# Meeting Brief

* The Eldorado National Forest (NF) Supervisor Jeff Marsolais introduced himself to the ACCG.
* Dr. Scott Stephens, University of California, Berkeley, gave a presentation and engaged the ACCG in discussion on the “Science Behind Forest Restoration – 20 years of forest restoration at the UC Berkeley Blodgett Forest in the Sierra Nevada.”
* The ACCG provided initial comments on the revised socio-economic ad hoc committee’s recommendation for [revised project support submission form](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/04-ACCG-Project-Submission-Form_ad-hoc-proposed-revision_7-22-20.pdf).
* 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** |
| Incorporate John Buckley’s edit and remove DRAFT watermark from July general meeting summary, then post as final on website. | Regine Miller |
| Redistribute the revised MOA and template signature letter for signature. | Regine Miller |
| Send Regine Miller revised MOA signature letters by September 4th. | All interested parties |
| Alissa Fogg will send an email to Regine for distribution to the entire group regarding the climate-smart meadow restoration workshop. | Alissa Fogg  Regine Miller |
| Provide socio-economic ad hoc committee with John Heissenbuttel’s written comments. | Tania Carlone |

# Summary

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

## There were no modifications to the agenda. The July General Meeting summary was amended to reflect John Buckley’s requested change via email. Corrections will be made to reflect John’s change then the summary will be finalized and posted on the website.

**PRESENTATION AND DISCUSSIONS**

**Introduction to the new Eldorado NF Supervisor.**

Supervisor Jeff Marsolais thanked the ACCG for its work, and shared that he has been on the Eldorado NF for seven weeks mostly focusing internally. Jeff had a previous assignment in the late 1990’s and early 2000’s on the Eldorado NF and also worked out of the Stanislaus NF Groveland district office.

Over Jeff’s Forest Service career, he has focused on balancing public services, natural resources and fire. Jeff served in the Lake Tahoe Basin Management Unit for the past 10 years where he had a strong focus on community defense projects. He is excited about the Eldorado NF’s strong prescription fire program which he wants to expand. Jeff stated that it’s a privilege to be part of the ACCG and asked if there were any questions.

* Rich Farrington: How does Jeff feel about working through partnerships? Jeff replied that the Forest Service’s old model was to look internally for expertise, and that now the expertise is a collaborative process with stakeholders, scientists, and committed folks on the ground. Jeff sees the Forest Service’s role is to continue to leverage expertise through partnerships. He relayed his experience with using the Lake Tahoe large landscape effort as a way to convene a diversity of interests. Jeff hopes to expand partnerships during his time on the Eldorado NF.
* John Heissenbuttel: What are Jeff’s ideas about increasing pace and scale around local communities? Jeff replied that he does not yet know the local barriers but that through his experience in the Tahoe Basin the Forest Service was able to increase pace and scale. Jeff explained that barriers to increasing pace and scale can be very localized, and that prescribed fire can help to increase pace and scale. He stated that increasing pace and scale can be achieved by a resolute community that is committed to it, noting that there also may be consequences to increasing pace and scale that we can learn from.
* Chuck Loffland: Does Jeff plan to attend the ACCG Planning WG meetings? Jeff replied that he does not yet know and is happy to engage where it will add the greatest value.
* Katherine Evatt: How can the Eldorado NF get more work to local contractors through stewardship contracts, and does Jeff plan for the robust use of local benefit factors in stewardship contracting? Jeff described CHIPS as an example of stewardship contracting in the Tahoe Basin. He stated that we need to begin to think about recruiting next generation of woods workers. The industry that supports forest management now is very different from that of the mid 1990’s. Jeff stated that he wants to keep local contractors at work but is also thinking about recruiting the next generation.

**Presentation and discussion:** [**Science Behind Forest Restoration – 20 years of forest restoration at the UC Berkeley Blodgett Forest in the Sierra Nevada**](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/03-Stephens-Amador-Calaveras-Consensus-Group-FFS-8-20.pdf)**.**

A video of the presentation can be viewed [here](https://youtu.be/RRVf-DIKPZ0).

Dr. Scott Stephens works at UC Berkeley and has been a professor of fire science and fire ecology for the past 21 years. Previous to this, Dr. Stephens worked for the Forest Service Pacific Southwest Research Station for two years, then served as a professor at CSU Cal Poly San Luis Obispo for three years.

In a 1956 National Geographic piece entitled, “Our Green Treasury: The National Forests” by Nathaniel Kenney, the argument was made that science is going to solve all of the forest problems. Dr. Stephens stated he thinks this is totally wrong, and that the single biggest issue facing the forest is people and the way they interact with the land. He stated, “…equipment and development alone won’t show how to keep having a few big fires. Researchers must let their imaginations soar…”

Dr. Stephens reviewed historical forest conditions, including that described by Show and Kotok (1924),

“Ca pine forests represent broken, patchy, understocked stands, worn down by the attrition of repeated light fires,” and “Extensive crown fires…are almost unknown to the Ca pine region,” and “The virgin forest, subjected to repeated surface fires for centuries has been exposed to …cumulative risk.”

Dr. Stephens showed a 1915 photo of the Bear Creek Guard Station in the Plumas NF and that showed open California pine forests that were broken by repeated light fires.

Dr. Stephens went on to review the history of fire suppression which became policy around 1905 with the creation of the US Forest Service. He stated that there is an average of 80,000 wildland fires per year today, with 98 to 99% of all fires extinguished being less than or equal to 5 acres in size. The remaining 1 to 2% of fires each year burn 98% of the burned ground each year and modify landscapes. Before 1800, 1.1 million acres of forests burned annually in California with 4.5 million acres total through lightning and indigenous ignitions. Today, only 10 to 25% of that amount burns each year. Dr. Stephens stated that fire was essential to the California landscapes, and can be considered almost as important as the soil and water.

* Sue Britting: Can Dr. Stephens point to any surveys or assessments that quantify the land covered by indigenous burning? Scott replied that the Air Resources Board is updating the amount of area burned for a baseline as it relates to legislation passed by the State in 2019. Dr. Stephens shared that he read the literature to determine the frequency of indigenous burning, but that it is difficult to translate that to a specific amount of area. He has written a paper that attempts to answer this question by getting the best information from indigenous scholars and people, then translated that information to the State legislation. Dr. Stephens shared that the paper was rejected on three occasions because he was told he needed to remove the indigenous burning component; he feels there is a bias against the idea of indigenous management.

Dr. Stephens discussed early forest inventory data from the USDA Form 321A that he retrieved from the San Bruno, California federal archives. He explained that he analyzed the forms to get a sense of forest inventory around 1920 and that 3 to 5% of the total forest area was sampled which is a relatively high rate. Dr. Stephens and his team resurveyed some of the sites including plots on the Stanislaus NF pre- and post-Rim Fire. The Rim Fire was a high severity fire that killed large patches of trees and removed seed sources. Before and after Rim Fire photos at several locations showed the total destruction of the forest.

Black oak is a critical resource for indigenous people, but the oak trees have been closed in by white fir and incense cedar as a result of the lack of fire. The proportion of pine trees has increased from the 1911 to 2013 surveys, with an average 25% canopy cover in 1911 over a 40-acre area. Dr. Stephens showed photos which illustrated the fir and conifer encroachment.

* Ben Solvesky: Can Dr. Stephens speak more to the changes in basal area? Ben stated that it is his understanding that among forest metrics, the basal area in current conditions is similar to historical conditions. He asked Dr. Stephens to speak more to the changes in basal area in his study. Pine-mixed conifer, Eldorado fir-mixed conifer. Dr. Stephens stated that the Blodgett Forest study is from fir-mixed conifer sites, and that in pine-mixed conifer sites, we see low basal area. But on fir dominated mixed conifer sites, the basal area is similar to historic metrics.

Dr. Stephens showed data on basal area from a timber survey in the Stanislaus-YOSE indicating a doubling of basal area from 1911 to 2013 (87 to 173 sq. ft/ac) with tree density increasing over 4 ½ times for 6 to 36 inch trees (22 to 101 trees/ac). In 1911 the canopy cover was estimated at 25% over a 40 acre area.

Dr. Stephens summarized the forest management implications:

* Contemporary stand replacing fire is outside the historical range of variability.
  + Most pronounced in mixed-conifer and yellow pine.
  + Not only proportions, patch sizes as well
    - Coordinated landscape treatments can mitigate uncharacteristic fire behavior (and effects)
  + Strategic treatments across 15-20% of landscape seems optimal
  + Cannot continue to use treatments to STOP fire
  + Manage landscapes to incorporate fire
  + Ecological Effects of Treatments

The fires result in high severity patches that are hundreds of acres or larger. These kill large patches of trees, remove seeds sources, and are not resilient.

Dr. Stephens said that landscapes should be managed to incorporate fire. He went on to describe the research he has conducted at the Blodgett Experimental Forest in the Georgetown area of Eldorado NF. In 2000, Dr. Stephens began a study which evaluated similarities and differences in forest treatments across 12 units which were each 40 to 70 acres in size. The treatments included: 1) mechanical thin only with mastication; 2) mechanical plus fire , and 3) fire only treatment. Results were compared to 3 control units. Each treatment was applied to three units. All pre-treatment units had very high fire hazard.

In 2003, mechanical thin and mastication were completed in some units. All California black oak were retained, and 90% of the trees less than 10 inches diameter at breast height (dbh) were masticated. Dr. Stephens stated that if he were to repeat this treatment, he would increase spatial heterogeneity because the marking guidelines were too homogenous. Seven years post treatment (2010), the masticated and natural surface fuel had decomposed by about 75%. The mastication shreds were conducive to fungi that decomposed material. By 2015, incense cedar is beginning to grow. The treatments thinning and mastication treatments were then repeated. The treatments resulted in increased tree vigor and were effective at reducing fire behavior at two entries over an approximately 20-year period.

In 2002, the units mechanically thinned and masticated were followed by fire. They had 30 tons of surface fuel, 30 tons of duff and 200 trees per acre, and was commercially thinned in the past. The unit was burned at the end of the year after the mechanical treatments were implemented resulting in an approximately 80% reduction of the surface fuels. Dr. Stephens stated that if he were a manager, he would have waited a year or two more to burn to allow the snow to break down surface residuals. A challenge with the fire treatment was the retention time and fuel bed, meaning that it was a long period of time to subject the residual trees to that energy. In 2010, there was an immense seed response from ceanothus which thereafter grew to ten feet tall by 2015. In 2018, Dr. Stephen’s group repeated the treatments. They found it much harder to moderate the fire behavior with the fuel bed because it is difficult to work with shrubs. They also found the fire resulted in more crown damage and killing of trees than they had anticipated. Dr. Stephens stated that it would be difficult to be more effective because of potential damage to the residual stand.

There were 30 tons per acre of pre-treatment surface fuels in the units subject to the fire only treatment. The burns were conducted in 2003 at night, with ladder fuels and live trees torching. The fire reduced surface fuels, killing 80% of live trees that were 10” DBH, meeting their burn goal. In 2009, they observed a ceanothus response and thereafter repeated the burns in 2009. In 2017, there was another shrub response so Dr. Stephens and his team conducted a third burn. Overall fuel consumption across the three burns averaged 45% of pre-burn levels, with consumption rates highest for the first burn at 65% and decreasing by 15 to 20% with each successive burn. The treatments showed there was a greater variability in fuel consumption with the third fire, and that fuel consumption depended on fuel type, stand, and tree species composition. This is an emergent property of the ecosystem developing heterogeneity, according to Dr. Stephens. The study results showed that the fire only treatment demonstrated three fires were needed to achieve the desired forest structure.

Dr. Stephens described the fuel treatment effects on carbon and stated they were evident after the third fire. The annual probability of fire in California mixed conifer forests was historically 0.5% but has increased to 2.5 to 3%. He asked how much of the carbon is emitted by the wildfire immediately and how much of it is retained in snags. If you take wood off a site, how long is the remaining carbon sequestered? Dr. Stephens stated that there are not large changes in carbon relative to the probability of wildfire for the mechanical + fire and the fire alone treatments indicating these are very stable treatments. Nevertheless, the control and mechanical treatments are still doing well at retaining carbon with changes in wildfire probability.

* Greg Suba: Regarding the mechanical only treatment, is Dr. Stephens’ conclusion ubiquitous across the Sierra or more specific to the Blodgett Forest? Dr. Stephens replied that if the masticator creates shreds with a high surface to volume ratio, the decomposition rate is relatively rapid. He went on state that the Blodgett Forest receives good precipitation which also helps. If the materials were left as round wood and not masticated, it would have persisted for much longer.
* Greg Suba: What were the targets for canopy cover and patchiness outcomes, and how would he have changed them? Dr. Stephens replied that the targets for basal areas and tree per acre were tight. The crown thinning was set up so that for every dominant tree and co-dominant tree, there would only be one neighbor intersecting the canopy. They also attempted to thin the species with the highest abundance. These efforts resulted in canopy cover decreasing from 75% to 55%. Fire behavior was not really affected by changes in canopy cover. The mechanical treatment didn’t give much positive outcome because the surface fuel changes offset the canopy cover fuels. Dr. Stephens stated he would do the standard deviation one below and one above, and vary the treatment throughout the stand to create heterogeneity.
* David Griffith: How would Dr. Stephens’ research apply to the eastern Sierra? Dr. Stephens replied that some of the concepts are applicable to the Jeffrey pine and mixed conifer forests of east side. Target conditions might be slightly different in the eastern Sierra but the lessons learned can inform management of the Jeffrey pine and mixed conifer. That said, as one gets into higher elevation sites containing firs, it could be a different story.
* Gwen Starrett: Did Dr. Stephens perform any biological monitoring with respect to birds or bumble bees? Dr. Stephens replied that they completed a 100% inventory of song birds, small mammals, and beetles, as well as conducted extensive soil surveys, invasive species surveys and a social science study. All biological monitoring found that the treatments created ephemeral changes but no significant ecological changes. Dr. Stephens added that they did not survey for California spotted owl but they did have carnivore camera traps from which they found a slight increase in jack rabbits.
* Ben Solvesky: There was a significant deer brush response in the fire-only treatment in 2018. Does Dr. Stephens think that is the stable condition or would he expect to see more deer brush coming back? Dr. Stephens replied that there is diversity in the understory layer including Sierra rose, ceanothus, white thorn, and also deer brush. He stated he does think there will be a significant component of shrubs in the understory that persists, and that the shrub component is patchy, and may require burning every 20 years or so. He suggested if there is a lightning fire, let it burn instead of actively managing it.
* John Buckley: There was 25% canopy cover over 40 acres in mixed conifer and pine. At the Blodgett Forest, a treatment dropped canopy cover from 75 to 50% but didn’t reduce fire severity risk based on the modelling. With the stated goal not to have homogenous conditions, this ties back to Individual trees, tree Clumps and forest Openings (ICO) conditions. With that in mind, when we are looking at variation across the landscape and trying to get to a canopy condition for closed canopy species, does Dr. Stephens have general observations on a sweet spot? Dr. Stephens replied that this is challenging. The pine-mixed conifer site on the Stanislaus NF, had high canopy cover at 25%, with a maximum of 45%. The Sequoia NF sites had a greater elevation gradient, and saw canopy cover around 25 to 28%. Canopy cover in the Sierra Madre sites is 10 to 15 to 25%. Dr. Stephens stated he doesn’t have all the answers. He’d stated that maybe we need to think about the historical range of variation and point more toward achieving the low end, helping us to persist through climate change conditions and stressors.
* John Buckley: On the Stanislaus NF and Rim Fire, deer brush, choke cherry and white thorn have come back thick in areas of high severity burns. In his experience, in some areas that have burned, the fire doesn’t do as effective a job at clearing fuels as desired. Has Dr. Stephens and his team used herbicides or mastication to reduce shrub thickets? Dr. Stephens replied that the study did not include the use of herbicides. He went on to state that one of the units includes white thorn which has proven more difficult to treat effectively than plots with other shrubs. He stated that managers need to get in early after a fire to treat shrubs using fire and/or spot herbicide to break them down to avoid homogenous cover of shrubs.
* Thurman Roberts: For bioenergy and biomass facilities, how does Dr. Stephens see the treatments affecting the feedstock procurement? Dr. Stephens replied that one could take crowns and materials out of the forest to use for bioenergy, followed by a burn to achieve a sharp response.

Dr. Stephens reviewed the study results stating:

* All of the forest treatments were successful in reducing fire hazards and fire effects in frequent fire forests
  + Reduction of Surface and Ladder Fuels Critical
    - Treatments can increase the vigor, resistance and resilience of remaining trees to improve adaptation to climate change.
    - All fuel treatments: Most ecosystem components exhibit very subtle effects or no measurable effects at all (soils, small mammals and birds, vegetation, bark beetles)
  + Longevity of treatments 15 to 20 years after 3 burns and about 10 years for less burn events.
    - Forest carbon more stable with fire treatments but mechanical and controls also important
  + Fire probabilities increasing, control fire severity likely underestimated
  + Scale of treatments continues to be relatively low in CA – Problem

Summary

* California mixed conifer forests have changed
  + Tree density increased 2.75 times since 1900, canopy cover 1.5x higher, large tree deficit
  + Forest change has decreased resiliency
  + Climate change makes worse – not biggest issue
    - Need increased restoration treatments and wildfire for ecological benefit
      * + Bring fire back and mechanical restoration treatments, more work with Tribes for innovation

California as increased resources for fuels management

Need to invest in fire extension program state-wide, Western US Prescribed Fire Training Center, increase pace and scale of treatments

Next 1- decades absolutely critical

o We are running out of time – Still hopeful

* Randy Hanvelt: What does early mean when getting in early? Dr. Stephens replied within 5 to 10 years of a fire, because that is when shrubs make a comeback. He asked, if you use fire as a maintenance tool, how soon do you have to get back in? He said that for the Blodgett Forest site where their interest is reducing the fire hazard to conserve the forest for the long term, one should burn at 20-year intervals. You may do it earlier or later for other values, and that after the first and second fire, you have to get back in earlier, but after the third fire you re-enter at 20 years.
* Ben Solvesky: Within the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS), they cannot modify canopy cover, they can only modify surface fuels. Is NRCS doing this all for nothing? Dr. Stephens believes the fuels question has been solved. He explained managers need to try to keep fire at a lower rate. 60 to 70% of the energy of a site is in the surface layer fuels, with about 5% of the energy in the over story layer, and 0% of the energy in the ground fuel (duff). Dr. Stephens recommends targeting surface and ladder fuels, and bark beetles and hazard trees, and suggests aiming to treat for the lower end of historical variation.

Dr. Stephens offered to host a site tour of the Blodgett Experimental Forest once COVID resolves.

## Presentation and Discussion: Socio-economic ad hoc committee’s recommendation for [revised project support submission form](https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/08/04-ACCG-Project-Submission-Form_ad-hoc-proposed-revision_7-22-20.pdf).

Tania Carlone provided an overview of the process to develop the recommendations for the revised project support submission form. Richard Farrington added that the socio-economic ad hoc committee applied the ACCG Principles and Policies document focusing in on economic and community benefits in as streamlined a way as possible. Tania stated that the Planning WG had a few questions which the committee focused on including a recommendation to incorporate information from the Sierra Institute’s recent socioeconomic monitoring study. Katherine Evatt added that the committee hopes the revised form helps project proponents to think about socio economic benefits when developing projects. Tania went on to explain that there is now the inclusion of a checklist that intends to operationalize the Principles and Policies document. Tania asked the group for input the committee can take back and continue their discussions.

* John Heissenbuttel: John stated that he sent Tania his initial comments for passing onto the ad hoc committee and said that stating the list is not a screen is disingenuous. John further stated that there are several issues the ACCG has not discussed, such as living wages. John believes that qualified and high performing contractors are more important factors than local. He asked why the ACCG should give higher priority to Native Americans than anyone else. He noted that protecting communities is buried in the list.

Tania replied that she will pass John’s comments onto the committee. Tania explained that she would not present the intent of the list if it was not genuine. One of the basic tenets of the work of a third-party mediator is to hold the participants to the ground rules which call for parties to engage in good faith.

* Katherine Evatt: Katherine missed the last Planning WG meeting where this revised form was discussed. She thinks it’s wrong to imply that the order of the checklist is in priority order, and does not think it prioritize one group over another but rather to helps people think about employing people who are underrepresented in our local workforce. Katherine thinks that the group tried to sincerely address concerns brought forward including those by John. The group developed the revisions that are grounded in science and the ACCG Policies and Principles document.
* Shane Dante: Shane expressed frustration that John commented there were not initially definitions of “living wage” and “local” in the document. The ad hoc committee thereafter found definitions from reputable sources, which John now questions. The definition of local comes from work the Sierra Institute did for the ACCG. Shane stated that he thinks it’s a good thing to draw from other sources.
* John Buckley: John stated that it is reasonable for people to see things from different points of view. The ACCG is often seeing things from differing points of view and trying to come to agreement on detailed wording. John suggests that, whether or not this is a perfect document, the group doesn’t impugn the efforts that went into this document. John added that he fears that whatever is produced will be used as a filter, and doesn’t want participants to perceive that they have to meet 100% of the checklist. John hopes the group can accept the document and move on.
* Rich Farrington: Rich offered that he can see how John perceives the check list and thinks the group may need to consider how to better accommodate the comments or not.
* Shane Dante: Shane stated that he believes the ACCG will be at a loss to not have the checklist, and that all projects will have varying degrees of community and economic benefits.

Tania reviewed the discussion stating that it is helpful in terms of clarifying the committee’s intent. The Planning WG’s intent is that the checklist is not to be used as a screen but rather a way to help understand opportunities for community and economic benefits when possible. Tania explained there is no action on the revised document today and that it will go back to the Planning WG.

## UPDATES

## Administrative Work Group Update

## Regine Miller shared that the Administrative WG reviewed and revised the draft Communication and Engagement Plan, and that the group is working to review the revised draft and bring it the ACCG this fall. The group also discussed the upcoming speaker schedule and will sort out the speaker schedule for the rest of the year and early 2021.

Regine reminded the group to send her the revised MOA signature pages by September 4th. Regine will redistribute the revise MOA and template signature letter.

**Planning Work Group Update**

**SLAWG update.**  Michael Pickard and Megan Layhee shared that the SLAWG has completed the project inventory component of the project mapper tool. The group is now working to prioritize projects across the landscape using assets and risks, and is planning to share it with full ACCG at the October or November general meeting. The SLAWG will be discussing the prioritization at its meeting tomorrow. Those interested in attending the meeting should contact [Megan](mailto:megan.layhee1@gmail.com).

**Monitoring Work Group Update**

Gwen Starrett reminded the group that Helen Loffland has begun to implement monitoring of CHIPS’ Wildlife Conservation Board-funded project area pre-commercial thin units. She will also be conducting camera monitoring at the roadside thinning units. Chuck Loffland has identified the aspen stands for restoration under this grant which will also be photo monitored. The Power Fire aquatic monitoring has been completed by the Pacific Southwest Research Station’s Karen Pope. The Caples Fire monitoring results have been released. The Red Fir monitoring has two components (Foster Firs and Hemlock); Hemlock has not been treated but Foster Firs has. Gwen stated that Becky Estes is looking to ramp up monitoring in Foster Firs this year. The Three Meadows project photo-documentation points have been established and the work group conducted a meadow analysis for the project.

## Roundtable

Liz Myer-Shields: (update via email). Her main update is with regard to staffing. There is a new District Manager, Chris Heppe, who will attend the September general meeting. Kevin Harrison, Chief Law Enforcement Officer, retired in June. Burns Brimhall is on a detail at the State BLM office until November. There have been no large fires within the Mother Lode Field Office’s area as of yet. Reach out to Liz, or Josh Sjostrom if you have trouble reaching Liz, to get help.

Carinna Robertson: The Hemlock project areas has three active timber sales including the Cabbage timber sale which is the District’s first Designation by Prescription (DxP) sale and incorporates a partnership with the Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority (UMRWA). This project would be a good field trip for the ACCG. The Thompson timber sale has begun which incorporates red fir monitoring. Carinna will get in touch with Becky Estes to coordinate the monitoring. The Black Springs camp ground is almost complete with UMRWA’s mastication wrapping up, with about 5 weeks left. UMRWA is also wrapping up mastication on the West Calaveras Thin and Bailey projects.

Kellin Brown: The District has had a fair number of lightning fires this year. There are not a lot of resources on the district currently. He has been given approval to begin sour grass mastication along Highway 4, just above the Dorrington area. About 40 to 50 acres will be masticated.

Chuck Loffland: The Amador Ranger District is planning to break ground on the Foster Firs meadow restoration on September 14. UMRWA is actively working on the Power Fire culvert restoration project. The California Deer Association will be coming in later this season to fence to protected aquatic resources. There is active logging on the Copycat and Scottiago projects. CHIPS crews are beginning to construct fencing around aspen stands as part of their WCB project.

Robin Wall: Rick Hopson is on a detail as the Region 5 Active Grants and Agreements Officer for the next few months. Linda Wadleigh will begin August 31 to fill Rick’s position. Marc Young was the Acting District Ranger for two weeks and is now on a fire. Robin is currently serving as the Acting District Ranger. The Margaret Fire is active at 8.5 acres and 55% contained. The fire should be under full containment tomorrow. The Mokelumne Fire lighting strike was on a tree, is out and being monitored.

Gwen Starrett: Thanked Carinna Robertson for connecting Zack Crowe from the Calaveras Ranger District to the ACCG Monitoring Work Group.

Katherine Evatt: The Pine Grove Youth Conservation Camp has been funded stay open in the Governor’s budget. There may be a local-State partnership, or some other arrangement to operate and maintain it, but it will stay open.

## Rich Farrington: The UMRWA Board has discussed becoming more involved in NEPA with its Forest Service partners for which there is support from both the Calaveras and Amador Ranger Districts. Richard Sykes will develop a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the two ranger districts that lay out scope, roles and responsibilities. The UMRWA Board approved UMRWA serving as CEQA lead agency on the Mattley Meadow project. SB 1348 (Stern Fire prevention, vegetation management, public education, grants, defensible space, fire hazard severity zones, forest management), includes authority for the State to provide grants for landscape NEPA for federal lands. The bill is supported by the majority of the UMRWA Board. The hearing for the bill is scheduled for tomorrow in the Assembly Appropriations Committee.

Richard Sykes: Richard will coordinate with Amador and Calaveras Ranger Districts staff to discuss the MOU which could eventually involve the ACCG.

Shane Dante: The Project 137ERC are above recreation flows. The August recreation flows from Electra have been cancelled. They will hold a meeting next week to discuss.

Alissa Fogg: The Power Fire bird monitoring is complete. Alissa is still completing the vegetation monitoring. She will send an email to Regine for distribution to the entire group regarding the climate-smart meadow restoration workshop.

# 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 |
| 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 |
| Megan Layhee | Consultant to Landmark Environmental and UMRWA | 3.0 |
| Chuck Loffland | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Shane Dante | Foothill Conservancy | 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 |
| Beverly Buloan | USFS South Sierra | 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 |
| Robin Wall | Amador Ranger District | 3.0 |
| Liz Myer-Shields | BLM | 3.0 |
| Tania Carlone | Consensus Building Institute | 3.0 |
| Richard Sykes | Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority | 3.0 |
| Scott Stephens | University of California, Berkeley | 1.5 |
| Pat McGreevy | CalAm Team | 3.0 |
| Ben Solvesky | Natural Resource Conservation Service | 3.0 |
| Jeff Marsolais | Eldorado National Forest | 3.0 |
| Terry Woodrow | Alpine County Board of Supervisors | 3.0 |
| Sue Britting | Sierra Forest Legacy | 3.0 |
| Sandy Anderson | Central Sierra Economic Development District | 3.0 |