**ACCG PLANNING MEETING NOTES**

**12/10/14 - JACKSON**

**ATTENDEES:** Kendal Young KY; Teresa McClung TM; Autumn Olsen AO; John Hoffman JH; Julia Stephens JS; Amy Rocha AR; C Koos Breazeal, CKB; Chuck Loffland CL; Kimberly Grissom KG; Gwen Starrett GS; Pat McGreevy PM; Reuben Childress RC

**On Lync:** Shana Gross SG, Central Sierra Ecologist, USFS

Action Items in yellow

1. **HEMLOCK LANDSCAPE RESTORATION COMMENT LETTER**
2. PM reviewed development of letter
3. GS – Red fir issue – climate change models reflect red fir disappearance; potentially the most critical species; reviewed her process /collaboration with Shana Gross
4. KY - Purpose of comment letter to point out deficiencies in proposed action and other potential means to achieve purpose and need if available. ACCG voiced consensus with letter except with red fir portion. GTR 220 is concept statement; GTR 237 is implementation document
5. JOHO - #1 Management of Red Fir Ecosystem paragraph – issues with “ACCG’s main concern…” Not all in ACCG had this concern – do we discern this?
6. RC – did Becky get with Malcolm North to develop a white paper on red fir?
7. SG – status of white paper unknown; they have been working on reference sites in Yosemite and Kings where fire has occurred to get a recent reference site; natural range of variability;
8. KY – status of white paper – deferred due to more immediate issues
9. SG – inclusion of a map with veg overlay would be helpful to include
10. KY – discussed FS direction regarding climate change in development
11. KY there has already been a shift in red fir zone, per long-term forester observations; looking for ½ acre gaps and not plant in red fir zone; short belt of red and white firs, with climate change scenario having white outcompete red fir, in theory. Shift in climate will favor white fir; even with management, red fir probably will not hang on; maybe a bit longer if reduced water competition, but over long term will not.
12. RC – mistletoe, canker, root rot issues
13. KY – less attention to removal of mistletoe (MT) than getting trees to grow up as fast as possible; if trees don’t get rained on by the higher canopy by growing faster, can remove a lot of problem; can never really get rid of mistletoe on the forest.
14. SG – mistletoe in large trees – based on studies, 50% or under of MT is within the natural range of variability; more than that, you may want to treat; less than 50% not a bad thing.
15. JS – supports retaining the old stands of RF for American Marten preferred habitat.
16. KY - Proposal does not support cutting trees larger than 30 DBH; data not available re MT;
17. PM recommends inclusion
18. SG posed question – have those older trees died yet (that were observed on previous study)?
19. KY – recommends ACCG have a conversation on climate change in the near future and come to a consensus regarding climate change.
20. RH – there is a climate change “scorecard” but nothing specifically in NEPA re CC.
21. TM – design projects to maintain resiliency – regardless of the disturbance, just creating a landscape that is more resilient no matter the disturbance.
22. CL – line is being blurred between proposed action and analysis results. Analysis has not been written yet.
23. JS – main aquatic features are CSERC’s primary concerns; want to be supportive with ACCG
24. RH – each entity can bring these issues up on their own via letter, conversation, phone call.
25. JH – some participants are new to the ACCG and bring in new issues; group has failed if we submit separate letters and have not arrived at common concerns
26. KY – ACCG has not come to agreement on first 3 items
27. CL - Add “these are the things we would like to see analyzed/address” and add bullets or “Please consider this in your analysis”
28. GS – propose deleting first 2 paragraphs on red fir and reformat 3rd para and say like above (y)
29. RC - Change “analyze” to “consider”
30. KY - FS defines relevant issues as to formulate alternatives
31. KY – RC and GS will work on resubmission and submit to CKB for submission by COB Monday, 12/15 can be email, fax, drop off to TM KY
32. **Social/Economic Monitoring**
33. Group reviewed KY’s document with objectives and indicators.
34. Who is receiving this document? KY intended to send to – J Kusel (SI), Erin Kelly (HSU), Susan Roberts (Dinkey)
35. CKB – spoke to Erin Kelly last week and they have withdrawn their interest in ACCG and are instead concentrating on Lomakatsi, Trinity Collaborative and one other [in southern Oregon?]
36. KY are we building this monitoring solely for Cornerstone or for all-lands? Right now building for Cornerstone, but intend to expand.
37. **Questions for CFLR**
38. KY sending list of 13 questions to planning team; encourage to take a stab at answering some.
39. **Power Fire**
40. RH – briefed on settlement fund use.
41. Does ACCG want to develop a Power Fire subcommittee or be involved in some way?
42. Relevance – without ACCG boundary, large-scale, recent success wwith WO -- will be a Cornerstone match.
43. Add to January planning agenda
44. RH has been communicating with Craig Thomas, SFL -- get a “think tank” to develop a plan for funds and how think tank would function. Outreach late Jan/Feb for further discussions.
45. JH - this is part of what we already do – keep as part of planning work group, etc.
46. RH - is this a separate work group or address project by project?
47. PM – include an outreach portion
48. RC – definition of “local” would fit in
49. Craig Thomas – landscape view
50. Teresa – new agreement tool between FS and state – expanded under Farm Bill – [www.fs.fed.us/farmbill/gna.shtml](http://www.fs.fed.us/farmbill/gna.shtml)
51. Next meeting – January 14, 2015. JH to secure meeting space.