*Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute*

# Meeting Brief

The Planning Work Group (WG):

* formed an ad hoc group to reconcile Planning Work Group (WG) comments reflecting the key themes and take-aways from the Scottiago field trip on June 26, 2019.
* refined the purpose statement and “green light” category of project activities, protocols and procedures for the ACCG Project Support Evaluation Tool. The WG will continue discussing the “yellow light” and “red light” categories of project activities in September and October and plans to bring the tool to the full ACCG for discussion at the November General meeting.
* encouraged the Strategic Landscape Assessment Work Group (SLAWG) to conduct outreach to several key stakeholders who have extensive project data and/or have engaged in similar mapping exercises in order to avoid a duplication of effort.
* continued to discuss Moving Toward Resiliency within the Mokelumne to Kings Landscape (MOTOR M2K), expressing ongoing concerns about the condition-based approach to the two-forest landscape scale project. The WG requested greater specificity about anticipated on-the-ground activities and sought clarification on the USFS’s willingness to consider alternatives to the condition-based approach.
* identified field trip opportunities for September-November 2019 and possible field trips for the spring and early summer of 2020.

# Action Items

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Point Person(s)** |
| Scottiago Field Trip ad hoc group meet to reconcile comments regarding the field trip notes in the Planning WG June 26th meeting summary. | Ben Solvesky (lead)Craig OstergaardRich FarringtonJoe Aragon |
| Revise Project Support Evaluation Tool. | Tania Carlone |
| Reach out to the CAL-AM Team to invite them to participate in the September Planning WG meeting to share their data relevant to the SLAWG mapping effort. | Craig Ostergaard |
| SLAWG set up meetings with the Amador Ranger District and Calaveras Ranger District to discuss project mapping information request. | Joe Aragon (coordinate) |
| SLAWG invite the Fall River RCD to make a presentation to a joint meeting of the SLAWG and Planning WG in October or November. | Joe Aragon (coordinate) |
| The Amador Ranger District will reach out to Mountain Counties Water Resources Association regarding submission their mapping data to the SLAWG. | Rick HopsonRobin Wall |
| The Amador Ranger District will provide a briefing on the Power Fire Settlement fund grantees at a future General meeting.  | Rick HopsonRobin Wall |
| Provide Michael Joe/Joe Aragon with comments on the MOTOR M2K Proposal as soon as possible. | Planning WG members |
| CBI and USFS work together to prepare for the September Planning WG discussion regarding MOTOR M2K. | Tania CarloneMichael Jow |
| Take notes on Callecat Field Trip and send to Tania at least one week before September 25th Planning WG meeting. | Gwen Starrett |

# Summary

## Agenda Review & Meeting Summary Approval

The Planning Work Group had no suggested changes to the July 24th Planning Work Group (WG) meeting summary. Tania Carlone, Consensus Building Institute (CBI), will finalize the document for posting to website.

The Planning WG formed an ad hoc group to reconcile comments for the Scottiago field trip summary. Ben Solvesky will take the lead in scheduling a conference call with Craig Ostergaard, Joe Aragon, and Rich Farrington. The ad hoc group will send a clean draft of the Scottiago field trip summary to Tania by 9/18. The Planning WG will discuss and finalize the document at the 9/25 meeting and will present the field trip findings to the full ACCG at the October General meeting.

## Project Support Evaluation Tool

Consistent with the Collaborative Engagement Strategy, the Planning WG continued its discussion of the project support evaluation tool. The WG refined the purpose of the tool and came to agreement on the “green light” category of project activities and associated protocol and procedures. The WG anticipates discussing the “yellow light” category of projects at the September meeting and the “red light” category at the October meeting. The WG expects to present the project evaluation tool at the November General meeting to receive feedback from the full ACCG.

**Next Steps**

Based on the WG discussion, Tania will make changes to the project evaluation tool document and send to the WG for review before the September Planning WG meeting.

## Strategic Landscape Assessment Work Group (SLAWG)

Joe Aragon, the SLAWG’s liaison to the Planning Work Group, reviewed the purpose of the landscape mapping tool currently under development. He explained that the project mapper will help the ACCG identify the location of treatment gaps which would lead to a better understanding, using spatial tools, of where to prioritize actions on the landscape. Joe also reported to the group that the development of the mapping tool could potentially be funded through a directional grant from the Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC) for capacity-building.

**Discussion**

* Given the data request the SLAWG made at the August General meeting, the WG discussed the importance of outreach to groups who have been doing similar mapping work in the ACCG landscape in order to receive their information and to avoid duplication of effort.
* The WG identified the following groups that require outreach: CALFIRE, Mountain Counties Water Resources Association, Amador Fire Safe Council, and the CAL-AM Team.
* The Planning WG specified that the CAL-AM Team has significant data that is important for the SLAWG’s mapping effort. Realizing how busy the CAL-AM Team is implementing projects, one Planning WG member suggested that it is important for the SLAWG to communicate the value to them in providing the ACCG with the requested data. The Planning WG suggested that it would be valuable to invite the Team to make a presentation at the next Planning WG meeting and to engage in a discussion about how best to go about sharing data.
* The Amador Ranger District will reach out to Mountain Counties Water Resources Association about their mapping data since they are one of eight grantees who received grant awards from the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and US Department of Agriculture’s Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region’s second round grants to restore forests and watersheds impacted by wildfires in the Eldorado and Lassen National Forests. The projects were awarded through the Northern California Forests and Watersheds Grant Program. The 2019 grant slate can be viewed [here](https://www.nfwf.org/norcal/Documents/norcal2019grants.pdf). These funds were derived from the Power Fire Settlement.
* The USFS will share data with the SLAWG. However, they need to have a better understanding of what information would be most helpful and in what format. The Planning WG agreed that it would be beneficial for the SLAWG to set up separate meetings with the Amador and Calaveras Ranger Districts for this purpose. Ben Solvesky requested to participate in these meetings.
* The WG also reiterated the value and importance of learning more about the landscape mapping tool that 34 North has developed under a contract with the Fall River Resource Conservation District (RCD). The SLAWG is attempting to get Todd Sloat from the RCD to come to a Planning WG meeting to make a presentation. Katherine Evatt encouraged the WG to visit the [34 North website](http://www.34north.com/) to learn more about their work.

**Moving Towards Resiliency in the Mokelumne to Kings (MOTOR M2K)**Michael Jow, USFS, gave an overview of the feedback received at the MOTOR M2K public engagement meeting on August 12 as summarized in the [MOTOR M2K Group Breakout Stakeholder Responses](http://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/07_2019-0821_MotorM2K_Aug12Stakeholder-ResponsesFINAL.pdf). He went on to request any comments that the Planning WG had on the [Draft MOTOR M2K Proposal](https://acconsensus.org/event/accg-planning-work-group-meeting-2/?instance_id=2033). He specified that the Stanislaus National Forest is interested in understanding how the three collaboratives in the project area (ACCG, YSS, and Dinkey) would define the side boards for the project, what aspects of other projects MOTOR M2K should consider, and what further information the ACCG felt it needed to engage with the development of the project.

**Discussion**

* Planning WG members continued to express concerns primarily about the timeline and the proposed conditions-based approach over such a large area encompassing two national forests.
* Some Planning Work Group members commented on how they continue to struggle with how to make meaningful comments without understanding what place-based treatments are being proposed on the ground.
* They also sought clarification on how the ACCG would function with a condition-based decision, specifically how they would be involved in project implementation. Michael suggested that the Stanislaus NF has discussed the possibility of having post-NEPA, site-specific discussions to establish rule-sets for the various treatments.
* One participant suggested that the project evaluation tool that the ACCG is currently developing represents the side boards that would apply to MOTOR M2K. The difficulty is that the ACCG is in the middle of developing the tool, which will likely not be finalized and approved by the full ACCG until November. This current work doesn’t align well with the MOTOR M2K timeline.
* Attendees suggested that Michael could bring unique conditions and expected scenarios to the Planning WG identifying possible treatments and anticipated locations. This would facilitate working through the scenarios and getting more specific about activities which would make it possible to talk through desired conditions and their associated “rule-sets” and “sideboards” that the USFS is requesting from the ACCG.
* One participant asked if the USFS was open to considering different alternatives to a condition-based analysis that could still accomplish landscape-scale work like a programmatic EA/EIS whose analysis focused on cumulative effects with smaller decisions that would fall under the programmatic document. Michael responded that Dean Gould, Forest Supervisor for the Sierra NF, and Jason Kuiken, Forest Supervisor for the Stanislaus NF, would be meeting soon to consider alternatives. They need to have a discussion internal to the region to figure out if there is flexibility on the timelines and approach. Michael suggested that stakeholders send in comments on the draft Proposed Action as soon as possible while these internal discussions are taking place.

**Callecat Field Trip Documentation**

Since CBI was not available to participate on the Callecate field trip following the in-office meeting on August 28th, Gwen Starrett agreed to take notes and email them to Tania before the next Planning WG meeting.

**Future Field Trip Options**

Planning Work Group members identified the following possible field trips for 2019-2020. The field trips will follow the regularly scheduled Planning WG meetings.

**September:** Hemlock Lessons Learned
**October:** Power Fire Area Beaver Ridge (two large landscape burns)
**November:** South Fork BLM project (lop and scatter vs. “slop” and scatter)- coordinate with Monte Kawahara, Pat McGreevey, and Steven Wilensky

**2020 Possible Options:** Scottiago or Hemlock DxP sites in operation in late spring (weather permitting); Mattley or Foster Meadow restorations

## Future Meetings

The next Planning Work Group meeting will be on September 25, 2019 at the Calaveras Ranger District in Hathaway Pines followed by a field trip to the Hemlock project area.

# Meeting Participants

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Miles** | **Hours** |
| Rich Farrington | UMRWA |  |  |
| Craig Ostergaard | SPI |  | 4 |
| Michael Jow | USFS |  |  |
| Shane Dante | Foothill Conservancy | 20 | 4 |
| Marc Young | USFS |  0 | 7 |
| Joe Aragon | USFS |  100 | 8 |
| Rick Hopson | USFS | 0 | 7 |
| Katherine Evatt | Foothill Conservancy | 24 | 4 |
| Gwen Starrett |  |  |  |
| Terry Woodrow | Alpine County | 134 | 7 |
| Ben Solvesky | Sierra Forest Legacy | 60 | 8 |
| Robin Wall | USFS |  | 8 |
| Tania Carlone | CBI |  180 | 9 |