has agreed to allow 3-4 demonstration projects around the state and USFS would like to identify sites this summer.

Mr. Moore went on to ask "What is the value of the water that comes of USFS lands?" It is estimated that the water being captured as runoff from USFS lands values approximately \$9.5 Billion. In order to protect these lands and, hopefully, secure a financial return from this runoff, the USFS needs to restore the health and resiliency of the watersheds. If we don't do something, then we are going to have larger issues. Mr. Moore believes that counties have the political clout and expertise to help USFS achieve these goals. To this end, USFS has met with EBMUD, Santa Ana Watershed Authority, and SoCal Edison to discuss relevant issues, including their need to prevent fires that destroy their infrastructure. USFS would like to see local utility companies that benefit from water originating on public lands, charge their customers a small amount that can be invested in restoring and protecting the lands that provide the water.

Update on Proposed National Planning Rule and Sierra Nevada Bio-Regional Assessment Effort: Joe Stringer, Director, Ecosystem Planning, Pacific Southwest Region, USFS, provided an update on the progress of the proposed National Planning Rule update. Specifically, he informed participants that the public comment period ended in mid-May and that the Plan Writing Team is analyzing comments now and looking to release the revised Draft Rule in late 2011. He explained that the USFS Chief decided to not extend comment period due to the robust public involvement and roundtables that had been held across the country. He emphasized that USFS is acutely aware of local government's concerns regarding their involvement in the overall process and, as such, the USFS will be engaging the counties through RCRC/CSAC as the process moves forward. USFS wants to continue the open and transparent process that has been used so far to revise the Planning Rule. Mr. Stringer emphasized that he does not know what exactly will be in the Final Rule and, thus, he hopes that local governments will continue to work closely with USFS as the process unfolds.

Mr. Stringer proceeded to explain that the Bio-Regional Assessments are designed to identify those issues (environmental, social, and economic) that cut across the regional landscape and are not intended to be at the individual forest scale. These assessments seek to identify what issues need to be addressed in the future through individual forest plan revisions. The overarching goal is to produce a "living document" that counties can collaborate with forests on. Utilizing an "All Lands" approach, the effort will identify challenging issues on each forest.

On a more local scale, forest plan revisions will start in the Sierra Nevada region with three forests (Sierra, Inyo, and Sequoia) all slated to start first with additional forests undertaking their plan revisions thereafter. The Sequoia National Forest is already in the process of developing its National Monument plan and it makes sense to couple this

undertaking with the broader forest plan revision effort. Revisions were approved for fiscal year 2012 for seven forests and three are in California which is going to make for a significant effort in the Pacific Southwest Region. A website is currently being developed for the effort and the plan is to have it live by August. The overall effort will include opportunities for county governments to be involved. Specific counties that need to be involved will be asked for their assistance. Mr. Stringer emphasized that the issues that each county wants addressed through the individual forest plan revisions need to be identified and he asked county representatives "what is the type and feel of conversation/dialogue that counties want?"

Mr. Stringer further explained that the Pacific Southwest Region anticipates assigning approximately six specialists help with the planning efforts. In order to complete the work in a timely manner, each forest will need a dedicated team assigned to the tasks and to assist with working with local officials and interested parties. The respective Forest Supervisor will be the point person on the ground. The current plan is to continue the necessary dialogue from USFS regional office until the planning team is in place.

Questions and Comments: After the Mr. Stringer's brief presentation, the following questions and comments were raised:

- Regional assessment effort needs to be explained in greater detail. Will it focus on economics, natural resource, and/or any other specific topics? Response: Agreed that more detail is needed and will be forthcoming. The assessments will cover the range of issues affecting both the natural environment and the social/economic conditions in the communities surrounding the forest lands. The effort seeks to determine what environmental and social changes are underway that have an impact on the public lands. Additionally, the effort looks to identify and understand the major drivers and emerging influences that we need to be prepared for in order to responsibly manage the forest.
- What is the process for soliciting input? Response: USFS is in the process of developing this process now and seeks input from counties as to what the best process will be.
- How will FS address illegal marijuana cultivation in many of the counties? Response: this is a very challenging issue due to the number of agencies involved. USFS needs to explore this issue in more depth. Colusa County believes there needs to be a concerted effort between USFS rangers and local law

enforcement to better understand the challenges and to develop strategies for addressing illegal operations on federal lands.

- Eldorado County expressed the need for USFS to more clearly explain the various “terms” being used in the assessment effort. In particular, “sustainable yields” means different things to different people and it is important to have shared meaning on these key concepts. The private sector needs to have business plans in place and this means knowing what a “sustainable” yield is. Ecosystem management versus sustained yield presents problems for local businesses. Response: USFS appreciates this concern and anticipates that updated forest plans will provide projected yield details to help local business interests plan and forecast their efforts. USFS understands the strong need for a vibrant business climate, especially in the rural communities.
- Butte County explained that it would be helpful if the forest plans could present a timeline for sustainable yield of various products originating on the public lands. For example, a specific amount of lumber should be permitted over a certain period of time to allow adequate business planning.
- County governments would like to be involved in collaboration on these efforts from the start and frequently during the overall process.
- Trinity County expressed a need for a very long term contract to allow biomass companies to work effectively and asked how this commitment could be assured.
- Placer County suggested that USFS come to board of supervisors meetings more frequently within the region to solicit input. The process needs to involve all supervisors and needs to address relations with other federal agencies.
- Drug cultivation is serious issue in many of the rural counties and there is a strong need to involve all relevant agencies to ensure that challenge is being addressed holistically. Response: USFS welcomes the opportunity to speak with county boards and will look for opportunities to do so once the official plan revision process is initiated. However, Mr. Stringer explained that USFS will not formally initiate the various plan revisions until funding is secured. This may be a challenge and USFS does not know exactly what timing for process will be. However, in the meantime, USFS will do what it can. Specifically, many other plans and assessments already exist and much work can be done to synthesize completed work so that it may be merged into the assessment process.

- Eldorado County is concerned that funds for enforcement patrols are being secured now and that there is a strong need to coordinate with county governments before federal agents are on the ground. He explained that there is over \$1 Billion available for local government enforcement and this needs to be coordinated.
- How will public use of USFS lands be addressed in assessment process?
Response: USFS understands that public access is important for many reasons and looks forward to continuing to work with RCRC and involved local governments to ensure robust dialogue on the issues.
- What are the principles USFS is starting from in this assessment process?
Response: Long-term sustainability of ecological, social and economics of the public lands is the goal. USFS know that density of some forests creates huge fire issues and that this needs to be addressed. There is also a need for thriving industry to work with biomass and this is going to be challenging. USFS has some of the tools, but needs help from locals to ensure that lands are managed appropriately into the future.
- How do we address the fact that some utility companies are buying up lands and keeping the public off of these lands? Also, county governments would like to see the continued allowance of grazing on USFS lands.
- If we are working with utilities and their lands, might this limit the types of public activities allowed on these lands? Will these lands become a mitigation bank for some other efforts? Response: discussion is focused on identifying what restoration activities need to be taken to manage biomass and sensitive species and landscapes.
- Calaveras County has great working relationship with Stanislaus National Forest. When Tom Quinn was Supervisor, counties supported increase in timber production, but this has not happened. We are still not doing what was committed to before. If no new funding is secured, what will priorities be? Priorities were set earlier in other efforts. Why more planning? Let's implement what we have already planned for.
- Ebbets Pass corridor is a good example of where illegal dumping is happening. USFS needs to figure out how to address this situation.

- Inyo County questions how the current watershed assessment underway fits into the larger bio-regional assessments? Response: need to inventory all watersheds across the state. USFS is working with the NRCS and other agencies to identify high priority performance goals that address watersheds. California is leading the effort to look at the all lands approach to maximize opportunities to improve the watersheds. This effort will be focused on outcomes with possible ranking of watershed health.
- Inyo County believes this is a perfect opportunity for engaging with counties. Need to work with locals to identify which streams to work on. Not aware of any meetings with Inyo or Mono counties to identify which streams to focus on. Would like to see forest supervisor brief counties on this matter in the near future.
- Trinity County believes it is very important to have counties involved in watershed assessments.
- Amador County: need to talk with counties early in the process. Some streams may never become a class 1 stream no matter what is done. What about the economic impacts resulting from the restoration activities undertaken. Response: It is not in the USFS' interest to do this. There are approaches to improve situation of any stream, but USFS is interested in assessing and discussing before any action is taken.

Implementation of the Leadership Intent for Ecological Restoration: Chris Nota, Regional Forester's Representative, Region 5, USFS, explained that USFS needs help and collaboration on this effort. Referring to a handout entitled "Region 5 Ecological Restoration," Mrs. Nota stated that this effort has been revised based on input received since last December. She and Bruce Goines, USFS, explained that ecological restoration intent will be a living document, but that the desire is to move into implementation as soon as possible. Internally, work has been undertaken to educate USFS employees as to what this intent is, what the trends are, and what the conditions that are being addressed include. Budget direction has been shared with individual forest units to help them identify opportunities to integrate efforts on all projects. USFS is working diligently on this intent now and plans on preparing a clear strategy for integration and focus in the near future. USFS has also been working on a strategic partner plan to detail how the effort will be collaboratively implemented.

USFS management are asking "who cares and what work might we do together?"

Focusing on water first and youth opportunities has allowed discussion to be explored with a number of partners. By identifying where local collaborative efforts exist that can help with overall effort, USFS identified the Santa Ana Watershed Authority, EBMUD, Amador/Calaveras Consensus Group, San Francisco/Tuolumne, and SoCal Edison as potential partners. PG&E is also on the list, but has not been engaged yet. USFS is looking to identify what the risks in the watershed are. City of Denver, Colorado has pursued a similar approach that has raised significant monies for watershed related work. Mr. Moore provided an example from Southern California where \$40M is going to be spent on removing sediment from streams and it would be very helpful if the utility companies could help with the effort at restoring the watershed which would help with the water quality. USFS is collecting data to help make the case for why it is important for contractors/utilities to invest into restoration. By doing so, USFS believes that these utilities will see getting involved as a "smart business" decisions.

Role of Biomass in Ecological Restoration: Bruce Goines, Ecosystem Services Group Leader, Region 5, USFS, explained that USFS has very engaged parties working on issues important to bio-energy infrastructure retention and expansion and is working on a number of important issues with the group including a potential pilot study to demonstrate the social, economic and environmental benefits of bio-energy production. Some have estimated that valuing these benefits in the market would result in improved revenue streams for utilities and forest landowners restoration efforts, and could cost the average utility customer \$2 per year. This past year, Biomass Working Group has been meeting and is comprised of really constructive partners and USFS is interested in having RCRC join the group.

Questions and Comments: After the presentation on both the implementation of the USFS Leadership Intent on Ecological Restoration and the role of biomass, the following questions and comments were raised.

- Butte County is excited to hear about these partnership opportunities and explained that they have been involved in a similar effort through the California Water Plan effort. Through this effort, they identified twenty-nine state water contractors that had no commitment to invest in the watersheds where the water they sold came from. Hopefully, new awareness from recent fires will help move contractors to see the need for becoming more involved.
- There are current court cases underway now concerning the California State Water Project that are relevant to this effort and USFS should look into the cases.

- North Fork and West branch of Feather River are unbelievable water providers. PG&E owns the hydroelectric facilities along the Feather River and there appears to not be any incentive for them to reinvest. The current incentive is to conserve water in order to allow utility to sell to other purchasers which raise profits while not undertaking any restoration.
- Water agencies/contractors and utilities are going to be very difficult to engage.
- Need to define “health of the watershed” as this means different things to different people. Sounds like restoration to many while it may mean something else to others.
- Ranchers are becoming very concerned with water rights. Need to be sure they are communicated with.
- Butte County estimated that if the Metropolitan Water District added a nickel to each user bill, it would generate huge amounts of money to undertake watershed work. As a result of this estimate, county believes there is great potential for raising needed funds.
- Communication at the watershed level is critical. USFS is going to have to invest in outreach “big time” if this is going to work.
- Internal USFS policies do not appear to support “all-lands” approach. Internal USFS liability forms and high level of mistrust makes the situation very challenging.
- USFS needs to change message from “we are the government and we are here to help” as this does not get very far especially in rural areas.
- Restrictions on wood cutting for home use is prohibitive. Need for consistency on rules across counties.
- Sierra County believes there is a strong need to consider economic impacts resulting from USFS actions and that the USFS is losing touch with the rural counties. There is a strong need more USFS presence on the ground.
- Sierra County has been working on this effort for many years and it is very frustrating. Need to clean-up the forest and restoration will occur. Why is the rule to allow only 100’ from road for woodcutting?

- Access is the key to this issue as well as many others. USFS appears to be saying that they want restoration and biomass collection, but access is restricted. Access touches all aspects of creating a healthy forest and there is a strong need for increased access on public lands.
- Look at Sweden for good examples of how to manage biomass. They are able to heat roads by burning biomass to minimize road maintenance.
- There is a strong need for environmentalist to get on board with this effort. National environmental groups are fighting the local groups and USFS needs to do much to help them understand benefits of biomass collection.
- FS needs to explain in a holistic approach across the board to help move the effort forward.
- Are there other forests being considered for monument status? Response: Presidential proclamation in the 1990s created Sequoia National Monument and the area that is not within monument is still being managed by USFS. Separate forest plan being developed for non-monument lands. There are currently no other lands being considered for potential monument status in California.
- Changing the national debate on biomass is what is needed. When we don't calculate the true costs of oil production and water extraction, then the true economic return from biomass cannot be determined.

Regional Forester Summary: Randy Moore, Regional Forester, thanked everyone for participating in the meeting and explained that the dialogue is very productive and he looks forward to future discussions. Many legal and administrative challenges faced by USFS, but by working together he is hopeful that progress can be made. Natural tendency to agree with the outcomes, but the process is difficult. USFS is struggling with recruiting people to move to rural areas. Hayfork District Ranger position was not able to be filled for very long time. Why? Does not have solution, but needs help from local governments to ensure that the public lands are managed properly and adequately.

Mr. Moore explained that the Community Forestry Project and Agreement in the community of Weaverville presents an opportunity to learn what is working or not. He invited other counties to take a look at this project and learn what is working or not and consider if a similar model might work for their community and forest. USFS is

supportive of re-authorization of the stewardship legislation and hopes counties will assist with this effort. Congressional representatives have expressed interest in helping with the reauthorization effort if counties are interested.

In closing, Mr. Moore stressed that USFS is committed to continuing to work with counties and understands that more work needs to be done to build trust and better working relationships. FS will continue down this path.

Supervisor Vann thanked participants and USFS for making this meeting possible. We all serve the same people, but county officials are just closer to the folks in the community. She explained that local communities are looking for more from forests and the staff that manage them. Planning needs to turn into action and the sooner the better.

