

## August 27-28, 2010 Jackson Advisory Group Draft Minutes

Friday, August 27 .....	2
1. Call to Order and Introductions .....	2
2. Review and Accept Agenda .....	2
3. Approve Minutes of the July 30, 2010 JAG Meeting .....	2
4. Landscape Committee Final Revisions, Discussion and Action on Consensus .....	3
4. a. Guidelines for LSD and OFDA.....	3
4. b. Landscape Allocations, Unresolved Issues .....	4
4. f. Hardwoods.....	7
5. Timber Harvest Plan Review .....	8
5.a. West Chamberlain .....	8
5.b. Waldo.....	8
6. Research Committee Final Revisions .....	9
Saturday, August 28.....	10
1. Attendance .....	10
2. Public Input.....	10
3. Recreation Report .....	10
3.a. Recreation Committee Report: .....	11
3.b Recreation Task Force Report:.....	12
4. Economics Committee Report.....	12
5. Public Comments .....	12
6. Next Steps .....	13
September Meeting Start Time.....	13
Report Writing: .....	13
Outreach Strategy:.....	13
Stakeholder Work Groups: .....	13
Public Meetings:.....	13

## Friday, August 27

Note: the minutes are largely organized by subject category as described in the meeting agenda, not necessarily in the chronological order in which they unfolded during the meeting. Discussion topics were substantially rearranged during the meeting. A strictly chronological presentation of the minutes would be less than readable.

### 1. Call to Order and Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 9:07. The following were present:

<b>JAG Members:</b>	<b>Department Staff:</b>	<b>Facilitator:</b>
1 Brad Valentine	Chris Rowney	Steve Zuieback
2 John Helms	Lynn Webb	
3 Vince Taylor	Craig Pedersen	
4 Mike Jani	Russ Henly	
5 Linwood Gill	Helge Eng	
6 Jere Melo		
7 Linda Perkins		
8 Mike Anderson		
9 Peter Braudrick		
10 Mike Liquori		

### 2. Review and Accept Agenda

**Motion (Jere, Mike J):** accept the agenda as is. The motion passed unanimously.

*Post Parte* Disclosures:

Mike L and John gave a presentation on the JAG to the Board of forestry and Fire Protection Science Committee.

Jere spoke to Mike A a couple of times regarding the silviculture committee. He had numerous contacts with staff and Vince regarding the Waldo sale. He attended the second field review of the Waldo sale. He will send a letter to John and Russ expressing fundamental disagreement with the JAG's timber sale review process.

Vince talked to Jere.

### 3. Approve Minutes of the July 30, 2010 JAG Meeting

John clarified actions on sections 1 through 3. Sections 1 and 3 were approved at the July 30 meeting. Section 2 has pending edits and the landscape committee will revise given the suggestions from the JAG, and bring it back to the JAG at the September meeting.

John's notes indicate that it is unclear who has authority to approve research projects.- He will share this and other smaller notes with the landscape committee.

Vince: in last months research document (document 3), top of page 11: the discussion of research proposals was not captured in the minutes. The underlined section of the following statement should be added: The proposed research oriented framework should be designed to provide more than sufficient opportunity to generate substantial revenues for meeting all other goals of the Forest. Russ and Mike L agreed. Russ' notes indicated a comment from Mike J to possibly move this section.

John had a few other changes to the research document he will share with Mike L.

**Motion (Mike J, Vince):** approve the minutes of the July 30, 2010 JAG meeting. The motion passed with three abstentions due to absence at last month's meeting (Jere, Mike J and Linda).

There was discussion of aesthetics in the Brandon Gulch Road 1000 area. Logging is ongoing. Vince suggested the JAG visit this area. John will work with staff and the operator for an appropriate time for a visit.

#### **4. Landscape Committee Final Revisions, Discussion and Action on Consensus**

Jere raised a point of process. The SC was formed at the end of the last meeting. However, the JAG has voted on landscape allocations without the information in this report. The information in this report directly pertains to those votes. The JAG charter as reflected in the work plan calls for the JAG to vote on landscape allocation and silviculture as a package, not as sequential independent pieces. Mike L: it would be helpful if the landscape committee started to organize the document as a coherent whole as it will be presented to the Board.

##### **4. a. Guidelines for LSD and OFDA**

Linwood reported on the SC meeting on August. Mike A, Linwood and Vince were present, along with Craig Pedersen. Guidelines for LSD and OFDA areas were agreed on very quickly. Linwood discussed the guidelines, contained in a handout dated August 20, 2010. The main goal was to distinguish between the two.

Mike L: The 1.5 foot dominant tree height not to exceed 2 acres criterion working backwards translates to a 110-foot tall tree. That seems short for the redwood region. He suggested 1) organizing the document as goals, constraints and guidelines rather than bullet points, and 2) provide justifications for the decisions.

Lynn, bullet point 5, OFDA: specify that short term emphasis should be on reducing competition between codominant crown classes. Distinguish the short term from the long term, in order to accommodate a greater range of different stand structures. The full JAG agreed with this suggestion.

Lynn, Mike L and John suggested making it explicit that there is room for innovation and variation around the rather prescriptive guidelines presented. Do not be too rigid.

Lynn expressed concern about the requirement that approximately 20 percent of the post-harvest basal area be in trees at least 40 inches dbh. We could easily paint ourselves into a corner in which the stand does not fit what we think of as an uneven aged stand. John suggested framing it in terms of an initial set of guidelines that will be revised a more knowledge is gained.

Helge suggested defining the same set of criteria for both OFDA and LSD in order to achieve the stated objective of distinguishing between the two silvicultural prescriptions. For example, a 20-30 year cutting cycle is defined for LSD but the document is silent on an OFDA cutting cycle.

The requirement that 20 percent of the post-harvest basal area be comprised of trees over 40 inches dbh has the potential to prevent harvest in a lot of stands, and in effect making the OFDA prescription very similar to the LSD prescription, which was presumably not the intent. He recommended backing off from a

hard 20 percent and 40 inch dbh requirement and instead come up with something less prescriptive that will accommodate research and learning.

Mike J suggested possibly qualifying the requirement by site productivity.

Helge suggested an up-front statement describing the intended difference between the two silvicultural guidelines. Linwood is working on a tabular comparison of parameters for LSD, OFDA and matrix.

Vince: specify that initially, the cutting cycle for LSD is 20-30 years, but eventually at some point harvesting will cease.

Helge attempted to point out that the management plan uses the term OFSZ in two different contexts, one being similar in concept to OFDA, and this has consequences for evaluating the costs of land allocations, but he was interrupted by Linwood and Vince who did not feel this was accurate or relevant.

Lynn: LSD bullet point 3, regarding minimizing regeneration, at some point you may want regeneration to help achieve a complex canopy structure. Bullet point 5: removing a clump is equivalent, in terms of scale of disturbance, to a large tree falling down. Mike J: this may be appropriate on a very limited scale. Vince: we have people who always want to manage for old growth on a short term time scale. LT natural processes can provide these openings. The forest knows best how to heal itself. We are allowing timbering here in part to generate revenue. Mike L: avoid anthropomorphizing the forest too much. We are trying to figure out how to work with a managed forest in an ecologically appropriate way.

Mike L: there are a lot of legal ease language in the recommendations. Try not to be too rigid.

**Motion (Vince, Peter): accept the guidelines for timber harvest in older forest development areas and late seral development areas in general, and ask the authors to take into account the changes discussed here. The motion passed unanimously.**

John requested that the silviculture group return in September with the changes discussed.

#### **4. b. Landscape Allocations, Unresolved Issues**

Vince led the discussion of remaining issues on landscape allocations. The following allocations were discussed:

1. Add LSD around OG at extreme east along Highway 20.
2. Change OFSZ to LSD around Dresser Grove OG, top of North James Creek.
3. Management measures in buffers around campgrounds per Kathy's 7/20/10 memo.<sup>1</sup>
4. Change OFSZ to LSD in 3 places around OG near Rd 1000.
5. Change OFSZ to LSD adjacent to Waterfall Grove OG.
6. Add LSD to south of Waterfall Grove, west of W. Chamberlain Creek.
7. Create Indian Springs Fire Reserve Preserve fire research.
8. Create Bob Woods Meadow Reserve.
9. Add OFDA\* to north of NFSF Noyo LSD
10. Add OFDA in east "thumb" of Camp 6 THP after current harvest
11. Add LSD in portion of Brandon Gulch headwaters after current harvest (Volcano area)
12. Designate Brandon Gulch THP as LSD.
13. Designate part of Camp 3 THP as LSD, modified including adjacent non-THP lands.
14. Designate the remainder of Camp 3 as Reserve/Control.
15. Change Campground Buffers to Reserves along NFSF Noyo.
16. Change Campground Buffers to Reserves along SF Noyo.
17. Add OFDA between Noyo and Big River drainages.
18. Designate three North Fork Caspar control areas in the Caspar Creek study as Reserves.

---

<sup>1</sup> Document 4 in the information package for the July 29, 2010 JAG meeting.

19. Designate Road 500-Jughandle Pine/Cypress near Pygmy as Reserve.
20. Change designation in part of Woodlands STA around the camp.
21. Change the Camp 3 out-area from OFSZ to LSD.
22. Change the west portion of the Volcano THP from selection to LSD.

There was general agreement on the following points: Allocation 9 is the same as allocation 17. Information that becomes available later on, such as economic modeling or research recommendations, can prompt revisiting and potentially changing some of the landscape allocations.

The above allocations were divided into three groups for discussion purposes. Group 1 consisted of allocations 2 through 5, 8, and 13 through 19. Group 2 consisted of allocations 1, 6 and 12. Group 3 consisted of allocations 7, 10, 11, 21 and 22.

#### **Group 1:**

All allocations in Group 1 were previously approved by the JAG in the context of a 40-year planning interval.

#### **Group 2:**

Allocations 1, 6 and 12 were left unresolved at the end of the last JAG meeting.

Allocation 1: landscape committee proposed buffering the OG around Hwy 20 up to the ridge top with LSD on the east, up to the road on the west. Mike A and others proposed OFDA designation as buffer instead of LSD. For the first entry, it will make no difference. OFDA provides the same protection as LSD, with the added advantage of allowing revenue generation. Linwood: all other OG buffers have been designated LSD.

**Straw Poll Motion (Linwood, Jere):** change the buffer from LSD to OFDA in allocation 1. Vince proposed voting on Group 2 as a group, not individually. A straw/sense vote was held on this motion. Six were in favor, three were opposed, one abstained. Based on Kathy's written statements, she was presumed to be a vote against the motion.

Allocation 6: the 2008 management plan had this area as part selection, part OFSZ. The landscape committee proposed the entire area become LSD. Mike A proposed the whole area become OFDA.

**Straw Poll Motion (Linwood, Peter):** designate allocation 6 as OFDA in its entirety. A straw vote was held on the proposal resulting in eight in favor, one against. Eight in favor, one against, one abstention. Based on Kathy's written statements, she was presumed to be a vote against the motion.

Allocation 12: Mike J proposed LSD designation for Hwy 20 OG buffers (1) and in return designate Brandon (12) as OFDA. Vince opposed this proposal. Mike J withdrew the proposal.

**Straw Poll Motion (Vince, Peter):** designate allocation 12 as LSD. A straw vote resulted in nine in favor, one abstention.

**Motion (Vince, Mike J):** designate allocations 1 and 6 as OFDA, 12 as LSD, given 1) the allocations are on a 40-years interim basis requiring sound analysis at the end of that time, 2) there is a priority on research into the difference between OFDA and LSD areas, and 3) we will clearly spell out deviations from the management plan.

Linda: there are compelling reasons to give the highest levels of protection to the buffers around Hwy 20. Mike J: within a 40-year planning interval, the difference is negligible. It is important to keep as much of JDSF in production as possible. Giving Brandon LSD protection versus OFDA protection for Hwy 20 OG buffers is a political compromise.

Mike: we have assumed it is a good thing to create this band of old forest structure across the Forest. The more we lock up things in late seral, the more we reduce flexibility to test hypotheses about management. The research umbrella is limited to the fit within the goals of the land allocation; you cannot put a five acre opening within an LSD area.

Census vote results:

1	Brad Valentine	Qualified support
2	John Helms	Strong support
3	Vince Taylor	General support
4	Mike Jani	General support
5	Linwood Gill	Qualified support
6	Jere Melo	General support
7	Linda Perkins	Fundamental disagreement
8	Mike Anderson	Strong support
9	Peter Braudrick	General support
10	Mike Liquori	Qualified support

### Group 3:

Group 3 includes allocations 7, 10, 11, 21 and 22.

Allocation 7 was addressed earlier under the West Chamberlain THP discussion, heading "5.a." in these minutes.

Allocation 10, 11 and 22:

**Straw Poll Motion (Mike A, Jere):** designate the Volcano THP area<sup>2</sup> (allocations 10, 11 and 22), as OFDA, after current harvest, without adversely affecting research possibilities. A straw vote resulted in eight in favor, one opposed, one abstention.

Discussion: Linwood feels the headwaters of Brandon should be matrix in order to preserve research flexibility. Having matrix, OFDA and LSD together in close proximity is a unique opportunity.

Mike L: we are setting up very uniform scale of experiments on the Forest, where we have multi-hundred acre patches aimed to ward a single treatment. We need to vary that at a finer scale. Seeing these areas chipped away and locked into late seral areas reduces the flexibility for experiments, and forces us to plan for them in advance.

As we take more and more of these areas out of matrix, we reduce the ability to conduct research on OFDA and LSD treatments in the matrix without severe effects on yields from matrix lands.

Allocation 21: the proposal is to change the "out" area of the Camp 3 timber sale, north of the sale and south of Road 330

**Straw Poll Motion (Mike A, Peter):** maintain OFDA designation in the Camp 3 out area. A straw vote resulted in seven in favor, one opposed, two abstentions.

Discussion: Mike A: the OFDA designation maintains flexibility for staff down the road. Like Vince pointed out, due to steepness of terrain, there is a good likelihood nothing will ever happen there. The approximate acreage is 63 acres.

---

<sup>2</sup> The gross Volcano THP planning area as defined in the 2008 management plan.

**Motion (Vince, Mike J):** support the straw votes for the Indian Springs reserve (#7), Volcano (#10, 11 and 22) and the out area of the Camp 3 THP (#21).

Census vote results:

1	Brad Valentine	General support
2	John Helms	General support
3	Vince Taylor	Strong support
4	Mike Jani	Strong support
5	Linwood Gill	Qualified disagreement
6	Jere Melo	General support
7	Linda Perkins	General support
8	Mike Anderson	Strong support
9	Peter Braudrick	General support
10	Mike Liquori	Qualified disagreement

Mike L: technically, the Indian Springs reserve (#7) was not a straw vote.

John: that is correct, we are in a sense confirming the vote already cast for the Indian Springs reserve.

#### **4. f. Hardwoods**

Brad discussed his proposal for retaining hardwood-dominated early- to mid-seral stands, Document 8 in the background information package. The last page, an 11x17 page map is inaccurate. The arrows are in the wrong location.

Reasons for retaining hardwood dominated stands within conifer types in an early seral condition include ecological, wildlife, research, education and recreation. Management guidelines consist of no harvest until conifers exceed two-thirds of total basal area.

Based on map figure 7 in the 2008 JDSF management plan, he identified three stands in each of three zones on the Forest, east central and west. These areas are fixed, they will not be rotated to replace stands as they grow out of an early-mid seral hardwood dominated condition. Road building, tail holds, etc. are acceptable within these stands. Stand manipulation is not permitted.

**Motion (Brad, Vince):** adopt the proposal in document 8 in the information package, with no stand manipulation until conifer BA exceeds two-thirds of total BA, subject to field verification of boundaries.

Discussion: Lynn is concerned about operational flexibility, and having to conduct operations around these stands could become a challenge.

Mike A expressed his concern that without the ability to manipulate stands to put in cable corridors, operations could become much more expensive.

Census vote results:

1	Brad Valentine	Unqualified support
2	John Helms	Strong support
3	Vince Taylor	Unqualified support
4	Mike Jani	Strong support
5	Linwood Gill	Qualified support
6	Jere Melo	Strong disagreement
7	Linda Perkins	Unqualified support

8	Mike Anderson	Qualified support
9	Peter Braudrick	Unqualified support
10	Mike Liquori	Strong support

## 5. Timber Harvest Plan Review

### 5.a. West Chamberlain

There was extended discussion about the proposed Indian Springs reserve area. The West Chamberlain THP is scheduled for operations field season 2011. Mike L: we may think there are opportunities here but researchers may not share that view. JDSF has high value to researchers as an area where they can do manipulative research. Other areas such as the Canoe fire on lands managed by Parks and Recreation may be better suited for reserve research. There was some disagreement over the suitability as a research area and whether there were three well defined scorch intensities over three adjacent watersheds.

**Motion (Mike L, Linda):** move the West Chamberlain THP forward. Meanwhile, the research committee, inclusive of interested individuals, will evaluate the research potential of the approximately 80 acres research area identified at this JAG meeting, within three weeks. The research committee will report its recommendations to the JAG at the September JAG meeting. The JAG will stand by the recommendation of the research committee and will adopt its recommendation.

The motion passed unanimously.

### 5.b. Waldo

John summarized the purpose of the THP Committee's second field tour of the Waldo THP: 1) evaluate stand and prescription variability, and 2) evaluate whether the allowable cut was appropriate, i.e. less than 35 percent.

Jere: the mark conformed to the selection prescription, as defined.

Linwood: the stand looked heterogeneous. The mark was fine.

Vince: the marking showed attention to retaining large trees. There were two areas, with an old and a new mark. The new mark seemed lighter, gentler and very carefully chosen so as not to arouse any upset over the mark being too heavy. If people are setting a trial mark that they know is going to be heavily scrutinized, does that influence the kind of mark that is done? It is probably human nature that it probably does. I think it would be a good policy to revisit a THP after it is completely marked, pick a couple of random areas, and see if the final mark corresponds to the impression that we got from visiting the trial mark.

Mike J: Vince's observation about the difference in the mark is correct. However, the two areas were different in tree size, setting, aspect, slope position. The first plot was a mid-slope flat, a micro-site of high site, with some very big trees. All of this influenced the mark that we observed. Granted, it was marked slightly more intense, but there were also more large trees. I felt the person doing the mark was holding to the marking instructions in both areas. They did an excellent job of keeping individual large trees between clumps.

Lynn: The upslope area with the flat had excellent visibility and it was a lot easier to keep a mental tally of the mark, as opposed to the second area, where you were walking through thickets of dense tanoak. I am troubled by the propensity of the JAG to assume that staff had a motive or agenda to hide information, rather than look for the reasonable explanations for the differences in the marking that we just identified.



Mike J: I think everybody that was out there agreed they did not feel as though JDSF staff was withholding something. Originally that was a concern, and that was why we went back for a second visit. When we went out of there, everybody thought it was perfectly fine.

Lynn: the fact that there was initially suspicion on the part of JAG about staff withholding information does say something about the JAG's opinion of staff, if we have to schedule a second tour to prove our honesty. That is a source of contention for staff, and it did involve considerable extra staff time to accomplish.

Linda: I was not calling staff's integrity into question. Effects of the latest NSO protocol on the timing of all of these plans is an unknown. The Parlin Form Management Area was within the THP.

**Motion (Jere, Mike J):** the Waldo THP complies with the management plan, and should go forward unchanged.

The motion passed with eight in favor, one against, and one abstention.

Vince proposed to amend the motion to set aside the two small areas identified during the field tour, but the amendment was not seconded.

Mike J clarified an earlier comment in which had proposed to trade timber volume by marking heavier further down slope in return for a lighter mark in the area of interest for set aside. He clarified that his comment was not a part of the motion, it was advise only.

Vince expressed an interest in obtaining post-harvest tree distribution, by size and basal area. Helge said that should be doable.

## **6. Research Committee Final Revisions**

Mike L went through the recommendations of the current draft of the research committee report. Several functional groups are defined:

1. Research Planning Team. These are the technical scientists that would develop a path for moving forward with the research plan
2. The Redwood Research group would consist of staff, hired to work full time on JDSF and other DSFs.
3. Redwood Regional Research Consortium would consist of stakeholders, primarily agencies, landowners and academia. This is an oversight body for the Redwood Research group.
4. Finally, an administration governance structure should be developed that fits within existing resources of CALFIRE and the Board, such as the Board's Research and Science Cte.

Vince felt the JAG needs to be part of the coordination group that the Research Planning Team works with. It does not make sense for the RPT to go forward without conferring back with the JAG.

John pointed out that the JAG deferred to the RPT as a more competent group for planning research. Given that JAG should be a part of the RPT.

As a part of discussion, a straw poll motion was conducted on whether JAG should be a coordinator with the RPT. The motion passed unanimously.

**Motion (Mike A, Jere):** adopt recommendations 5, 6, 7 and 8.

Census vote results:

1	Brad Valentine	Strong support
2	John Helms	Strong support
3	Vince Taylor	Qualified support
4	Mike Jani	Strong support
5	Linwood Gill	General support
6	Jere Melo	Strong support
7	Linda Perkins	Strong support
8	Mike Anderson	Strong support
9	Peter Braudrick	Strong support
10	Mike Liquori	Strong support

Vince explained his vote. He stated this is a fairly grandiose vision and will be difficult to achieve under the current budget situation. Mike L replied that the mandate for the research committee was to define what a world class research organization should look like.

The meeting adjourned at 17:22.

## **Saturday, August 28**

### **1. Attendance**

The meeting was called to order at 9:00. The following were present:

JAG:	CAL FIRE staff:	Facilitator:	Public:
1 Mike Anderson	Chris Rowney	Steve Zuieback	Nancy Banker
2 Peter Braudrick	Lynn Webb		Mark Schlafcus
3 Linwood Gill	Craig Pedersen		
4 John Helms	Russ Henly		
5 Mike Liquori	Helge Eng		
6 Jere Melo			
7 Linda Perkins			
8 Vince Taylor			

### **2. Public Input**

John opened the floor to public input. There were no takers.

### **3. Recreation Report**

Steve: the purpose of this agenda item is to hear from the recreation committee and the recreation task force and get input from the full JAG on the report's recommendations.

### 3.a. Recreation Committee Report:

Peter discussed the August 26, 2010 version of the recreation committee report. He went through each of the recommendations in the report.

The report recommended that the Department let a contract to conduct a recreation user survey and develop a recreation plan. Craig: staff is working on developing the specifications for such a contract. Vince: when will it be ready?

Jere referred to a letter from Forest, and requested that the Department distribute the letter to the full JAG. Jere believes the JAG is overstepping their bounds by getting involved in the development and timing of a Department contract. The JAG can make a recommendation for such a contract to the department, but it should leave the details of specifications and implementation to the department. He is very concerned, and will send written comments to John detailing those concerns.

John and others expressed disagreement with the recommendation to allocate 20 percent of the JDSF budget to recreation. A hard target would inappropriately restrict the department's management flexibility. Such a recommendation is also beyond the mandate of the JAG. Russ pointed out that the Forest lost money last year. We did not have a lot of wiggle room to spend money. We are still priming the pump to build a trajectory of increasing revenues.

Vince read a statement by Forest. Forest thinks the recreation task force goes too far. He cannot support their recommendations.

Mike L expressed some confusion regarding overlap of mandates between the recreation committee and the recreation task force. He thought the recreation task force would do all the work, thereby leaving the recreation committee without a well defined purpose. There is potential for the recreation committee usurping something that has already been covered. Nancy Banker: there is in fact a logical division of labor between the recreation committee and recreation task force. For example, the recreation committee can best handle the relationship between logging and recreation.

John stated that the JAG has put a lot of emphasis on recreation, and the modus operandi has been for the JAG to defer to, and liaison with, the recreation task force. He expressed concern about the JAG potentially starting to take initiatives on recreation issues, in the process breaking with past practices and thereby creating confusion about its relationship with the recreation task force. He would like to avoid the JAG taking action that should be the province of the recreation task force.

In regard to recommendation 3, which calls for the department to proceed with recreation maintenance and improvements prior to completion of the RP process, Vince felt the department was resistant to spend any money on recreation until the recreation task force recommendations are complete. There are many small things that can be funded that will not make a big difference regardless of what the final recreation task force recommendations may be. Vince believes department staff are wrong-headed.

Craig:the department continues to spend on existing facilities. We did not want to proceed with new facilities and trails until the recreation plan is done.

Helge and Craig stated that the first three sentences on page 2 of the recreation committee report:

- 1) "CAL FIRE has historically placed a low priority on recreation",
- 2) "Recreation staffing and expenditures have been cut disproportionately multiple times", and
- 3) "Currently almost no funds are being spent on recreation",

are factually incorrect. Staffing levels do fluctuate over time with economic conditions, but even with reduced staffing in recreation and other areas, staff redistribute their workload to meet recreation services targets. Lynn: the last thing we cut is recreation when economic conditions are bad. Professional staff have

cleaned outhouses when the situation called for it. JDSF has historically delivered a consistent level of recreation services.

Linda was concerned about the public's perception of recreation services delivery at JDSF, and requested specific figures for recreation from the Department.

### **3.b Recreation Task Force Report:**

Nancy Banker presented the recreation task force report. The recreation task force are well aware of the limitations placed on them by existing laws, regulations and policies. They deliberately chose not to let these limitations limit the formulation of their vision and plans. Policies change over time, but they wanted their contribution to research management at JDSF to be a pure effort at reaching the ideal management situation for research on JDSF.

There was discussion of recreation funding and grants. CAL FIRE has some non-profit partners, but the majority of funding for non-profits will probably come from outside JDSF.

Russ: going forward, there is potential for conflict between recreation and the legislatively mandated primary land use for JDSF, research and demonstration.

There are mixed feelings on OHV use on the recreation task force. The majority of members on the recreation task force are not excited about OHVs. The primary concern is noise. Regardless of how much noise reduction is built into new machines, they remain an unnatural noise that disrupts the tranquility of the forest. If there is a way to confine it, with little impact on other activities, one can limit illegal use. The revenue potential is significant.

Russ will provide the recreation task force report, and post it on the CAL FIRE web site.

## **4. Economics Committee Report**

Jere discussed the Economics Committee report and recommendations (item 5 in the background materials package).

Vince and Linwood recommended stating the recommendations more clearly. Other recommendations included adding a section addressing the possible costs of recommendations from the landscape committee and recreation committee, and profit and loss statements. It was recognized that JDSF does not break down expenditures by subject category. Jere does not wish to push quarterly profit and loss statements. Rather, he would like to see one eventually that shows progress.

The Economics Committee will revise the report and bring it back to the full JAG.

Russ provided an update on recreation user fees legislation (AB 2351), which passed the Senate and is on its way to the Governor's desk. Legislation to provide a rainy day fund for FRIF, which would have enabled carrying revenues over from one fiscal year to the next, did not survive. This was largely due to the incorrect perception that it would potentially take revenue away from the General Fund. We hope to go back with this legislation and make it clearer that it does not take anything away from the General Fund.

## **5. Public Comments**

Mark Schlafcus is a neighbor of JDSF. He is interested in recreation and supports the JAG efforts. He thinks what the JAG is doing is great, and completely supports what they are doing.

## 6. Next Steps

**September Meeting Start Time:** It was agreed that the September 24 JAG meeting will start at 8:30 am.

**Report Writing:** There are three sections that can be started immediately, and John wants to initiate movement on drafting these report elements for the September meeting:

a. The introductory statement (members, tasks, major recommendations). John and Vince will draft this section for distribution at the September meeting.

b. Research committee report. John and Mike L will draft the report.

c. Landscape committee report. John suggested that department staff, Russ, be asked to get the diverse materials prepared in a format that is appropriate for a report, and that Linwood and Mike J help with review and writing tasks as time allows. Linwood has severe time constraints, but is willing to help in a review capacity as time permits.

Vince proposed that he and Kathy Bailey draft the landscape committee report. Steve stated that, rightly or wrongly, the purpose was to avoid creating the impression of an agenda. Linwood and Mike J have a lot of support by the whole landscape committee.

Vince wanted the whole landscape committee to buy into the idea that Russ helps with drafting the landscape committee report. The landscape committee will have a conference call next week to consider this idea. Because it is strictly procedural, a public notice will not be necessary.

**Outreach Strategy:** at the last meeting, the JAG charged John and Peter with working on draft strategy for coordinated outreach. John and Peter will meet in Berkeley next week.

**Stakeholder Work Groups:** The landscape committee will have a conference call next week to reach agreement on whether or not they can agree to have RH start on a first draft of the landscape committee report.

**Public Meetings:** Vince: the JAG needs to hold a public meeting in Fort Bragg. We should start planning now. November is the latest possible date for the meeting. The JAG needs to hold the public meeting before the final JAG recommendations are out. Otherwise, the public will feel that they did not have an opportunity for input.

The meeting adjourned at 11:55.