# Meeting Brief

* Dr. Malcolm North, USFS PSW and UCD, gave a presentation and engaged the ACCG in discussion on “Climate Change and Implications for Forest Restoration: Creating a Resilient Landscape.”
* Helen Loffland, Institute for Bird Populations, presented the Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration Project Monitoring Plan and solicited ACCG member feedback.
* The ACCG reached consensus on a letter of support for the Mattley Meadow Project, presented by Gia Martynn of the Plumas Corporation.
* The ACCG discussed and reached consensus on the revised Memorandum of Agreement. Existing and new ACCG participants are requested to submit signature letters to Regine Miller by September 4, 2020.

Action Items

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Responsible Parties** |
| Regine to remove DRAFT watermark from June general meeting summary and post as final on website. | Regine Miller |
| Regine to distribute MOA signature form letter. | Regine Miller |
| Regine to contact Richard Sykes at UMRWA to inquire if UMRWA is interested in participating in the Funding Coordination Work Group. | Regine Miller |
| Provide input and comments to Helen Loffland on the Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration Project Monitoring Plan by July 29. | All |

# Summary

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

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

**PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Presentation and discussion:** [**Creating a Resilient Landscape**](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/03-M.-North-Climate-Change-and-Implications-for-Forest-Restoration-ppt-1.pdf)A video of the presentation can be viewed [here](https://acconsensus.org/resources/videos/).

Dr. Malcolm North introduced the intent of the presentation which focused on reviewing ideas that he and several researchers have put together to address how to handle changing climatic conditions, how to create a resilient landscape, how to define resilience, and how do we get there?

Dr. North stated that 25 years ago climate change was a relevant issue that everyone agreed would eventually show up and impact forest ecosystems. He went on to state that the future is now here; the question is how to hold onto the forests we still have and the ecosystem services they provide in light of climate change. Sixteen of the 20 largest fires in California have occurred in the last 20 years. The state is seeing an increase in wildfire impacts with high severity fire shifting from about 3 to 8% historically (pre-European arrival) to now more than 30% of the fire footprint. The King Fire of 2014, for example, had over 55% high severity burn. Such high severity fires have increased dramatically in size and affect conifer seed dispersal making it difficult to reforest all areas that require it.

Greater than 150 million trees across the Sierra were lost during the recent drought, which Dr. North noted as the most severe drought in about 1,000 years. The main drivers of tree mortality are climatic water deficit and stand basal area. Beetle mortality is accelerating the loss of large, old growth trees. Dr. North asked, given these conditions, how do we create resilient forests?

Dr. North gave an overview of his presentation content including:

1. What is landscape resilience and how do we create it?

2. Constraints: spotted owls, limitations on mechanical treatment and on fire use

3. Changing treatment pace and scale

4. Pyrosilviculture proposal which he described as combining fire and silviculture to complement each other, rather than operating in silos.

Dr. North stated that we cannot achieve landscape resilience without a dramatic change in pace and scale. He went on to discuss what landscape resilience is reviewing the top down (climatic) and bottom up (physical) factors which influence what forest conditions we largely cannot alter. He stated that top down factors provide measures of forest productivity on sites and that bottom up factors moderate disturbance and climatic effects on forest structure. Therefore, one needs to change forest structure and composition to match site conditions and exposures, creating variable forest conditions that can absorb or flex with climatic drivers. A fundamental goal of forest resilience is to maintain a structure and condition that facilitates a forest to remain a forest.

Dr. North stated one can “reverse engineer” forest conditions in the Sierra Nevada by accentuating differences in forest conditions using bottom-up factors to influence disturbance and developmental processes. He went on to state that it is clear that overstory conditions are driven by soil moisture availability while understory conditions are driven by fire frequency and intensity. This creates heterogeneity in the forests which produce variable fire effects increasing resilience.

Dr. North showed a schematic and described the how climatic factors can define a suite of interactions that determine what forest structure should ideally look like in different places. This work is based upon models for 20 locations throughout the Sierras. He went on to state that forest structure changes depending on topographic conditions (bottom up factors). For instance, in valley bottoms (wet locations), one observes larger size and abundance of clumps of trees while on the ridges (drier locations) one observes a greater size and abundance of gaps. These factors can provide reasonable target metrics for, say, a thinning prescription or burn objectives in terms of how many gaps and clumps one should create.

He asked how you know when you’ve created resilience in forests that historically had frequent fire. Post treatment, is competition still driving composition and structure or is disturbance the driver? If forest systems are able to adapt to stresses, they need an environment where competition is less of a driver than a system in which you’ve got less frequent disturbance. Frequent fire or grazing has kept most of these systems able to absorb disturbance, and remain well below carrying capacity and secure stable carbon stock. Active fire held systems are at a much lower density and amount of biomass than they would have had without the exclusion of fires. The disturbance has created a resilient forest.

Similar ideas have emerged in two other fields: carbon dynamics and drought resilience. Heather Keith suggests that in order to maintain carbon storage and offset anthropogenic carbon emissions, one of the key things is to have stable carbon that doesn’t lead to mortality events. We should aim for a carrying capacity that is below the maximum amount of carbon you can pack into a system. Sierra forests have high density, and are at risk for carbon loss. Work by Gould and Bales helps to explain drought mortality. When climate bangs around creating wet and dry years, trees can put on too much biomass and leaf area during the wet years that produce structural overshoot (too much foliage). Then, once conditions dry out, the forests are very prone to mortality. Forest conditions need to be below their carrying capacity. Normally, how we manage forests looking at density dependent competition may not be the appropriate way to view forests that need to adapt and flex to climate stressors.

Dr. North reviewed constraints to creating landscape resilience including limitations from the California spotted owl (CASPO). He noted there is a strong association of owl use with canopy cover and asked how to support canopy cover in a system that is prone to drought and wildfire? He reviewed a LiDAR analysis of CASPO habitat which included one of the largest data sets in California with a complete census on greater than one million acres. Dr. North stated that, in essence, the researchers found that 75% canopy cover is optimal owl habitat. But that in Sequoia Kings Canyon (SEKI) National Park, where CASPO is increasing, owls were operating in areas with 40% or less canopy cover. What makes SEKI different from other areas is that it has an abundance of very tall trees. The conclusion is that it’s not total canopy cover that is important, but rather the cover of tall trees that affect owl populations. The owls were avoiding areas of high cover in the understory strata suggesting you can reduce ladder fuels and stem density without impacting owls. Therefore, the goal should be to create tall tree canopy cover, not total canopy cover.

Dr. North went on to state that moisture availability drives tall trees, and that many Protected Activity Centers (PACs) in the Sierras are in places where tall trees have been left. In the long run, we should be thinking about developing and cultivating tall tree in the wettest locations to create resilient landscapes. These areas have higher survival ability in light of drought and fire.

Mechanical treatments may be considered another constraint in creating resilient forests. Could we try to thin our way to resilience? A large portion of Sierra forests are not timber productive, leaving only 28% of forests available for mechanical treatment. Dr. North stated that, given this, we need to identify places within the landscape that can be treated with fire. In about 20% of sub watersheds in the Sierra, enough of the landscape could be thinned to affect fire behaviors. But in 46% there is not enough land to affect wildfire behavior with mechanical treatment alone. The suggestion is that, in certain places, mechanical treatment can be used entirely on its own, and about 1/3 of landscape will require the use of mechanical treatment and fire. One constraint with using fire is that fire treatments don’t generate revenue that help to offset costs.

Dr. North suggested that we need to increase pace and scale, otherwise treatments will be minimized by fire and drought. He shared that the Dinkey CFLRP treated 22,000 acres of forests over nine years was then hit by severe drought conditions in 2012-2015. The forests and treatments were overwhelmed by beetle mortality in landscapes that were overly dense. This suggests that any type of treatment needs to be on a much broader scale than it currently is to affect drought mortality and fire. Dr. North asked the group, how do we change pace and scale on National Forest lands? Approximately 1/10th of the landscape used to burn each year; current treatments register at about 8% of the historical rate creating a huge annual deficit. How do make treatments that are extensive and economical, and maintain them?

In closing, Dr. North offered the group his conclusions. First, the treatment deficit is so large he stated that all-hands-on-deck is required. Pyrosilviculture, or the combination of fire and fuel thinning, is needed to scale-up and concentrate efforts at the fire shed scale (HUC 12). He went on to state that one should use the extensive nature of fire and recognize that you don’t always have control over fire and how it will affect stand structure. Dr. North suggested that the key is to relax our view of what fire can do for us and use fire to reduce forest carrying capacity. Fire will selectively kill individuals and selects for better phenotypical ability to survive fire conditions. He stated one should use silviculture in areas where precision is needed, such as within the Wildland Urban Interface. Mechanical treatment can also be used to create anchor areas that can facilitate the use of fire. Once strategic anchors on 20% of the landscape are created, it can become much easier to use fire on a widespread scale.

* John Buckley: It is obvious that if a forest is heavily thinned and creates gaps and openings it reduces conifer competition and fuel that will carry a fire. He has observed sites which were thinning and the spaces between conifers is now comprised of brush and hard woods which compete for water and create surface ladder fuel. From John’s perspective, thinning doesn’t resolve the fire risk created by surface and ladder fuels.  He went on to ask, given the Forest Service’s constraints, does Dr. North have a solution to increase pace and scale of treatments to reduce the threat posed by surface and ladder fuels in between thinning treatments?

Dr. North replied that brush and shrubs are challenging and that often within the first 3-5 years shrubs and brush are minor, but then it’s possible to get a huge shrub response. Initial data suggests, large trees are associated with areas that are wet and it appears that shrubs take those sites over following thinning. Therefore, when we treat forests, we should be careful to retain big trees. Once fire is back in the stand, there is the ability for shrubs to take over where in areas of moisture reserve where trees have been removed.

* Steve Brink: Forest Service management is not taking Dr. North’s work and running with it, particularly as it relates to carrying capacity. One way to get at the carrying capacity issue is to get below the maximum stand capacity index but the Forest Service is not doing this. Has Dr. North discussed this with Forest Service regional leadership? Steve said he wishes the Forest Service would conduct demonstrations evaluating the carrying capacity issue.

Dr. North stated he has had discussions with the Region 5 leadership about these ideas. One of the acknowledgements made is that forests were historically much more open and less dense than we are used to. However, the leadership is unwilling to go to such a dramatic change right off of the bat. Historic density and basal area are much lower than even what aggressive CFLRPs, such as Dinkey, are producing. Unless we can wrap our heads around going to these much more open forest conditions, we will be losing our forests for some time to come.

* David Griffith: Dr. North’s definition of pace and scale, and the necessity to do so much more differs from what we hear from others who suggest that if we reduce excess biomass from 25-30% of the forests, we will be fine. Do we need to treat most of the forests, or is treating 25-30% of the forest adequate?

Dr. North stated that biomass production is important to make forests more fire resilient but it is not enough of a reduction to make forests more resilient to fire and drought. We need to get forests to where they have the ability to regenerate and hold on which will take more than biomass removal.

* Rich Farrington: In Dr. North’s slide showing the strategic anchors, what are the anchors: are they fuel breaks?

Dr. North replied that these are areas that are mechanically treated, that could possibly generate revenue. You can under burn in these areas and let fire expand into the areas that cannot be mechanically treated.

* John Buckley: Does Dr. North believe the science is showing that canopy cover does not need to be at 60 or 70% cover to have suitable habitat protection essential for spotted owls.

Dr. North stated that science has shown canopy cover is not something required by the owls with one exception: within a 10-acre area around the nest location you may want to maintain higher canopy cover because there is benefit for microclimate modification. Beyond the nest location, canopy cover is not the most important criterion.

* Alissa Fogg: Where is Dr. North seeing the more innovative projects demonstrating pyrosilviculture?

Dr. North replied that Rob York, who is the manager at Blodgett Experimental Forest near Foresthill, is combining fire and thinning. He is using silviculture to open the window for fire and has also used fire in young stands. Dr. North went on to state that he has not seen pyrosilviculture on a landscape scale except for in western Australia.

* Chuck Loffland: Have they used post-fire salvage logging to help offset costs of burning large scale?

Dr. North replied that there is an opportunity to use salvage logging judiciously. It is clear that with mechanical removal of the trees you are removing big woody inputs. In the short term, you can see an increase in fine fuels from tree limbs but he would advocate nearly anything that could generate revenue to help offset costs. Salvage logging revenues are typically not a lot but if there is a way for salvage to produce revenue in a way that helps with the future fuel situation, Dr. North stated he thinks that it is a benefit towards increasing pace and scale.

* Rich Farrington: He has the impression that management resists pyrosilvilculture because fire after forest treatment could impact forest prescriptions after removal of trees. Does Dr. North have a response to this?

Dr. North stated it is a difficult mindset to overcome. When marking trees, you think with a lot of precision but, when using fire, it is a very blunt tool. Fire requires a different mindset because you don’t have the level of control you do with mechanical treatment.

We most often use fire as a tool for site preparation but we need to also use fire to thin forests, and get them below carrying capacity. If we want to do this at scale, we have to do this extensively or we will lose trees; even big trees. We have to ease up on controls in order to accelerate pace and scale.

* Katherine Evatt: Has Dr. North seen the Caples Fire results?

Dr. North stated that he visited the fire recently and that the loss of some trees was part of doing business. But 3,000 acres were treated some by prescribed fire and some by wildfire. But, in the end, the increase in the areas treated was worth it from what he saw.

Tania stated that the Planning WG will discuss the ACCG presentations and take-aways, then distill the information down to something that is meaningful and applicable it to the ACCG’s work.

**Presentation and discussion:** [**Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration Project Monitoring Plan**](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/05-Upper-Mokelumne-Forest-Restoration-Project-Monitoring-Plan-ppt.-1.pdf)

Helen Loffland reviewed Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions’ (CHIPS’) Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration Project and described how the monitoring fits in. She reviewed the three main monitoring objectives outlined in the grant proposal that originated in the ACCG Monitoring Work Group’s (MWG) Monitoring Strategy.

Helen presented the monitoring methods to be used for each treatment type within the project using a combination [of Common Stand Exam](https://www.fs.fed.us/nrm/fsveg/index.shtml) (CSE), [Individuals, Clumps and Openings](http://www.nwfirescience.org/biblio/ico-approach-quantifying-and-restoring-forest-spatial-pattern-implementation-guide-version-30) (ICO), photo monitoring and contract compliance. She stated s use circular plots, for which sizes will depend on whether or not they opt to use CSE or ICO. Helen plans to sample at least three plots per unit, with the intent to sample up to 10% of the total unit. Helen then presented the ICO and CSE monitoring components for the pre-commercial thinning and revegetation units. For the latter units, she plans to use the same monitoring method the ACCG MWG has already implemented within the Power Fire planting sites to be able to compare how different planting arrangements change over time.

Within the roadside/fuel break thinning units, Helen and/or CHIPS will conduct before/after photo documentation and contract compliance monitoring. Within the aspen restoration area, the Forest Service will conduct photo documentation and monitor vegetation height.

Helen asked the group for pre-project input within the next two weeks, before she begins pre-treatment sampling. She can be reached at [Hloffland@birdpop.org](mailto:Hloffland@birdpop.org).

* John Buckley: The monitoring objective is to see how different planting densities affect growth and competition. Obviously, the planting density will affect results. For example, in areas of higher planting density you will have higher survival and/or growth. Is there any consideration for also assessing whether or not there is more ecological diversity retained? Or, how the different planting arrangements affect plant diversity or say hardwoods?

Helen replied that the protocols will record and monitor all vegetation on site, shrub cover and height will be recorded, natural and planted for shrubs and trees.

* Gwen Starrett: She added that the Monitoring WG has expressed concern with invasive plants and asked that they be included in the monitoring. She has observed an invasive plant issue in the Power Fire area.

Helen replied that the CSE data collection will include recording the presence of invasive species and estimating cover within the plot. She believes this will help evaluate invasives without going too far afield from the monitoring objectives established in the project’s grant application.

**Seeking consensus letter of support for the Mattley Meadow Project**

Gia Martynn of the Plumas Corporation shared that the Mattley Meadow project was first identified when the ACCG and the Forest Service entered into the Cornerstone Project. In 2014, the Forest Service contacted Plumas Corporation to assist with the meadow restoration design. A field trip was held in 2014 to review the conceptual design with stakeholders. The project was then put on the back burner due to post Rim Fire priorities. In 2017, the project team conducted another field trip with regulatory agencies to address populations of Sierra yellow legged frog and modified the project design not to treat the west channel. The team then moved forward with the NEPA/CEQA analysis. The Forest Service issued a Decision Memo in May 2020. The Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA) is the CEQA lead agency and plans to review the Mitigated Negative Declaration for final filing on July 24. UMRWA received comments from the Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) asking to make sure they secure all necessary permits. Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center (CSERC) provided comments regarding concerns over grazing. The project team modified the mitigations for grazing. Plumas Corporation is now applying to the Wildlife Conservation Board’s Forest Conservation Program and using Forest Service match as in kind cost share.

* John Buckley: This was an extremely well presented and analyzed project. CSERC is enthusiastic about the project.

Tania Carlone shared the draft letter of support for the group to review and asked for any questions or discussions about the letter.

* There was brief discussion about when the project list came about. It was agreed the correct year was 2011. Gia will revise the letter accordingly.

There were no other concerns. Regine will work with Gia to execute the letter immediately.

**Seeking consensus approval of** [**revised Memorandum of Agreement**](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/09-ACCG-MOA-Admin-WG-Review-Draft-v.-5-14-20.docx)**.**

## The original MOA was set in 2010, and extended in 2015. The Admin WG has been concentrating on the revised MOA over the past year. The group has reinforced foundational elements, addressed inconsistencies and offered greater clarity to terms and processes, updated the document to align with how the ACCG has come to operate, and removed obsolete work groups.

Tania reviewed the comments received which included:

1. John Heissenbuttel’s suggestion that all members resign the revised MOA.
2. Rich Farrington’s question asking if there are three willing members that represent the triple bottom line balance to form the Funding Collaboration Work Group, realizing that it is an open group. Rich added that if the ACCG cannot get volunteers for the Funding WG then the group should consider adding this role to the Admin WG functions.
3. John Buckley commented that right now with how the ACCG membership is set up, representatives of either an entity or an individual can share in the decision making, and that 100 percent of members must approve a decision. He added that the group could have an individual who shows up, who is a member and disagrees with a project causing the ACCG to fail to reach consensus. If that matters to the ACCG, then anyone can participate but individuals should not be voting members. If this doesn’t matter to the ACCG, then leaving the MOA as is, is fine.

Tania stated that the Admin WG discussed the comments and that the Admin WG felt it was important for everyone to be part of discussion and decision making, particularly private property owners. Consensus decision making means the decision is agreed upon by 100% of the signatories present in attendance at the meeting. As described in the MOA, when canvassed by the facilitator for a decision, a member may approve, abstain, or disapprove of a consensus decision. All (100%) of members eligible to participate in the decision at a meeting who do not abstain must approve for a consensus approval decision.

* Katherine Evatt: One of the reasons she is comfortable with this is that this has not been a past issue and also the group does have a dispute resolution process with the objector obligated to help resolve the issue.
* Michael Pickard: Suggested the consideration of adding a sentence into the MOA, that for someone who comes in and signs the MOA on a given day, that they are not a decision-making member until the following meeting. This could prevent someone from coming in, signing the MOA, and blocking a decision on the same day.

Tania asked the group if they felt this was important prompting a revision to the MOA. There was no group discussion. She then asked Michael if he is willing to live with the MOA as is to which Michael replied that he was.

* Greg Suba: Cited a minor edit to Section 4b Accomplishments. Change “wilderness urban” to “wildland urban interface.”

Tania noted the change and discussed the next steps. Regine will distribute an ACCG MOA signature form letter asking for members to renew their commitment. She requested members place the letter on their organization’s letterhead (if applicable), sign, date and email the letter to Regine. Signatures are requested by September 4, 2020.

Tania then asked if there were three volunteers for the Funding Coordination work group. She reviewed the triple bottom line membership of the work groups as outlined in the MOA and the Funding Coordination work group’s charge. Regine Miller and Michael Pickard volunteered as members. Regine will discuss with Richard Sykes to see if UMRWA will participate in this. Tania suggested follow up conversations with UMRWA, and asked for anyone else interested in joining to follow up with Tania or Regine.

Tania asked the group if they have consensus approval of the MOA. The group reached consensus.

## UPDATES

## Administrative Work Group Update

Regine Miller shared that the Admin WG discussed the upcoming speaker schedule and the comments received on the revised MOA. She stated that the group scheduled a working session to discuss revisions to the draft Communication and Engagement Plan.

**Planning Work Group Update**

Shane Dante stated that the Planning WG focused on how to integrate community and economic benefits into the project development process. The group will present the revised project submission form which includes a community and economic benefits checklist at the August general meeting.

Megan Layhee stated that the next SLAWG meeting is July 16th from 1-2:30pm. The group is refining the project mapper and defining maintenance intervals. They will then discuss the prioritization tool component of the work, looking at assets and wildfire risk models. Megan encouraged participants to email her if interested in being included on the SLAWG email distribution list.

## Roundtable

John Heissenbuttel: The Amador Fire Safe Council and Amador County Board of Supervisors adopted an ordinance that requires all improved lots to establish and maintain defensible space around homes.

Alissa Fogg: Point Blue has received funding to hold a workshop on a climate smart meadow restoration framework and tools, and demonstrate how it can be applied to projects. The group is planning to hold the workshop this fall via Zoom. She will send Regine the email with a form to gauge interest, and will schedule the date based upon the groups’ interest.

Chuck Loffland: The Three Meadows project bids are expected back this Friday and those for Foster Meadows are expected a week from this Friday. There are three active timber sales on the District. The Forest Service is generally seeing a lot of recreational use and abuse above what they normally would.

Rick Hopson: The Power Fire Culvert Project is underway. The District is also interviewing tribal members regarding importance of plants and cleaning up grow sites. Rick shared that he is trying to get the new Eldorado Forest Supervisor to attend one of the ACCG’s upcoming meetings.

Ray Cablayan: There is a lot of activity in the Hemlock area and the Black Springs Campground is under construction. The Calaveras District is also seeing a lot of use and abuse on the district and forest wide. They are also seeing a spike in COVID-19, even among their own crews.

Sara Husby: Introduced herself as the new Program Director at CSERC. She expressed that she’s looking forward to meeting people down the line once COVID gets better.

Gerald Schwartz: It was a good meeting today. EBMUD is limiting the number of cars on the north and south shores of Camanche Lake.

Michelle Workman: EBMUD is seeing similar recreational impacts as on the National Forests. They are limiting access to Mokelumne River day use areas to avoid misuse and dangerous parking. She asked if a recording of Malcolm’s presentation will be made available. Tania replied it would be posted to the ACCG website following the meeting.

Gwen Starrett: The Three Meadows project is out for bid. She has begun pre-restoration photo monitoring. They are cutting back on volunteer aspects of the project because of COVID. If anyone is interested in conifer thinning within the meadow boundaries, she can get them an Avenza map and discuss safety online.

Rich Farrington: UMRWA is a public entity and Joint Powers Authority. The next Board meeting is July 24th at 1:30pm. UMRWA staff asked the Forest Services if there is interest for UMRWA to help facilitate NEP. There was a positive response from the Forest Service.

Thurman Roberts: Most of his work is currently focused on CHIPS’ Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration Project monitoring and implementation.

Regine Miller: CHIPS is continuing to implement the Upper Mokelumne Forest Restoration Project and is looking ahead to beginning work on National Forest and National Park agreements, and to kicking off the CAL FIRE CCI Arnold Avery fuel break maintenance project.

Matt Hilden: He will retire July 31 and be replaced by Kellin Brown. Tania asked the group for comments and input regarding Matt’s retirement. Many members congratulated Matt on his retirement, thanked him for his contributions, and wished him well.

# 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, Citizens Climate Lobby | 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 |
| Rick Hopson | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Greg Suba | Sierra Forest Legacy | 3.0 |
| Kellin Brown | Calaveras Ranger District | 3.0 |
| John Buckley | Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center | 3.0 |
| Gerald Schwartz | East Bay Municipal Utility District | 3.0 |
| Ray Cablayan | Calaveras Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Megan Layhee | Consultant to Landmark Environmental and UMRWA | 3.0 |
| Chuck Loffland | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Shane Dante | Foothill Conservancy | 3.0 |
| Helen Loffland | Institute for Bird Populations | 3.0 |
| Matt Hilden | Calaveras Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Sue Holper | ACCG Member | 3.0 |
| Carinna Robertson | Calaveras Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Thurman Roberts | Sierra Nevada Alliance, Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions | 2.0 |
| Alissa Fogg | Point Blue | 3.0 |
| Malcolm North | Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station | 1.0 |
| David Griffith | Alpine Biomass Collaborative | 3.0 |
| Sara Husby | Central Sierra Environmental Resource Center | 3.0 |
| Randy Hanvelt | Association of California Loggers | 3.0 |
| Scott Cones | Calaveras Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Steve Brink | California Forestry Association | 3.0 |
| Michelle Workman | East Bay Municipal Utility District | 3.0 |
| Robin Wall | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Becky Estes | |  | | --- | | Forest Service Pacific Southwest Region | |  | | 3.0 |
| Sandy Anderson |  | 3.0 |
| Anne H |  | 3.0 |
| Tania Carlone | Consensus Building Institute | 3.0 |