# Meeting Brief

* Sue Britting and Scott Dailey presented on the Caples Fire volunteer efforts and initial fire effects, respectively.
* Liz Meyer-Shields presented the concept of a Bureau of Land Management Community Forest Agreement. The ACCG formed a committee to explore the idea further.
* The ACCG received an overview of the changes made to the revised Memorandum of Agreement and discussed next steps.

Action Items

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Responsible Parties** |
| Regine Miller will remove watermark from April General Meeting Summary and post on the website as final. | Regine Miller |
| Regine Miller will outreach to Community Forest committee to support their organization and beginning work. | Regine Miller |
| ACCG participants are to submit comments on the revised MOA to Tania Carlone by June 1st. | ACCG |

# Summary

## Modification and/or approval of agenda and April 2020 Meeting Summary.

## There were no modifications to the agenda. The April General Meeting summary was adopted as final with no changes and is to be posted on website.

**PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Presentation: Caples Ecological Restoration Project.**

**Project Introduction**

Scott Dailey introduced himself as a Fire Ecologist with the Forest Service Enterprise Program and went gave an overview of the Caples Ecological Restoration Project and the first order fire effects.

The Caples Creek watershed is a unique, roadless area without significant vegetation management which has resulted in increased fuel accumulation and decreased forest health. There has been a departure from historic fire intervals of 11 years for mixed conifer and 40 years red fir with low to mid severity in the watershed. The Caples Ecological Restoration project’s mission is centered on long term forest health, including reintroduction of fire to the landscape.

Within the watershed, there were abundant small trees, ladder fuels and down dead trees. The project was established through a collaborative process between El Dorado Irrigation District (EID) and Sierra Nevada Conservancy (SNC). It is important to point out that the project was about interdependence, with collaboration from the SNC, EID, science community including the Pacific Southwest Research Station and California Academy of Sciences, CAL FIRE, and the Sierra Forest Legacy (SFL).

Units were identified for burning in the NEPA planning, with burning to take place in narrow window of time in the early fall. This past September, the area received several inches of rain, followed by snow which set good conditions for burning, protected dormancy of trees, and was consistent with Native American-lit fires.

Within the watershed, there are legacy trees [400 to 700 years old and greater than 40 inches diameter at breast height (dbh)]. Because of the lack of fire, there were deep accumulations of litter around the base of trees raising the risk of tree injury from when the prescription fire came through. Volunteers removed the duff accumulations from around the base of the trees. The prescription fire was initiated on September 30, 2019 under ideal conditions. On October 8, folks were made aware a wind event was happening, and tactical decisions were made to keep the fire within the project boundary. The fire rate and intensity was higher than planned which, under the burn plan, required fire suppression resources. The fire was designated a wildfire which allowed for firefighting resources to be deployed. The prescription fire’s desired effects were still achieved creating a mosaic of high and low burn areas. The project area was flown and it was observed the majority of the area had burned in low intensity fire, with some pockets of high intensity fire. Most of the legacy trees fared well post fire demonstrating that raking was effective. The fire burned a total of 2,663 acres within the restoration project and an additional 320 acres outside of the project area.

**Local community support, and volunteer enthusiasm and efforts during pre-fire preparation.**

Sue Britting introduced herself and described the work that SFL leadership did to help with the Caples pre-fire work to conserve large trees. See her [power point presentation](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/03-Caples-volunteer-work-ppt-REVISED.pdf) here. She described how the burn occurred in the western area of the project area and stated that the watershed is a beautiful area, loved by many people offering opportunities for fishing and hiking. SFL is interested in supporting appropriate active management in roadless areas and had followed the project for quite a while. In 2018, SFL realized the pre-fire work to protect large trees needed to happen and could be done by volunteers. Sue stated this was an opportunity to work within and among chaparral, meadows and legacy conifers. Ben Solvesky, formerly of SFL, spoke with Dana Walt, the silviculturist on the Eldorado National Forest (NF) about conservation measures to protect the trees. The group agreed to: 1) where possible, remove small diameter trees by hand using chainsaws and pile the resulting material; 2) rake duff and pine needles away from the base of the trees, and; 3) remove downed wood and limbs from around the large trees. Dana and Ben identified the areas of focus, then worked with Becky Estes of the Forest Service to develop criteria for what it was the volunteers would do around the trees and to establish monitoring to evaluate the areas where the duff was greater than five (5) inches deep. The group worked together to identify what trees to protect. This was subjective and consisted of the determining “Wow” trees. SFL’s work was planned to remove excess duff to prevent fire from burning down into the roots of the large trees, causing damage to the trees.

Sue described how the project included two parts. First, Ben Solvesky, in coordination with the Forest Service, organized a chainsaw training program so that volunteers could fell small trees, and move and pile them out of the way. Ten people completed the training, followed by a couple of days of trained volunteers cutting and piling, and preparing the site for the prescription fire event. The SFL recruited volunteers and held 11 work days between late June and August, comprised of 68 volunteers who worked over 400 hours, raking around the base of 200 trees over 100 acres. There was a wide spectrum of volunteer groups involved in the effort.

* Katherine Evatt asked how SFL handled the insurance for the volunteers. Sue stated that the California Native Plant Society agreed to join the Forest Service in a volunteer agreement so the work could be conducted under that agreement.

**First order fire effects resulting from the 2019 Caples Fire and preliminary information on post-fire data.**

Scott Dailey stated that the fire effects data was collected by the Fire Behavior Team (FBAT). FBAT is a semi-formal organized group operating since 2003 and consisting of people from different agencies, the majority of whom are fire and fuels managers, scientists, and persons interested in collecting fire behavior and fire effects data. The group is interested in the ecological impacts of fire and how well fuel treatments are performing, among other things.

The FBAT group was requested by the Eldorado NF in late October 2019 to collect first order fire effects data on the Caples Fire. The intent was to provide a preliminary estimate on fire effects and determine if restoration objectives were met. Scott stated that we will continue to see effects of the fire in coming years. Scott provided a [presentation on the FBAT’s Caples Fire analysis](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/04-Caples-Fire-First-Order-Effects-PPT-REVISED.pdf).

The FBAT looked at changes in: 1) tree density related to levels of tree mortality; 2) Burn severity on the group, and; 3) fuels consumptions. The group also provided information to support completion of the project, ongoing monitoring and research, including tracking the effectiveness of raking.

Scott described that planning for the data collection occurred very quickly, within one week with collaboration between the Forest Service Regional Ecology Program staff and Eldorado National Forest fire staff. The data collection protocol was based on a pre-existing protocol used to collect pre-treatment data to define baseline conditions. The plots useds were 1/10th acre plots. Data was collected over two weeks, starting the first week of November.

Data was collected on 46 of the pre-established plots that fell within the footprint of the Caples Fire. Of the 46 plots, 38 of those were in forested vegetation, and 8 were in chaparral or shrub vegetation. The FBAT took photos along each of the four transects in each plot, looking north, east, south, and west which matched pre-fire photos.

Next, FBAT collected qualitative information on burn severity for substrate (soil, litter, and duff), and understory vegetation which includes all grass, herbaceous, forbs, shrubs, and trees less than 3 inches diameter. The group estimated the percent of the plot that fell under qualitative burn severity categories using a five point rating system, developed by the National Park Service. FBAT collected quantitative data to rate burn severity for trees. All trees greater than 3 inches within plots were sampled, recording whether the tree was alive or dead and measuring height to live crown. FBAT did not measure tree diameter (DBH) and total tree height because this information was collected within the previous 6 years and, while it would be valuable to know even small changes in tree growth that had occurred, the group had many plots to sample and needed to triage for the key objective which was fire effects.

FBAT collected information on fuels, including litter and duff depths and the number and size of dead and downed woody debris within each plot.

For the raked trees, FBAT evaluated trees greater than 31 inches diameter which appeared to have been raked pre-fire, recorded GPS coordinates, took photos, and recorded basic tree metrics, fire effects, burn severity of the surroundings, the raking method used (bermed or scattered), and an estimation of pre-fire litter and duff depth.

Scott explained the overall burn severity monitoring results:

* A high portion of ground is unburnable with a greater burn severity for non-tree vegetation in the chaparral (shrub areas), compared to forest areas. Scott stated that this is desirable to reduce accumulations of decadent shrub that had built up over time.
* Higher levels of high burn severity in substrate in forested plots versus shrub plots which is to be expected with high accumulations of duff and litter in the forested plots.
* Higher levels of high burn severity in chaparral versus forested areas. This is desirable in that fire is effective to reduce shrubs and conifer encroachment.
* Greater low severity burning in areas with larger trees.
* Overall burn severity was high in shrub areas, and lower in the forested areas. This is a desired result.

Scott stated that there was interest in evaluating how fire effects differed in areas burned with the prescribed fire treatment, compared to areas burned as wildfire. Using the fire progression map, FBAT stratified data for prescribed burn and wildfire. These results showed the wildfire area has a slightly lower percentage of high burn severity than the prescribed burn. However, there is a greater percentage of low burn severity in the prescribed burn area.

Scott discussed Natural Range of Variability (NRV), which is a method for assessing ecological integrity. NRV describes the variation in ecosystem characteristics under historic (pre-European) disturbance regimes. These reference conditions can be interpreted by various means and can be compared to contemporary conditions found following resource benefit wildfires. Resource benefit wildfires are fires that burn with little or no human interference in wilderness or backcountry areas where they pose little or no threat to humans or property.

The FBAT compared burn severity and other metrics gathered for the Caples Fire to metrics found in resource benefit fires. Other sources of NRV was used as a yardstick of sorts to suggest where the fire was successfully meeting restoration objectives in improving ecosystem health and resiliency. The results of the Caples Prescribed burn are very similar to resource benefit fires, suggesting that the Caples Fire achieved its restoration goals.

Scott shared that a lot of what drove the work to be done was to improve the ecological condition and improved resilience in case a wildfire were to occur. Had a fire occurred under conditions that could support extreme fire and high intensity fire, results could have been bad. He stated that the King Fire occurred at the beginning of a drought, and the Caples Fire occurred at the tail end of the drought. Vegetation and trees in the Caples Creek watershed were probably still in a state of recovery from the drought. One can compare the two fires which show that the Caples Fire could have experienced much more high severity burning than it actually did.

The Caples Prescribed Burn Plan set an objective to limit the mortality of large trees (> 30 inches) to no more than 5%. Base on trees sampled, there was zero tree mortality for trees >30 inches in prescribed burn areas. In the wildfire area tree mortality was 7%.

With regard to tree density, wildfire did a better job at reducing small trees to levels close to NRV than prescribed fire. As it relates to large trees, large trees were left closer to the NRV with prescribed fire than with wildfire which had higher levels of tree mortality which brought large tree densities down and further from NRV.

Prescribed fire did a better job of bringing smaller surface fuels closer to the NRV than larger fuels. On the other hand, for larger fuels, wildfire did a better job of bringing levels close to NRV.

Pre-fire, litter and duff depths were 2.2 inches which is 267% above the NRV. Post–fire the litter and duff depths were measured at 0.2 inches (67% below NRV).

Scott discussed whether or not the Caples Prescribed Burn Plan fuel load reductions objectives were met. For smaller surface fuels <1 inch, the objective was met but for larger fuels in the 1 to 3 inch size class and >3 inch size classes, the consumption went over the target by 17% and 39%. The objective for shrub cover reduction was met.

Scott explained the FBAT’s evaluation of raked trees. He explained that a monitoring plan was to have been put into place prior to the fire but that this was not possible. Raked trees were difficult to identify but FBAT believes it has identified 15 likely trees. FBAT evaluated the species treated, mean diameter, bole char height and pre-fire duff depth, and percent of surrounding trees killed within 1/10th acre.

Scott shared his email address for the group’s follow up questions: [scott.dailey@usda.gov](mailto:scott.dailey@usda.gov)

* Marc Young stated that the report indicated the team sampled every other tree in some of the plots, and asked how did the collection method affect numbers reported? Scott replied that for some plots that were super dense with trees, FBAT chose to collect data on every other tree to generate estimates of numbers to work within the timeline and budget and stated that the method could impact their results but he didn’t know exactly how much. The FBAT’s objective was to provide immediate, quick estimates of the fire effects and not to be a scientific study. There will be a more robust secondary effects study in the future.
* Jennifer Chapman asked if there are obligate seeders, or will the population resprout? Scott replied that he expects sprouting to occur immediately and that the area will recover quickly. Some areas of high burn severity may be slower to recover than less severely burned areas which will create diversity and a mosaic of conditions.
* Jennifer Chapman asked when the plots will be sampled again. Becky Estes replied that the Forest Service plans to revisit the plots in the 2020 season, to complete tree metrics and full floristics but that it is dependent on the COVID 19 restrictions.
* Ben Solvesky stated that he would be happy to show the Forest Service the raked trees, and that some trees that had been raked were dead and some were going to die, based on pre-fire wound.
* Joe Aragon stated that, in his experience, no matter how deep one digs/rakes the duff, the fire would come through an area and burn through the work. Did Scott find much of this? Were there technicalities in the field that made it harder to protect some trees compared to others? Scott replied that is was hard to remove all of the organic material, but removal of some was expected to help reduce injury and fire effects to the trees. The group will not know for some time the degree to which the raking protected the trees.

**Presentation: BLM Community Forest Agreement Concept**

Liz Meyer-Shields stated that the concept to establish a Mokelumne Community Forest predates her tenure at the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). She has seen a tremendous amount of success for securing funding and implementing forest restoration and fuel reduction within the Mokelumne River watershed and that the efforts are very person-dependent and highly reliant on volunteers. Liz went on to state that BLM does not have the infrastructure to make this a more comprehensive effort. The Community Forest concept would include BLM forested lands within the Mokelumne watershed, east of HWY 49. The goals of the agreement would be to provide community ownership of the decision making process that goes into the management of the lands, help provide a comprehensive management strategy for BLM, support local economic growth, create a mechanism to house institutional knowledge, and build something that is sustainable. Liz continued that challenges to this effort have been finding the right tool to establish the agreement and that the model that seems to work best is similar to what the BLM has in western Nevada County in the ‘Inimim Forest. Here BLM developed an overarching Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) that establishes the goals for the BLM management and how BLM will work with the local community parties, and lays out some of the options that can be used to implement individual projects. The MOU does not commit to a specific tool, but more to a decision framework. If the ACCG is open to developing a Community Forest agreement, it would benefit the BLM to use the ACCG as a community voice rather than creating a community panel to help advise the BLM. The BLM would retain final decision making authority on what happens on BLM land with a commitment to work through whatever group the ACCG established to develop the agreement. Liz stated that the first step would be to draft an MOU that establishes the goals and process for working together followed by the pursuit of funding for forest management planning to help set the overall strategy for BLM management for the community forest. Liz explained that planning could possibly include a programmatic NEPA document that calls out specific treatment options.

* John Buckley stated that the forest planning would be very helpful to increase pace and scale of projects, and would boost to treating lands around communities. CSERC supports moving forward these efforts.
* Steve Wilensky stated that there are approximately 17,000 acres of BLM lands in the Mokelumne and Calaveras watersheds. He suggested the group does not burden the Planning WG with the MOU, but instead establishes a specific subgroup to develop governance agreement. Steve explained that the intent today is to introduce the concept, then present more fully in future meeting with maps.
* John Heissenbuttel stated the Cal Am Team advocates a decentralized approach. The programmatic EIR or EIS is a good idea and would provide an umbrella for a generic MOU. He expressed concern that centralized oversight may create a bottleneck. John believes that pace and scale could be increased by securing buy-in from individual neighborhoods and does not want the ACCG to rush to develop a centralized model.
* Shane Dante stated that he is not familiar with the history of this idea locally, but this is concerning a lot of disjunct BLM lands. He stated that it is hard to imagine a community forest of disjunct lands and that he has not heard anything about recreation and how it will be incorporated into the community forest.
* Rich Farrington stated that the group needs to have a clear statement of objectives for the community forest concept, including roles and responsibilities of each of the partners. He asked if there would there be an expectation of partners to attract grants and be a fiscal agent.

Tania stated that it would be beneficial to form a subgroup who can discuss the concept and these questions. She stated she was previously the Executive Director of the Yuba Watershed Institute (YWI) which formed a Community Forest Agreement with the BLM. Tania offered to ask for the YWI to present their experience to the ACCG, if that would be helpful.

Tania asked for volunteers for the Community Forest Agreement committee. Michael Pickard, Steve Wilensky, Katherine Evatt, Shane Dante, and John Heissenbuttel volunteered. Regine Miller will follow up with group to help them get organized and started.

**Introductory Overview of Revised ACCG Memorandum of Agreement.**

Tania explained the context of the [revised ACCG Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/06-ACCG-MOA-Admin-WG-Review-Draft-v.-5-14-20.docx) and the changes made by the Admin WG to which included reinforcing the foundational elements in the original MOA, addressing inconsistencies and improved clarity to terms and processes, updating to align with how the ACCG has come to operate, and removing obsolete work groups. Tania asked the group for clarifying questions (there were none) and requested comments by June 1. She stated the revised MOU would be discussed at the June general meeting.

## UPDATES

## Administrative Work Group Update

There were no updates other than the revised MOA which was previously covered.

**Planning Work Group Update**

**SLAWG update on Project Mapper Prioritization Tool.** Megan Layhee stated she will present the draft project mapper to the Planning WG at its May meeting and invited participation. She stated she will then present it at the June general meeting. Megan will then develop the prioritization tool, present her suggestions and get feedback from the group. Megan’s email is [megan.layhee1@gmail.com](mailto:megan.layhee1@gmail.com). Participants can email her to be added to the SLAWG list serve.

* John Heissenbuttel asked Megan if she has determined how the FRAP may be used for the SLAWG’s efforts. He encouraged her to look at the FRAP program to avoid duplicating efforts. Megan replied that the data she has gathered is from CAL FIRE’s publicly available database and that she is working with CAL FIRE and the Forest Service Region 5 to coordinate efforts and avoid redundancy.

**Socioeconomic ad hoc committee.** Shane Dante shared that the committee has determined a way to incorporate socio economic benefits into the project development planning process and will bring it to the Planning WG at the May meeting to discuss. Shane expects to have more details for the larger group at June general meeting.

**Monitoring Work Group Update.** Gwen Starrett stated that some monitoring is cancelled or postponed because of COVID-19 which may include photo monitoring for the Three Meadows project, post planting sampling for the Foster Firs project and Point Blue’s avian monitoring in the Power Fire area. The ACCG is the lead in the variable density monitoring in Power Fire. The work group is developing the monitoring protocol for CHIPS’ Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration project. The Forest Service will conduct a formal risk assessment for field monitoring. Gwen anticipates that field crew capacity will be limited because of COVID-19.

## Roundtable

David Griffith via Zoom chat to Tania Carlone: The scoping study has been completed and, like all biomass/bioenergy projects, it still require monetizing of benefits. The study is available on the Alpine Biomass Collaborative’s website. David welcomes suggestions of possible developers. He noted the Economic Development Administration grant and Community Vision forgivable loan which funded the work.

John Buckley: In addition to CSERC, the Yosemite Stanislaus Solutions (YSS) stakeholder group has coordinated with Stanislaus NF on the Bridge Project which includes initiating a planning project on 110,000 acres of public and private lands to increase pace and scale. This represents YSS’ response to Barnie Gyant’s request for an alternative to MOTORM2K. John requested a possible 10 minute future update to the ACCG to explain this and overlapping efforts.

Becky Estes: Reminded people that in addition to Scott Dailey, participants can reach out to her with questions on the Caples Fire. She stated that the Natural Areas Conference scheduled for fall in Reno will now be held virtually. Contact Becky for more information.

Liz Meyer-Shields: BLM fire restrictions are expected around May 29th. She will be reaching out the folks working on BLM to determine if variances are needed. The BLM is also looking at individual county COVID-19 travel restrictions to determine potential impacts BLM field work.

Gerald Schwartz: Calaveras and Amador Counties have let their ordinances lapse, so Lake Pardee and Camanche are open to boating and fishing.

Gwen Starrett: the Three Meadows Project Decision Memo has been signed and distributed. Amador Resource Conservation District has submitted a Request for Proposals to get work started this year. She asked for participants to advise her of local contractors. Gwen shared that there will be volunteer opportunities for photo monitoring this summer, likely in June and July. The Sierra Meadow Partnership is in Stage 0 Meadow Restoration. All of the trees the ACCG members raked prior to the Caples Fire survived.

Joe Aragon: The majority of Calaveras Ranger District employees are still teleworking, with some limited field work under the risk assessment. The District’s front office is closed, seasonal workers started last week and are finishing their self-isolation this week before they can begin work. Many employees are in the first 40 fire training. Joe expects for the District to take a diverse approach to the field season, with seasonal workers shared across the disciplines.

Katherine Evatt: The Governor’s May revise budget will result in the closure of the Pine Youth Conservation Camp. The conservation camp wards perform valuable wildland fire fighting across the state, and also in our area. The State Senate Budget Subcommittee 5 will review this afternoon at 1:30pm. If you have the opportunity, you can comment via phone. Katherine stated that the camp is critically important to our community and that we will lose a valuable resource if the camp closes because the county will not be able to afford to keep it open. <http://sbud.senate.ca.gov/subcomittee5>

Marc Young: Chuck Loffland is on a 30 day assignment. Robin Wall is planned to be back from her detail the week of June 22nd. The District is working on numerous risk assessments. There will be no planting on the Amador Ranger District this year.

# Michael Pickard: The SNC June 4 board meeting will be held via Zoom. The Amador Fire Safe Council and CHIPS will be awarded grants. Check website for meeting link.

Dawn Coultrap: Her ranger detail ends June 1. Ray Cablayan will be back as District Ranger very soon.

Rich Farrington: Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) staff has coordinated with the Calaveras and Amador Ranger Districts to identify potential projects to submit to SNC for potential emergency funding. The UMRWA Board authorized UMRWA to be lead agency for Mattley Meadows CEQA lead agency and authorized award for culvert and road improvement project work, West Calaveras Thin project, and later this year an update on the Mokelumne-Calaveras Integrated Regional Water Management Program (IRWMP).

Shane Dante: CAL TRANS is planning to upgrade the bridge over the south fork of the Mokelumne and plans to release final environmental document next month. Construction will begin in May 2022. PG&E stated they will repair Tiger Creek Road, between Highway 26 and the Tiger Creek after bay within the 90 days. This road washed out in winter 2017.

Regine Miller: The Amador Ranger District has submitted a Risk Assessment to seek approval for CHIPS crews to begin work under the Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration project and the Specific Project Agreement. Chips has completed the majority of the mechanical treatment on the South Fork Mokelumne project in Glencoe. Field crews are fully staffed and working community projects under a Paycheck Protection Program loan.

# Meeting Participants

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Time Committed to Meeting** |
| John Heissenbuttel | Cal Am, Amador FSC | 3.0 |
| Katherine Evatt | Foothill Conservancy | 3.0 |
| Gwen Starrett | ACCG Member | 3.0 |
| Michael Pickard | Sierra Nevada Conservancy | 3.0 |
| Regine Miller | Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions | 3.0 |
| Rich Farrington | Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority | 3.0 |
| Elizabeth Meyer-Shields | Bureau of Land Management, Mother Lode Field Office | 3.0 |
| Greg Suba | Sierra Forest Legacy | 3.0 |
| Joe Aragon | USFS Stanislaus NF, Calaveras Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Dawn Coultrap | Calaveras Range District, Acting Ranger | 3.0 |
| John Buckley | Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center | 3.0 |
| Gerald Schwartz | East Bay Municipal Utility District | 3.0 |
| Randy Hanvelt | Association of California Loggers | 3.0 |
| Marc Young | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Megan Layhee | Consultant to Landmark Environmental and UMRWA | 3.0 |
| Rick Hopson | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Shane Dante | Foothill Conservancy | 3.0 |
| Steve Wilensky | Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions | 3.0 |
| Sue Holper | ACCG Member | 3.0 |
| Scott Dailey | Forest Service Enterprise Program | 3.0 |
| Ben Solvesky | Natural Resource Conservation Service | 3.0 |
| Sue Britting | Sierra Forest Legacy | 3.0 |
| Beverly Buloan | Stanislaus National Forest | 3.0 |
| Jennifer Chapman | Eldorado National Forest | 3.0 |
| Tania Carlone | Consensus Building Institute (Facilitator) |  |