

NOTES: SOFAR Landscape Vision Committee

Held Jan. 24, 2018

Key Outcomes

- **Resources for fire expertise:** Kendal will talk with ENF leadership about the need for resources, specifically a fuels/fire specialist.
- **Analysis needs more time:** The indicator analysis needs about 6 months to model priorities.
- **Identifying near-term projects:** The group is going to recommend to the collaborative developing some priorities and near-term projects that would be shovel-ready in 2019.

Action Items

- **Kendal** will follow up with the ENF leadership about the options for fuels expertise. The group is open to helping any way that it can.
- **Kendal** will brief the steering committee on the idea of near-term project development concept and resource concerns
- **Becky** will request if PSW could provide fuels expertise.
- **Chris** will scan and email Kendal changes made at Dec. meeting on values at risk table
- **Heather** will have Council's map person contact Melanie Rossi because she has had a hard time tracking down the previous submittal.
- **Melanie** will check her email for EID's GIS data set for hydro facilities.
-

Next Meeting -- switch to 4th Thursday

February 22, 1:00-4:00

Meeting Materials @ <http://sofarcohesivestrategy.org/meetings/>

Landscape Vision Road Map Run Thru – Kendal

Kendal ran through the road map. There were no questions.

Indicators and Indicators as they Relate to Existing Conditions

Big Topics: Fuels experts needed more time needed to do the full analysis; agreed to do a near-term project area prioritization to identify shovel-ready projects for next year while the analytical work continues; lack of resources to carry forward;

Fuels Expertise Essential to Completing Work

Having a fuels expert is a barrier to completing the analytical process. Becky needs help from a fuels person to make decisions on the data and information to inform the analysis.

SOFAR needs someone several days a month to participate in a 3-hour monthly meeting and for ongoing contributions and to consult on data. This has been missing from the landscape vision conversation. The group would prefer to have the forest-level fuels officer or potentially work with PSW or some combination of both.

First Choice Options on Fuels for SOFAR

- (First choice) Forest Service ENF – Teresa R is the fuels officer.
- (Second choice) PSW – Brannon Collins
- Or some combination of both

Other Options *not as likely*

- Tahoe Central Sierra Initiative has funding for PSW, but SOFAR may be too early on the detailed. (Becky is the research liaison to the Tahoe Central Sierra Initiative.)
- Regional Office
- CalFire under Fire Adapted 50 relied on a consultant.

Next Steps - Fuels

- Kendal will follow up with the ENF leadership about the options. The group is open to helping any way that it can.
- Becky will request if PSW could provide fuels expertise.

Indicators Analysis needs more Time to complete

Work is underway. It has taken a while to gather data and information. Becky anticipates that conducting the analysis will take nearly 6 months. Becky is happy to provide substantive expertise, but does not feel she can coordinate the number of meetings that will be necessary to conduct the analysis in the set timeframe. Someone observed that the fire person should be providing this role since so many of the indicators.

Next Step

- Kendal agreed to coordinate these meetings.

Recommend doing a near-term project area prioritization to identify shovel-ready projects for next year

Given existing constraints, the group would recommend to the full collaborative to focus on one project in the community and one project in the matrix. Each would help get a project moving forward and be ready for next year's round of funding. In the mean time, the analytical work could continue.

The group would find an intermediate way to prioritize the landscape, identifying some projects. SOFAR could work with the Fire Safe Council and the Regional Office's rapid assessment to identify some near-term projects. This would be helpful to the ENF because staff are identifying budgets now.

CBI will work with Duane and Kendal to organize the ad hoc workshop. The idea is to get a group together to identify a set of areas that need the projects and establish near term project planning and implementation to be shovel-ready for the next round of funding.

TCSI is very supportive to create pathways to funding with a list of projects. Encourage the whole collaborative to identify projects.

Steps for near-term projects

- Identify where you want to do work.
- Is there NEPA / CEQA documentation
- Then approach the grant process.

Next Steps

- Brief the steering committee
- Discuss with the collaborative in February
- Have a small ad hoc workshop-like meeting with land managers
- Bring ideas back to full collaborative in March

Potential Ad Hoc Land Manager Workshop Participants

1. Duane
2. Forest Fire Manager: Teresa R. or Jay Kurth or Nickie Washington
3. CALFIRE: Mike Webb
4. Supervisor Brian Veercamp
5. SPI: Rich Wade and Chris
6. Environmental: Craig
7. Fire Safe Council: Heather and Pat Dwyer
8. Finance: Chris. Andy F (Chris' boss)
9. District Ranger(s): John Jue
10. EID: Dan Corcoran who would consult with John Bertolino

Concerns about Resources

The group had a lengthy discussion about bigger issues and concerns regarding resources. Some expressed concern that they are "spinning our wheels" without the leadership and resources that are needed to support this effort, expressing caution that this could jeopardize agencies and organizations willingness to participate.

Spatial Datasets

Boundary discussion was very helpful for the analytical elements.

Zones – SOFAR doesn't have spatial data for community built zones. It is too small for the analysis. The group would recommend that SOFAR just clarify that the community built zone is not being articulated because SOFAR is at the landscape scale and work in the community built zone is the responsibility of the homeowner.

Fuels and Vegetation Projects – Melanie is starting put that together. Then she has the districts and then collaborative partners verify the data.

General Forest (white spot) characterization of the highly developed south of Placerville would be re-designated because the area is WUI. It became a white spot because it's outside the ENF.

One option would be to use the CalFIRE data for some areas outside the forest. Melanie will do this next. Then, the group can flag if there are any other areas that need attention. It would be important to document that the defense zone is different from community build zone.

Defense was around communities, but the group also identified it around the major roads. Highway would be defense, but other transportation corridors would be identified, but would not be defense.

Next Steps

- Heather will have Council's map person contact Melanie Rossi because she has had a hard time tracking down the previous submittal.
- Melanie will check her email for EID's GIS data set for hydro facilities.
- Melanie will pull in CALFIRE data to correct communities as defense where they are not now.

Project Boundary

The proposal is to keep the official SOFAR boundary the same, but for analytical purposes to change the boundary to include some areas that should be considered for analytical purposes.

Agreed – For analytical purposes, SOFAR will add a 2km buffer around the SOFAR boundary and include west to Garden Valley and encompass the Mormon Immigrant Trail.

Discussion

Changing the boundary will help to analyze and articulate outcomes.

The South Fork watershed goes all the way down to Folsom Lake, which encompasses a huge urban area.

Berkeley worked with a 2 km buffer around projects for analytical purposes. Adding a 2km buffer would incorporate a lot of the areas and exclude other lines that are more urban and complicated. The exception might be to include all of Pollack Pines (since SOFAR only incorporated half of it.)

GIS specialist Melanie Rossi recommended that SOFAR either use a set buffer or geographic features. Everyone agreed that they would not remove any part of the SOFAR area from the analysis. She wants to have a good description. She is ok with the recommendation since she can write the description.

Diamond Springs is already covered by CWPPs.

Values at Risk

Kendal presented a revised set of values at risk. These values essentially serve as a modifier to the resilience ranking via the indicators. January full collaborative discussion reiterated the previously identified values. Kendal talked about the methodology to marry the value with the associated desired conditions.

Ranking (priority within zones)

Work Group previously started ranking values by zones. Rogue River Cohesive Strategy did a good job with this ranking.

Group would need to complete the ranking. It might be helpful to receive the LIDAR for General Sherman and these other efforts to think about the ranking. In addition, the group will need to define the values and what they mean.

The goal via the cohesive strategy is that the values are resilient to fire-related disturbances.

Potential Core Values

1/24/2017 List

- 1) Forest conditions
- 2) Habitat for listed / sensitive species
- 3) Wilderness
- 4) Areas frequently used for recreation / tourism
- 5) Infrastructure protection
- 6) Human life and property protection
- 7) Economic and socially important areas
- 8) Culturally sensitive areas

Next Steps

Kendal will refine. Then the group will need the indicators to refine this. This will also go to the collaborative at some point, depending on the agenda.