

**H CAPE DOMESTIC WATER SUPPLY DISTRICT  
FOREST MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE MEETING  
MINUTES: Thursday August 31, 2023**

1. Attendees:

Committee Members – Pat Noonan, Clark Binkley, David Dougherty, Mike Ardington, Doug Caffall. Board Representative – Bob Cerelli,. Consulting Forester: Ben Hayes. Facilitator: Bill Campbell

2. Public Comments: None

3. August 2<sup>nd</sup> Meeting Minutes accepted without changes

4. Update on RFP Process

- RFPs distributed on August 18<sup>th</sup>
- 3 potential bidders participated in Q&A on August 29<sup>th</sup>
- 2 potential bidders are confirmed for site visit on September 5<sup>th</sup>
- Bid Opening is on September 19<sup>th</sup>

5. Certification

The intent of this conversation was to determine if certification should be included in the long-range financial plan scenarios. A final (future) decision about whether or not to apply for certification will depend upon whether logging is actually being considered within the source water protection area and the expected timing of that logging.

- a. There was consensus that certification should not be considered if logging is only to be done outside of the source water protection area.
- b. If logging is anticipated within the source water protection area, then only FSC certification should be considered, with the proposed timing and duration of certification being 5 years before and 2 years after the logging event
  - *Rationale for paying for certification:* Provides an independent audit that forest management and logging is done to an accepted high standard (social license). When multiple foresters are involved over time, provides a common understanding of forest management objectives. May open up certain markets, that may be closed to non-certified logging.
  - *Rationale against paying for certification:* Since the District will be selling stumpage and not individual logs, certification is not likely to have any appreciable effect on markets. Legislation, practice standards and our management plan already set a high standard for forestry and logging. With a small area to be logged, the necessary level of control can be achieved internally. The District may not want restrictions on the tree stock that can be planted.
- c. An alternative for certification may be a 3<sup>rd</sup> party review of our multi-resource management plan.

- d. No consensus was reached on whether or not to certify in the event that logging will be done in the source water protection area. For the purpose of building possible financial scenarios only, certification will be included as a cost only in scenario(s) that call for logging within the source water protection area, just to ensure that the cost is considered in case the decision for certification is made at a later point in time.

6. Consideration of Ecological Road Assessment (*Attachment page 181-135*)

The primary objective of any road work to be done is to provide for protection against fire damage and to control sedimentation in the source water.

The first 5 of 6 scenarios and decommissioning as outlined in the Ecological Road Assessment were reviewed and discussed.

The criteria to be used for defining and prioritizing the work to be done are: a) the importance of maintaining access to other roads or areas, b) the severity of the existing problem and likelihood of it getting worse, c) maximizing how much can get done with the money available – the possibility of getting something accomplished with a minimum cost.

To the extent that money is limited so that all of the work cannot be completed with the ARPA funds, the priority for completing the projects is #1, #2, #5 (with an additional \$50,000 for decommissioning), #3, #4, decommissioning of roads in red, decommissioning of roads in yellow. If all of the work cannot be done with ARPA funds, the remaining work should be completed with other available funds within the next 5-10 years.

Notes:

- Legal review of easements (at additional cost) is likely to be required related to project #4.
- The primary purpose for project #5 is fire protection access to the south side of the property
- An alternative access to the south side of the property may be via a connection with the road that goes east out of the church parking lot.

8. The next meeting will be set of September 25. The agenda will be:

- a. Results of RFP process
- b. What should be our approach-plan for Fire Response? (see attached for status of past discussions)
- c. What are the minimum maintenance requirements of and operational interventions in the Watershed that we should be considering and factoring into the Finance-Operations plan?

9. Public Comments: None

10. Adjourn