



- Cohesive Strategy Goals**
- Resilient Landscapes •
 - Safe & Effective Wildfire Response •
 - Fire Adapted Communities •

Collaborative Group - Meeting Summary

Meeting held May 9, 2018
 Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute

Meeting in Brief

At the May meeting of the SOFAR Collaborative, the Landscape Committee shared information about its three priority focus area sub-groups, which focus on Sly Park/Pollock Pines, Caples Headwaters, and Chili Bar to Georgetown. Participants discussed the role of collaborative groups in the NEPA context as well as lessons learned from other collaborative groups.

Two guest presenters shared about their respective biomass projects: Jonathan Kusel of the Sierra Institute presented about how Plumas County is utilizing woody biomass to address its community needs, while Sean McCoy of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory presented on a pilot project to produce an intermediate fuel from woody biomass through autothermal pyrolysis.

The Collaborative will next meet on June 16 at 1:30, will shift to project meetings during the summer, and will resume meeting on September 12.

Action Items

Who	What
CBI	[COMPLETE] Post meeting presentations to website
All	Contact Pat Manley (pmanley@fs.fed.us) if interested in resilience indicator field trip
USFS	[COMPLETE] By May 31 - Identify a USFS representative to join the Caples-Headwater sub-group

Meeting Summary

Introduction

The Cohesive Strategy is an all-lands approach to achieve the goals of resilient landscapes, fire adapted communities and safe and effective wildfire response. As described in the SOFAR charter, the Collaborative is charged with shared problem solving, identifying areas of agreement, and moving forward in such a way that meets all interests in the room.

Update: Landscape Strategic Area Sub-Groups

The Landscape Vision Committee established sub-groups for three strategic areas identified at the February SOFAR Land Manager workshop.

Strategic area		For Discussion
Sly Park/Pollock Pines	Projects are currently in process in this area, some in the planning stage	May
Cables-Headwater	[Completed] Need a USFS staff person to join this sub-group; before May 31	May
Chili Bar	Broader, more conceptual	June

Each strategic area has funding-ready projects as well as projects that are still in a conceptual stage. The SOFAR Desired Conditions document articulates end-state objectives for these areas. The Collaborative will discuss Cables-Headwater and Sly Park/Pollock Pines at its June meeting and Chili Bar at the following Collaborative meeting.

Collaborative Planning

Collaborative Planning for Mutual Gain

[View slides](#). Facilitator Gina Bartlett presented the following steps of a mutual gain approach to collaborative planning:

1. Identify the challenge, the opportunity, and who cares about the issues.
2. Determine who needs to be involved in a collaborative process; how the collaborative makes decisions; who receives the collaborative's decisions; and the collaborative's timeframe.
3. Clarify facts and issues: What information is needed; what information is available; from whom do we receive information; will the information be credible to those who care about this effort? Data gaps will serve as a foundation for work moving forward.
4. Negotiation and seeking joint gains: Stakeholders interface, negotiate elements of the project and attempt to address the interests and concerns of as many stakeholders as possible.
5. Clarify outcomes in an agreement; move the process forward to where it needs to go. In a NEPA context, a collaborative recommendation typically becomes the proposed action.

Collaborative participants reaffirmed the importance of leveraging projects off of each other in order to maximize opportunities for grant funding.

Collaboration with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

[View slides](#). Kendal Young presented on collaboration in the NEPA context, for which the level of analysis varies depending on the proposed federal action.

In the past, the U.S. Forest Service typically drives the NEPA process and the public responds to scoping via public comment. However, there is opportunity for NEPA processes to be collaborative, with public involvement throughout. In a collaborative model, project planning may take longer, but the overall the process produces more robust outcomes. For efficiency, it may be useful for a collaborative group to identify zones of agreement in order to expedite the NEPA process. Young clarified that NEPA is site-specific, so while information from one project can inform another project, site-specific effects must be document.

Panel Discussion: Collaborative Efforts

Mark Egbert, Craig Thomas, Kendal Young and Steve Brink participated in a panel discussion about their experiences with collaborative planning efforts.

Mark Egbert, Resource Conservation District

The Resource Conservation District (RCD) does not own or manage land and is non-regulatory; as such, all of the RCD's work is in concert with others. Egbert noted that before seeking funding, it is critical to first establish consensus among stakeholders, to develop a pipeline of shovel-ready projects, and to have clarity regarding the level and type of stakeholder participation during project implementation and after project completion. Also key is building relationships and trust throughout the planning and implementation process.

Craig Thomas, Sierra Forest Legacy

Craig Thomas described his work with the Dinkey Collaborative. Dinkey drew on the research community to support planning on the landscape, which helped to defuse charged issues. Thomas advised that for contentious issues, it can be useful to draw on scientific and technical information in an effort to resolve the issues a public setting with the best available science. The Dinkey Collaborative developed one large project per year and gradually built trust, project by project; this foundational trust later helped the group move through more challenging or controversial issues. Though Dinkey received \$1 million in annual funding, the Collaborative nonetheless faced challenges due to limited staff time and the complexity of the work on the landscape.

Kendal Young, USFS

Young worked as the coordinator for the Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG), which had a project across two national forests. Young noted that planning time is a critical consideration to be able to utilize existing funding sources. A variety of Collaborative planning methods is useful and needed to respond to the complexity of multiple agencies and funding streams.

Steve Brink, CA Forestry Association

The Yosemite Stanislaus Solutions group builds capacity for the National Forest and County to develop projects on the landscape. Brink emphasized the importance of strategically utilizing resources such as the Good Neighbor Authority, partnerships with land managers, working with land owners to establish and maintain shaded fuel breaks, and coordinating with SMUD on utility corridors. Brink noted the importance of securing adequate funding to complete work on the landscape and observed that the SOFAR Collaborative's strength lies in the diversity of its composition.

Biomass: Addressing Community Needs in Plumas County Through Wood Utilization

[View slides](#). Jonathan Kusel of the Sierra Institute presented on the Sierra Institute's program to utilize woody biomass with the aim of simultaneously improving the rural community. Currently, significant funding is available for landscape-scale restoration work. Kusel emphasized the importance of embedding investment in people, retraining, and local industry into landscape restoration efforts. Forest restoration presents a critical opportunity to rebuild local economies based on sustainable forest management and business development – if deliberately designed to do so. This depends on increasing local capacity to utilize forest materials while simultaneously supporting businesses to move to and stay in the area.

Key Themes

1. The cycle of work currently moves too slowly; critical to pivot to landscape scale work.
2. Collaboration is here to stay and funding will flow to collaborative processes.
3. Funding is coming – do groups have a plan in place in the event that they receive significant funding? Are you ready to put projects on the ground?
4. To make a lasting impact, it is critical to invest in local infrastructure and communities.

The Sierra Institute conducted a Plumas County community visioning process, out of which emerged the vision of establishing a community network of boilers powered by woodchips, with a central facility to make chips. Many public institutions had boilers that were more than fifty years old and needed to be replaced; the program turned the problem into an opportunity. Boiler efficiency has improved significantly over the past decades, such that modern boilers burn cleaner than ever before. Moreover, the material from pile burns can be put in confined units for controlled emissions. The program hired local labor and utilized cross-laminated timber, which is very strong and stores a great deal of carbon, for construction of the new Plumas County Health and Human Services Center boiler facility.

The California Energy Commission funded this project because it serves as a demonstration unit to build capacity of other groups that might undertake similar work. The Sierra institute conducted a feasibility study with partners in Plumas County and removed the old Quincy High School boiler with funding from the Wind Innovations grant. These boilers are set up to utilize woodchips (not logs) as feedstock. The first loads

of woodchips came from an existing mill; however, the plan is to ultimately establish a chipping site at the wood utilization campus, for on-site grinding of small diameter material and wood waste.

The Sierra Institute is currently in the process of building a boiler facility at the old Crescent Mills mill site that closed in the mid-1980s. The Sierra Institute entered into a voluntary clean-up program that has taken a long time; they now have the clean-up plan and received \$600k to cover the site with soil.

The Rural Community Development Initiative (RCDI) provides the opportunity for communities and partners to share information and collaborate on projects related to woody products and biomass. While it is not feasible for small communities to conduct their own marketing, efficiencies can be gained through a central group or entity conducting marketing on behalf of a group of communities.

Biomass - Wood-to-fuel for California's Transportation Sector Using Autothermal Pyrolysis

[View slides](#). Sean McCoy, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, presented on a Livermore National Laboratory and Iowa State University partnership to use wood to create an intermediate fuel (substitute for crude oil) that can be processed at a refinery.

This work responds to the following California state policy goals:

- Reduce carbon intensity of transportation fuels used in CA 10% from the 2010 baseline by 2020
- Expand supply of low-carbon, renewable fuels to support CA's climate policies
- Improve forest management practices and respond to the increase in tree mortality

In 2013, the California Energy Commission announced a funding opportunity for projects that research and demonstrate decarbonization of transportation fuels. CEC issued a call for project proposals that "support... cutting-edge, pre-commercial low-carbon fuel production processes that result in the development of bio-oil as an intermediate fuel with wide-scale adoption potential, and that support California's transportation sector and greenhouse gas emission reduction efforts." Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory submitted a winning proposal and will soon receive the contract.

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory's project proposal will:

1. Demonstrate the technology (a module, brought in on a truck);
2. Produce 50k gallons of bio oil;
3. Ensure that the intermediate oil product can be upgraded to a usable oil product;

4. Develop commercialization pathway for the product.

The goal of this project is to produce 50k gallons of bio-oil to meet the California Energy Commission’s mandate. If the intermediate fuel is hydro-treated it can produce a renewable diesel that will behave like a petroleum diesel (i.e. not get cloudy in cold temperatures like biodiesel). There may be differences in product based on the type of feedstock used.

Project Partners and Responsibilities

<p>Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) - Prime contractor, responsible for: delivery of project tasks; mandatory and ad-hoc CEC reporting; financial controls; relationship with site; operation of pilot project; TEA\LCA deliverables.</p>	<p>Iowa State University - Subcontractor to LLNL, responsible for: provision of IP technology and expertise; pilot testing of feedstocks; upgrading tests for bio-oil; delivery of relevant inputs to analysis and CEC reporting.</p>
<p>Sierra Pacific Industries (SPI) - Subcontractor to LLNL, responsible for: provision of space, utilities, and feedstock for pilot project; may also use excess bio-oil as cogeneration fuel.</p>	<p>Easy Energy Systems (EES) - Subcontractor to LLNL; will design, manufacture, and (as required) conduct operational maintenance of the demonstration unit.</p>

Iowa State University’s autothermal pyrolysis technology utilizes biomass feedstock to produce four outputs:

- **Unrefined sugars**, which can be upgraded to alcohols such as ethanol
- **Phenolic oil**, which can be converted to transportation fuel
- **Unrefined acetate**
- **Biochar** - this project will produce 100 tons of biochar; not yet certain whether there is a market for it.

SPI is providing the Camino demonstration site as well as wood feedstock. The site is easily accessible and close to water and electricity.

Tentative project timeline

2017	2018	2019	2020
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Site selection • National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance • CEC Award 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project start (anticipated 3Q) • Permitting and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Compliance • Engineering, design and manufacturing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Equipment installation (spring) • Demonstration site operations (Summer) • Bio-oil upgrading tests • Equipment removal (Fall) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Documentation, reporting, and close-out
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market Adoption Partnership activities 			

McCoy offered to provide an update to the SOFAR Collaborative in the coming months.

Group Agreement

Collaborative participants agreed to err on the side of caution when bringing agenda items related to issues that are currently in litigation.

Upcoming Events

- [Site Visit](#): June 21, Fire Adapted 50 Site Visit, 8:00-5:00
- [Site Visit: June 30 or early July](#), Understanding Resilience at Caples, Pat Manley, Pacific Southwest Research Station and California Academy of Science (info will be posted on ["News" on SOFAR Website](#))

Upcoming Meetings

Collaborative	Landscape Vision Committee
<p>The SOFAR Collaborative meets on the second Wednesday of each month, 1:30-4:30 pm.</p> <p>NOTE: SOFAR will shift to project meetings during the summer.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 13, 1:30-4:30 @ Office of Emergency Services • September 12 	<p>Location: Placerville Supervisor's Office, 100 Forni Rd, Placerville, CA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thurs., May 31, 2:00-4:00 • Thurs., June 28, 2:00-4:00
<p>Always check sofarcohesivestrategy.org for meeting location and latest information.</p>	

May Meeting Participants (who signed in)

Lori Parlin	
Sue Taylor	
Monte Kawahara	Bureau of Land Management
Mike Webb	CALFIRE
Steve Brink	California Forestry Association
Norma Santiago	Catalytic Connections
Kathy Witherow	El Dorado County Board of Supervisors
Rod Pimental	El Dorado Northern
Greg Hawkins	El Dorado Irrigation District
Vincent Cornish	K&S Oak
Emily DeSantis	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Sean McCoy	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
Kathy Lewin	Northern Sierra Summer Home Owner Associations
Mark Egbert	Resource Conservation District
Eric Brown	Sacramento Municipal Utilities District
Steve Hertzog	Shingle Springs Miwok
David Zelinsky	Sierra Club
Jonathan Kusel	Sierra Institute
Ben Solvesky	Sierra Forest Legacy
Craig Thomas	Sierra Forest Legacy
Chris Dow	Sierra Pacific Industries
Mark Lustel	Sierra Pacific Industries
Tim Tate	Sierra Pacific Industries
Jennifer Chapman	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest
Laurence Crabtree	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest
Michelle Havens	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest
John Jue	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest
Nancy Nordensten	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest
Dana Walsh	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest
Kendal Young	U.S. Forest Service – Eldorado National Forest