



"To protect, enhance, and support Butte County natural resources and agriculture by working with willing landowners and citizens through education, land management, and on-the-ground projects."

150 Chuck Yeager Way, Ste. A, Oroville, CA 95965 * (530) 693-3173 * bcrd@carcd.org

BOARD OF DIRECTORS Agenda

Date: Thursday, June 18, 2020

Time: 9:00 AM

Location: No physical location

NOTICE OF TEMPORARY PROCEDURES FOR BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING: Pursuant to California Governor Gavin Newsom's Executive Order N-29-20 issued on March 17, 2020, relating to the convening of public meetings

in response to the COVID-19 pandemic, **the Butte County Resource Conservation District will be closing the June 18, 2020 Board of Directors Meeting to members of the public and nonessential District staff.** Additionally, members of the Board of Directors are allowed to attend the meeting via teleconference and to the same extent as if they were present.

Members of the public are encouraged to participate in the Board meeting in the following ways :

1. Remote Viewing

[h <https://zoom.us/j/321411651>](https://zoom.us/j/321411651) (Meeting ID: 321 411 651) OR use
One tap mobile: +16699006833, then enter 321411651#

2. Public Comment

Public Comment can also be submitted anytime via email at bcrd@carcd.org . Every effort will be made to provide Board Members with your comments before the agenda item is heard. Comments received after an agenda item will be made part of the record if received prior to the end of the meeting

- 1) **CALL TO ORDER** – Allen Harthorn, Vice Chair
- 2) **WELCOME AND INTRODUCTIONS** – Directors Allen Harthorn, Colleen Hatfield, John Christofferson; Associate Director Mike Crump; staff Thad Walker, Tim Keeseey, Wolfy Rougle; member of public Shanna Hobbs
- 3) **REVISIONS TO AGENDA** (only emergency situations requiring the need to take immediate actions may be added as action items pursuant to Gov. code 549954.2(b)). Added: Item m, time-sensitive contract with Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserves Staff
- 4) **PUBLIC COMMENT (on non-action items)**

*(1) (3 min. limit per speaker/topic, 15 minutes/person/meeting total) (2) Public comment is encouraged. Any member of the public may address the Board with any comment related to the Resource Conservation District's areas of concern. However, no action can be taken by the Board on such items at this current meeting. The Board may direct staff to agendaize such items for consideration at a future meeting. (3) *Please note that all action items will have time set aside for public comment prior to the vote occurring. After a motion*

is made and seconded by two BCRCD Directors, the Chair will first ask for any further discussion from the Directors and Associate Directors and then Chair will open up the item for brief public comment limited to 2 minutes/person. After the public

comment period closes a vote will be held.

- 5) **CONSENT AGENDA:** Project Updates (see board packet).
- 6) **ACTION ITEMS –**
Allen Harthorn, Vice Chair
- a) **Review and approval of the minutes of the BOD meeting held 5-21, 2020** – John moved, Colleen seconded, motion passed unanimously. Colleen noted that the P&Ps item proposed last month for this month’s agenda did not actually make it onto this month’s agenda. P&P revisions need to be a standing agenda item in the future.
- b) **Review and Approve Outstanding Bills and Financials – Colleen Hatfield** – Over \$127,000 has come in in the last 30 days, mostly from EFRP and DOC invoices getting paid. Several payments are expected very soon or are even in the mail. In some cases the expected payments contain money we have owed to subcontractors for some time.
- c) **Contractor Invoice Payment Practices- Dave Lee.** On behalf of Dave, Colleen addressed this issue. As discussed above, currently we only pay subcontractors once a month (at board meeting) yet we frequently receive payments just after a board meeting. In this situation, subcontractors must wait until the next BOD meeting (as much as 29 additional days) to be paid. Many subcontractors are local small nonprofits or family businesses for whom this delay can be a hardship. This can disincentivize subcontractors from working with us in the future. Colleen proposed that when midcycle payments are received, the Treasurer be able to pay subcontractor invoices if they are both: (a) already identified on the AP list from the most recent BOD meeting and (b) were highlighted or flagged by staff as critical, i.e. long outstanding and important to pay as soon as feasible. John asked what “long outstanding” meant; staff suggested that if the subcontractor invoice shows up on a previous BOD meeting AP list, it is very likely to have already been outstanding 30 days by the time a midcycle payment arrives. Allen suggested a special color-coding on the AP to distinguish those bills that could be paid mid-cycle. Colleen moved that the Board identify, at each BOD meeting, with DM input, outstanding (30d+) contractor invoices that could be paid midcycle if payment from funder is received mid-cycle. John seconded, motion passed unanimously.
- d) **Audit Update- Colleen Hatfield – (no action needed).** Colleen’s goal is to get all needed documentation to auditor and she may need some help from Thad. The auditor checklist has some items the BCRCDC doesn’t currently have completely in place (many of them simple additions to the P&Ps). Allen will send Colleen his Form 700 right away.
- e) **2020/ 2021 BCRCDC Budget- Colleen Hatfield/ Staff** - The 20-21 budget shows almost \$1.8M in projects with a revenue of \$120,000; this level of income is, however, predicated on being able to provide enough staff to do all the work that is available to us. The budget summary shows the number of full-time staff the BCRCDC could (or would need to) support in order to complete all the hours available in all the contracts and grants. For no month is it less than 10 staff. The RCD currently has 5 staff.
- John moved to approve the budget as most recently revised. Colleen seconded. Motion passed unanimously. Afterward, Mike asked whether there shouldn’t be a discussion at a future board meeting about potentially adding another staff member? John encouraged staff to continue bringing forward needs for staff and to identify individuals who would be a

good fit for the RCD. He expressed that it's better to hire people the RCD knows of (through experience or at least reputation) than to roll the dice through Indeed.com or other wide nets. Mike Crump remarked that the County typically authorizes a certain number of positions per department as needed to fulfill work, and the RCD board has just virtually done that by approving a budget that requires up to 13.7 person-months of work a month! Colleen agreed that a somewhat formalized process for hiring is preferable to only extending offers to people we already know. Allen suggested adding another standing item to the agenda, "Staffing Needs," to the regular BOD agenda. Thad suggested incorporating that into the "Project Updates" which are delivered monthly as part of the consent agenda. For the next 30-day period, Colleen suggested staff pull together a list of skills needed and have the RCD staff start recruiting in ways that don't cost money.

- f) **SDRMA Insurance Policy and Claim Update- Colleen Hatfield (no action needed)** – Update on NRCS Jeep rented from GSA and involved in minor accident (no injuries, no other vehicle involved) while being driven by RCD staff on conservation mission– 3 estimates have been collected and they're all in the about \$2,500-\$2,800 range. Jeep will be taken to the mechanic the GSA authorizes. No matter what mechanic is chosen, RCD will be on the hook for \$1,000 because we have a \$1,000 deductible.
- g) **Setting up a nonprofit fund through NVCF - Revisions - Wolfy Rougle.** We were joined by special guest Bill Hubbard from NVCF. Board asked, "How broad can we make the purpose of donations through an NVCF Camp Fire recovery fund? Can it encompass general watershed resilience or does it need to be narrowly focused on planting and caring for trees in the burn scar?" Bill explained that NVCF has 2 responsibilities to the donor: clearly explain what the donor's money will be used for, and ensure that the donor's money really does go there. Yes, the RCD could establish a broader purpose for the fund, but the broader the scope, the more difficult it is for NVCF to fulfill its responsibilities and the more donors tend to lose interest. However, the agreement allows for a "sub-fund agreement" to create sub-funds for particular special projects. Bill feels it would be most effective for the RCD to stick to a narrow, focused purpose of tree planting and tree care for this agreement, and add additional sub-funds as needed for separate projects. John said this made perfect sense.
- Board's second question was: Can we add more than 1 person authorized to request distributions from the fund (this person is called the "fund advisor")? Bill responded that the Fund Advisor (1 or 2 individuals) must be **named** and cannot be merely roles (e.g. "any Board member or manager"). The fund advisor can be easily changed at any time through a simple amendment sheet filled out by the Board. The Fund Advisor has the ability to go into the system and see how much money has been contributed/withdrawn at any time.
- John moved that BCRCDC approve the agreement with the NVCF with the following changes to paragraph 11: Delete the last sentence "any single fund advisor may sign disbursement requests" and say that 2 fund advisors must sign each request. And change Fund Advisors to Thad, Colleen, and Dave. Colleen seconded. During discussion, John further added that Paragraph 2, stating the purpose, should stay as is but with the addition of "purchase and planting" of trees rather than just "planting". Motion passed unanimously.
- h) **Revision of agreement with UCD Researchers to provide Concow monitoring plan - Wolfy Rougle.** John moved the Board approve the new contract and also that the BCRCDC develop an item for the P&Ps for next month stating that we don't allow a subcontractor to charge more than 10% indirect on projects. Colleen seconded, motion passed unanimously.
- i) **Resolutions to submit full proposals for up to 3 WCB Forest Conservation Program grants**

(includes signing STD204) – Wolfy. Colleen moved the Board approve all 3 resolutions. John seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

- j) **Contract with Susan Heffernan to develop CAP 106 Forest Management Plan – Tim** – Project is funded by EQIP and would make Susan eligible for funds through AFF, MSW and other funds so more trees can be replanted to join the 322 acres of reforestation we did in spring 2020. Colleen moved, John seconded, motion passed unanimously.
- k) **Contract/employment with Gabe Babcock to assist with Forestry projects – Tim** – This may need to go into closed session, but Tim shared that Gabe is willing to become an employee rather than a contractor. Tim suggested perhaps we extend Gabe’s contract for 1 month for now, and address any possibility of employment at next BOD meeting. John proposed we move this discussion to closed session, joined by Tim, and from closed session Board will direct DM on how to proceed.
- l) **Contract with McCombs Archaeology to assist with Granite Basin OHV Archaeology** – Tim has not yet had a chance to discuss this with Diane, but he’d like to renew her contract over Granite Basin so that if additional archaeological questions come up (as we anticipate) regarding the Swayne RR grade trail route alternative, BCRCD could consult with Diane. Item postponed til next meeting.
- m) **Contract with Big Chico Creek Ecological Reserve staff to provide forestry services for BCCFMP as deliverable to contract with BCFSC** – Tim. This would allow BCRCD to transfer \$6,000 of our \$10,000 forester line item in our contract with BCFSC to the CSUCEF (Enterprise Foundation). The remaining \$4,000 would be divided between Phil Nemir, RPF and BCRCD. Phil Nemir has already consented to the change. Tim recommended that if BOD approves the contract, they do so with the elimination of paragraph 3 under “Notes” on the rate card, which seems to allow CSUCEF to raise its rates mid-project without adequate notice or negotiation. Colleen wanted to modify this suggestion to allow CSUCEF to return with alternative language stating CSUCEF could only raise rates with an amendment approved by BCRCD. “Labor rates stated above may be modified with approval from the Butte County RCD.” Tim will also add language to the first paragraph in the SOW clarifying the deliverables, stating “The CSUCER will provide, as a deliverable, a complete FMP for those lands within the project area that are part of the BCCER.” John at first asked this item be brought back for next meeting, but because of its time-sensitivity, Tim asked if it would be possible for the board to approve the contract contingent on John reviewing it before final approval. John was concerned that would mean approving a contract without full Board review, which is not ideal. The Board chose to table this item until either the next meeting or, potentially, a special meeting before then. In the meantime, Tim will work with John to make sure John is comfortable with the contract before it comes before the BOD again.
- n) **Next Meeting of BCRCD BOD- Thursday July 16th @ 9 AM.**

6) RCD PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS

- a) Update – See staff updates in BOD packet. John had a question about the Granite Basin OHV Development project. Was the Swayne RR grade alternative proposed by the USFS or by BCRCD? Tim responded that it was a BCRCD suggestion which would allow PNF to stay in compliance with its programmatic agreement (PA) with USFWS regarding SNYLF habitat. That PA states that the PNF will not construct a new trail through SNYLF habitat if an existing trail would serve the same purpose. An existing (albeit non-system) trail does already traverse the Swayne RR grade. John responded that this explanation made sense and that he felt the Swayne RR grade option was preferable from a conservation

perspective.

Tim had an update to the project updates: He worked with the CSUCEF to submit a large proposal to the BCFSC for a 27K-acre forest planning project with a total budget of \$400,000 to be split about evenly between BCRC and CSUCEF. BCRC would cover the FMP and archaeology, while CSUCEF would cover CEQA review for a VMP and NOEs on some tree harvests.

Colleen asked about the Cottonwood Conservation Area report and Tim confirmed that he is still working on the 18-19 report, but this does not mean we are behind on the 19-20 report, as it is not due til November of this year.

b) Continue discussion of staffing needs – We did not really cover this again but perhaps it was adequately addressed already.

7) PARTNERS' REPORTS (5 minute limit per group) - None

- a) Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS)
- b) Butte County departments
- c) Community groups and agencies

8) CLOSED SESSION – Directors only

- a) Personnel Discussion

9) BOARD OF DIRECTORS REPORTS

- a) Butte County RCD Directors and Associate Directors are welcome to report

10)ADJOURNMENT

***NOTE:** The Butte County Resources Conservation District (BCRC) distributes its Board meeting agendas electronically at least 24 hours in advance of meetings. If you would like to be added to, or removed from, the email list, please notify the Butte County RCD at (530) 534-0112, ext. 122 or by email to: bcrd@carcd.org. The BCRC also publicly posts notice and agenda of meetings 72 hours in advance of meetings at the Butte County RCD office located at 150 Chuck Yeager Way, Suite A, Oroville, CA. **Reasonable Accommodations:** In compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, if you need special assistance to participate in this meeting, please contact the Butte County RCD Manager at (530) 534-0112, ext. 122.*

Please note that all action items will have time set aside for public comment prior to the vote occurring. After a motion is made and seconded by two BCRC Directors, the Chair will first ask for any further discussion from the Directors and Associate Directors and then the Chair will open up the item for brief public comment limited to 2 minutes per person. After the public comment period closes, a vote will be held