**Purpose Statement:** The purpose of this document is to describe and distinguish among categories of project activities proposed in the ACCG landscape that represent fundamental agreement, situational agreement, and areas of fundamental disagreement. These categories are described explicitly to help project proponents anticipate the level of potential controversy associated with proposed projects and create a roadmap for successful collaboration with the ACCG. Understanding the potential level of controversy can help project proponents prepare a strategy, timeline, and approach geared towards promoting agreement among diverse stakeholders in as realistic and expedient a manner as possible. The tool has also been designed to help the ACCG engage in constructive dialogue that promotes mutual understanding, learning, and the trust-building within the collaborative while clearly communicating the project development process to external parties. Its intent is to streamline the project development and approval process. In doing so, it outlines the protocols and procedures associated with each category of project in an attempt to right-size the level of effort when vetting projects. This document is a key component of the ACCG project development and approval package (link to website).

|  |
| --- |
| Category 1: *Green Light*Description: These project actions are broadly supported by the ACCG and are generally considered non-controversial. For projects that clearly fall into this category, project proponents can follow an expedited protocol to seek ACCG support. |
| Protocol: Expedited Process immediately routed to ACCG General Meetings |
| Project Activities | **Considerations** | **Procedures** |
| 1. Re-routing roads and trails around meadows
2. Road repairs to improve water quality
3. Road repairs to provide fire-fighting access
4. Meadow restoration that does not include removal of legacy trees
5. Modest improvements to existing developed facilities
6. Prescribed fire with agency approved plan
7. Plantation thinning when consistent with forest plan and General Technical Report (GTR) 220
8. Hazard tree (trees that impact public health and safety) removal from roadsides and developed sites, as long as tree marking doesn’t encroach.
9. Herbicide use as a temporary treatment to change vegetation conditions or to treat non-native plants, not as a long-term maintenance strategy
10. Removing trees less than 16” dbh\*

\*Is dbh the correct metric and, if yes, it may be important to describe the context/situations where this would apply in the “considerations” column and the possible consequences of removal of too many smaller trees if the desired landscape outcomes are not described? | 1. Expect at least two weeks from submission of the project form to receive a signed letter of support from the ACCG.
 | 1. Complete the Project Support Submission Form and send to the ACCG Administrator at least one week before the ACCG General meeting (which occur every third Thursday of the month except in December).
2. The ACCG Administrator will place Category 1 projects on a General meeting consent calendar for ACCG consensus approval.
3. If ACCG determines that any given project doesn’t clearly fall into this category, it would be referred to the Planning WG for review.
 |
| Category 2: *Yellow Light*Description: These project activities require some discussion and may result in moderate controversy.  |
| Protocol: Discussion initiated at the Planning Work Group whose recommendations are sent to the full ACCG for concurrence. |
| Project Activities | **Considerations** | **Procedures** |
| 1. Logging trees 16 to 20” dbh especially in key habitat areas like PACS or den buffers.\*
2. Logging trees 20 to 30” dbh, especially in HRCAs and fisher territories.
3. Aspen restoration that includes logging trees greater than 30” dbh (even if legacy trees are retained).
4. Roadside hazard tree logging when marking overreaches.
5. Herbicide use near drinking water source.
 | 1. Expect a minimum 1-3 months of engagement with ACCG.
2. What role do site conditions play in determining support for larger tree removal?
3. Do the project activities strive to achieve forest heterogeneity and fire resiliency?
4. To what degree do project activities strive to maintain existing and future high-quality habitat values?
 | 1. One week prior to Planning meeting, provide relevant project materials to Planning WG lead(s).
2. Present project at Planning meeting.
3. Conduct any follow up activities to address Planning WG concerns or information requests.
4. If concerns persist, the Planning WG will initiate the conflict resolution process, as described in the ACCG MOA.
5. Regardless of the outcome of deliberations, once the Planning WG makes a recommendation on the project, the WG will convey to the Admin WG to be placed on the ACCG general meeting agenda.
6. Individual members may provide support or opposition for any project or aspects of a project.
 |
| Category 3: *Red Light*Description: These project activities may result in significant controversy. However, ACCG could ultimately achieve support. Because these actions are more sensitive, the ACCG anticipates needing considerable time to thoroughly discuss, deepen understanding, and find approaches that could achieve consensus support. |
| Protocol: Discussion initiated at the Planning Work Group with regular updates to the full ACCG at General meetings. Ultimately, Planning Work Group recommendations are sent to the full ACCG for concurrence. |
| Project Activities | **Considerations** | **Procedures** |
| 1. Road development
2. Logging in inventoried roadless areas
3. Logging trees greater than 20” dbh\* in PACS\*\*
4. Logging trees greater than 30” dbh\* for “forest health” (e.g., red fir dwarf mistletoe, etc.\*\*\*)
5. Reducing canopy cover in high quality spotted owl habitat to lower canopy cover class\*\*
6. Reducing canopy cover to less than 50% in spotted owl HRCAs\*\*
7. Multiple Categorical Exclusions (CEs) for logging used in a concentrated area over a short duration (cumulative effects)
8. Salvage logging, especially when sensitive wildlife may be affected
9. Aspen restoration that includes logging legacy trees
10. Herbicide use for plantation establishment
11. Herbicide use for creating or maintaining large fuel breaks indefinitely
12. Rare plant habitat used as a staging area
 | 1. Expect many months to over a year engagement with the ACCG.
2. Project size and other project effects could affect the level of controversy
3. The move from more directive forest plans to descriptive ones could increase the level of controversy
4. Certain CE categories such as 36 CFR 220.6 (e) (6), Timber Stand and Wildlife Habitat Improvement. This exclusion category does not have an acreage limit. If large-scale logging projects that include controversial activities were implemented under such a category, the level of controversy would be high.

\*\* Does this need a set of principles associated with it to clarify when/if removal of larger trees in PACS would be supported?\*\*\* Are there other examples that would provide some clarity to a project proponent? | 1. One week prior to Planning meeting, provide relevant project materials to Planning WG lead(s).
2. Present project at Planning meeting.
3. Conduct any follow up activities to address Planning WG concerns or information requests.
4. If concerns persist, the Planning WG will initiate the conflict resolution process, as described in the ACCG MOA.
5. Regardless of the outcome of deliberations, once the Planning WG makes a recommendation on the project, the WG will convey to the Admin WG to be placed on the ACCG general meeting agenda.
6. Individual members may provide support or opposition for any project or aspects of a project.
 |