

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

Meeting Brief

- McKays Strategic Fuelbreak Project support letter.
- ACCG Work Groups and meeting participants provided updates of their activities.
- Round table and 2022 Priorities discussion.

Action Items

Actions	Responsible Parties
Finalize the McKay Strategic FB ACCG support letter and submit to Jason Kuiken.	Megan Layhee
Make modifications to October summary based on Rich Farrington's comments, then remove draft watermark and post the website.	Megan Layhee
Follow up with Thurman Roberts about TEK guest speakers and topics and add to the potential speaker list.	Megan Layhee
Send out links to postfire restoration and management publications that were mentioned at the meeting.	Megan Layhee
Provide ACCG with an update on the STF review of the McKay project and the Brown Darby EIS.	Carinna Robertson
Plan and coordinate presentation on GTR-270 to the ACCG (Planning WG or general meeting).	Becky Estes Megan Layhee
Follow up with Monitoring Work Group (Becky Estes or Megan Layhee) if there are any data or information needs for the CFLR FY 2021 report.	Carinna Robertson

Summary

Publication links provided to the meeting participants (Action item: Megan Layhee will send these materials out the full ACCG listserv):

- Chuck - GTR 270 - Post-fire restoration framework for National Forests in CA https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/documents/psw_gtr270/
- Greg- thanks for that link Chuck. I'd also like to promote that folks take a look at and consider this post-fire landscape planning (for more than Reforestation - which is what the very helpful GTR-270 focuses on). While Stevens et al. 2021 is written using SW US conifer forests (UT, CO, AZ, NM), its planning steps are applicable to R5 forests <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112721007684?via%3Dihub>

Modification and/or approval of agenda and November 2020 Meeting Summary.

Rich Farrington proposed moving forward with organizing a TEK-related guest speakers for a 2022 ACCG general meeting, and asked Thurman Roberts to help with networking. (Megan will follow up with Thurman Roberts about this task).

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

October meeting summary brief – Rich had several modifications and revisions. Megan will make those suggested modifications and post the revised version to the website and remove the draft watermark. (Action item for Megan Layhee).

Discussion: Letter of Support for McKays Strategic Fuelbreak Project

Presentation and Discussion materials:

- ACCG Project Submission Form: https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/11/ACCG-Project-Submission-Form_McKays11712021.pdf
- McKay Project slides here: <https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/McKays-Strategic-Fuelbreak-slides.pptx>
- Brown Darby EIS here: <https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Brown-Darby-EIS.pdf>
- Final ACCG letter of support [revised after the Nov. 17th meeting and submitted to Jason Kuiken on Nov. 17th, 2021]: <https://acconsensus.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/ACCG-Letter-of-Support-McKays-Strategic-FB-11.17.2021.pdf>

Carinna Robertson with the STF Calaveras Ranger District gave a presentation about the McKay project (see links to slides above), which is as a maintenance FB project that is part of a large-scale, collaborative fuelbreak project (CCWD, Cal Am Team, USFS, SPI, CCRCD, CAL FIRE). This larger, collaborative FB project extends Vallecito to Camp Connell along both the N and S sides of Highway 4, with 4,000 acres under development currently and 6,000 acres that are built and defensible.

Carinna added that the Cal Am Team has done the on-the-ground reconnaissance and layout work already, and has developed the proposed treatment prescriptions and developed the maps and proposed treatment areas.

The McKay project falls under the Brown Darby EIS (forest restoration NEPA), which was completed and signed in 2002. Carinna added that she believed they can use this existing EIS. However, she did add that the EIS will have to be sent out to FS specialists for their review in order to assess whether conditions have changed or if there are any new concerns, and also to ensure that the proposed project prescriptions fall within existing guidelines in the EIS. For instance, Carinna advised not to propose to convert a mastication unit to a commercial thin unit.

Project stats:

- 1,088 acres, 3,700-4,480 ft elevation, <40% slopes, Sierra mixed conifer forests
- Project team: CCRCD, Cal Am Team and Calaveras RD
- Objectives: Restore fuelbreak (1995, original construction), and connect cooperative fuelbreak.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

- 2016 hazard tree sale in the project area- much of the material stayed on site or in piles
- Project was vetted through ACCG about 6 years ago (and field trips to this project area in the past).
- Main treatments – mastication, precommercial thinning, biomass removal and salvage of ladder fuels and understory fuels.
- Lots of landings and roads already out in the project area – no new landing or road construction proposed
- Yellow star-thistle identified within project area
- Masticate around old existing piles (brush growing up through some of the piles), creating a line around the old piles to allow for pile burning of these piles.
- Past roadside hazard tree removal work helped with standing dead trees around roadways in the project area, but there are still lots of dead standing trees in this project area. See pictures in slide ppt.

Jan Bray with the Cal Am team added that this project will tie in with the Last Chance FB and the Arnold-Avery FB on the Dorrington side, and that the amount of collaborative work going on along the Highway 4 corridor is a notable accomplishment.

Steve Brink wanted to note a few things: 1) to be clear and distinguish between salvage and biomass removal and to caution folks on how they use the term, “salvage”; 2) added that the FB construction is the first step and then the second step would be to treat down into the river canyon; and 3) he added that small hand piles are a problem.

- Jan Bray agreed with Steve that a lot of the dead standing trees in the project area are too old to be merchantable, but noted that there were some merchantable newly dead standing trees out in the project area. She also added that these fuelbreaks do help stop fires in combination with other forest treatments on the other side of the river, noted the Darby Fire was stopped by these combined treatment efforts. She also reminded the group that SPI already constructed the Love Creek FB in between the McKay FB and Arnold.
- Carinna addressed Steve’s comment about small hand piles that the FS Fuels staff have directed any new projects to construct large, mechanical piles.

Greg Suba had the following questions:

1. The proposed action is covered under Brown Darby EIS (2002) and the ACCG is proposing to support getting the STF to review the EIS and whether it fits with the new project? Are the 4 proposed treatment activities (mastication, precommercial thin, salvage thin and biomass removal) in the EIS and analyzed back then?
 - Carinna said yes, they are covered in the Brown Darby EIS.
2. Review the proposed treatments: what is the salvage component?
 - Carinna said salvage is roadside hazard (if they have merchantability) removal, and that biomass removal is to take dead standing and put into a pile.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

3. How will the public know and review subsequent decision of the STF review of the EIS and the project?
 - Carinna said that the STF NEPA coordinator will review it, a PIFF will be sent out to FS specialists, and if the FS determine they are in scope with the EIS, then the project can move forward. However, if specialists decide conditions have changed or that the proposed project is out of the scope of the original EIS, then a new planning effort will need to occur (scoping and comment period). Carinna does not foresee it take more than 2 weeks for the FS review to occur. She also added that if the STF gets ACCG support and will allow it to get on the program of work.
4. Can the ACCG members get notified of the review outcome, whatever the outcome is.
 - Carinna said yes, she will keep the ACCG in the loop and provide an update to the ACCG at our next meeting or when an update is available (action item for Carinna Robertson).
5. Apart from the timing, other concern is removal of green trees and the removal tree size. He asked for clarification on whether the guidance for precommercial thinning and salvage logging is already in the Brown Darby and already approved.
 - Carinna said she would have to double check on that, but that there is also other environmental documents that cover hazard tree removal.
6. Can the ACCG get a copy of the Brown Darby EIS?
 - Carinna said yes (action item for Carinna and Megan Layhee)
7. Will new landings be constructed?
 - Carinna said no, mostly service work, the project is not proposing new road construction.
8. Burning larger piles is that in the EIS already?
 - Carinna deferred to Kellin about this question. Kellin Brown said he was under the impression that that was the intent of creating the piles was to burn them. Scott Cones added that the EIS does allow for pile burning and understory burning in the units.
9. Have some suggested modifications to the letter. See below

Rich Farrington said that this sounds like a great project. He asked Carinna and the Cal Am Team to clarify how biomass removal is defined. Is it just piling and burning? Also asked if Rx fire and underburning is planned or desired as part of this project. Asked whether the precommercial thinning intent is piling and eventual burning, or lop and scatter. He also wanted clarification on whether the FS thought the landscape would be ready for a wildfire or a Rx fire after these treatments, and also asked the speakers to comment on Steve Brinks' comment about conducting subsequent treatments down in the canyon and whether that would be feasible.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

- Carinna said yes to the question about biomass removal, and added that it is not economically feasible to chip and remove. The cheapest and easiest route is to pile and burn.
- In regards to the Rx fire questions, Kellin says no burn plan for the area currently, but they would like to get to that point.
- Carinna says no to the question about the precommercial thinning. She added that the majority of work is going to be primarily mastication.
- Kellin responded to Riches second to last question, saying yes Kellin believes that the landscape will be ready for pile burning, but that further prep would be needed to conduct understory Rx fire, and in terms of the wildfire, he believes the project area would be more defensible after the proposed treatments were conducted.
- Scott Cones responded to Riches last comment, that yes, they have burned down in the canyon before under the Brown Darby EIS and they have done Rx fire in the area before starting from the ridgetop and down into the canyon. He added that they have an existing, old burn plan under the Brown Darby EIS to do this work.

Michael Pickard was not able to attend the meeting and sent an email saying, “SNC supports ACCG signing the letter of supports for McKays FB. Looks like it lines up well with areas identified as high priority by the ACCG Project Mapper.”

John Buckley could not attend the meeting but sent an initial email to Megan Layhee saying, “CSERC supports the McKays Fuelbreak project and agrees ACCG should approve a support letter. Unfortunately, the support letter simply notes support, and it doesn’t ask Jason to either provide any available dollars (which potentially may now be coming due to national level funding from the Infrastructure Bill), nor does it ask Jason to do anything else to expedite planning and implementation. To simply let Jason know ACCG supports it seems to be pretty meaningless unless we also ask for him to help in some way to make it a reality.”

- Note: John Buckley also sent a follow up email to Megan Layhee after the meeting saying:

Here is a brief perspective about the FS using the Brown Darby EIS from 2002 as a basis for the newly proposed McKay’s strategic fuel break project.

First, the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) that was put out in 2003 completely revised and updated regional policies; So to potentially rely on an EIS that was developed prior to that SNFPA probably makes no sense.

Second, the CA spotted owl policies in the Brown Darby EIS I believe were different from those revised by the SNFPA. And even more pertinent and relevant, the Brown Darby EIS owl policies certainly aren’t consistent with the Region’s latest 2019 Conservation Strategy for the CA Spotted Owl.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

Third, this fuel break project provides an opportunity for a CE to be speedily developed and then approved by Ray and Jason so that the project can set an example of a cut-to-the-chase streamlined environmental document that simply “lifts” or “copies” environmental setting information from Brown Darby or any other available documents, and then very narrowly focuses solely on any potential significant issues that the Fuelbreak project might pose. I believe that there is no need for a lengthy environmental document.

For example, what really are the issues?

Will the fuel break project actions on National Forest lands be designed to carefully avoid the removal of trees 30” dbh and larger outside of CA spotted owl and goshawk territories, and will the project provide even stricter diameter limits to protect large trees within CA spotted owl and/or goshawk territories?

Will the fuel break project's green tree thinning logging be consistent with the already proven, regularly applied logging prescriptions used extensively within the Stanislaus Forest?

Will the the fuel break treatments initially simply thin out overly-dense conifers and also shred, masticate, or burn surface and ladder fuels, rather than adding in herbicide treatments that may require a more in-depth CE or EA?

Last, are there any fuel break actions proposed by the project that would pose risk to known archeological, cultural, rare plant, or wildlife values. If so does that justify the development additional mitigation measures in a CE prior to approval and project implementation?

Focusing on what really matters could lead to an abbreviated, short, and focused CE that should be fully sufficient for a non-controversial fuel break project.

If we can't get a simple fuel break project approved under a speedily developed CE, then it will be difficult to get need work done on the national forest in the ACCG area with years of planning that will delay implementation of essential treatments.

But it would appear to be inappropriate to rely on a 20-years-old post-fire-salvage Brown Darby EIS that was created under different Regional guidelines and that really didn't focus on cutting green trees or managing areas as fuelbreaks.

CSERC can support a streamlined, speeded-up CE.

Megan Layhee brought up the draft letter with Greg Suba's track changes. “...supporting the environmental review of the McKays Strategic Fuelbreak Project. The environmental analysis was last completed in 2002 and review by the District will establish if the current environmental documents are adequate or need to be supplemented.”

Ray Cablayan and Steve Brink had additional suggestions to the letter, to add the following, “If the environmental review is aligned with the current NEPA, the ACCG will support the project.” Greg Suba said that was fine with him.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

Steve Brink added that he said it should read, “will support *implementation* of the project.”

Greg Suba said that was fine with him.

Charles Beckman with EBMUD had to leave, but added in the chat that EBMUD supports the project.

No objection was made from any signatories (ACCG members) that were present on the call today on the revised support letter.

Action items:

- Megan Layhee will finalize the McKay Strategic FB letter and submit to Jason Kuiken.
- Megan Layhee will get Brown Darby EIS from Carinna and send out the full ACCG.
- Carinna will provide updates to the ACCG about the outcome of the STF review of the Brown Darby EIS and McKay project proposal.

UPDATES

Administrative Work Group Update

Megan Layhee gave the Admin WG update. The Admin WG met virtually last on November 8th. They confirmed the November general meeting agenda. Discussed the Point Blue presentation and to notify the greater ACCG about it. Briefly discussed the C&E Plan which is posted to the ACCG website. Also discussed the upcoming facilitation training workshop that will occur in early January 2022 – confirmed attendees include Michael Pickard, John Heissenbuttal, Chuck Loffland and Megan Layhee.

Planning Work Group Update

Megan Layhee gave the Planning WG update. The Planning WG met last on October 27 and discussed:

- Discuss next steps for the Pyrosilviculture Ad Hoc group moving forward with their Shared Vision.
- Discuss Planning Work Group meeting frequency moving forward, value of meeting in November if there is no update on the Forest Projects Plan, and next steps on helping the FS move forward with planning and implementation.
- Discuss upcoming guest speakers and topics for the remainder of 2021 and into 2022.
- Review and update Planning Work Group meeting action item list.
- Meeting participant updates.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

- Next Planning Work Group meeting – TBD via Zoom. If after follow up with the Calaveras RD, we will not have a November meeting but plan to meet in January 2022 for an update on the UMRWA FPP.

Monitoring Work Group Update

Chuck Loffland gave the Monitoring WG update. They met last on November 10th via Zoom. Point Blue's Alissa Fogg and Jay Roberts gave a presentation to the group titled "Monitoring the effects of Power Fire herbicide treatments on the bird community". Becky presented on the Post-fire restoration framework for National Forests in CA (GTR-270). Greg added that the Stevens et al. 2021 paper is a great supplemental paper that talks about postfire landscapes and breaks it in to manageable bits in addition to replanting management, and has a flow chart. Chuck added that the CFLR FY 2021 annual report is being developed, and added that if the Monitoring WG needs to add any data for that report for Carinna to reach out. Dec topics include continue development of monitoring strategy, discuss potential online or field symposium in 2022 (for Power Fire and/or Caldor Fire and Caples Fire), and second monitoring field tour into the Hemlock project, and need to discuss these tours with the larger group.

- Chuck - GTR 270 - Post-fire restoration framework for National Forests in CA https://www.fs.fed.us/psw/publications/documents/psw_gtr270/
- Greg- thanks for that link Chuck. I'd also like to promote that folks take a look at and consider this post-fire landscape planning (for more than Reforestation - which is what the very helpful GTR-270 focuses on). While Stevens et al. 2021 is written using SW US conifer forests (UT, CO, AZ, NM), its planning steps are applicable to R5 forests <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112721007684?via%3Dihub>

Steve Brink commented that he would support a comprehensive Caldor Fire field trip, particularly looking at Grizzly Flat, Scottiago mechanical thinning, roadside hazard tree removal, and Echo summit to see how fire got across Christmas valley and into south shore without burning Christmas valley.

Rich Farrington added that he read that the Sierra Club made a suggestion that doing nothing in the forest is better than conducting forest treatments. Rich asked if the monitoring group or anyone on the call can answer that question.

- Chuck replied that there is a plenty of literature out there that suggests that that is incorrect, and that landscape treatments, but that maybe Becky can address that from an ecological standpoint or the Fuels Specialists can address that from a fuel's standpoint.
- Rich added that the Sierra Club is referencing science. But added that he agrees with Steve Brinks suggestion to go see the Caldor Fire for ourselves.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

Funding Coordination Work Group Update

Megan Layhee read Michael Pickard's update for the work group via an email Michael sent Megan, since Michael could not attend this meeting – "Both SNC and CAL FIRE Forest Health grant applications are looking to open in January 2022. SNC's guidelines will focus on forest and watershed health in addition to post-fire restoration. Rich Farrington brought up the fact that the Forest Management Task Force is looking to move towards regional block grants and that it may be worthwhile for ACCG to work towards a full watershed restoration plan."

Rich Farrington added if the ACCG had master plan for whole of the Mokelumne watershed, as far as assessment and then identify treatments and pick off projects along the way -- that's where we need to go.

Roundtable

Steve Brink – He mentioned the increase FS funding: 1) Continuing Resolution that added \$1.3B to FS above last year, of which \$250M is for fuels reduction and postfire recovery, \$470M for roads and building and improvement maintenance; 2) infrastructure act gives almost \$1B a year for 5 years to FS of which \$500M per year for fire risk reduction including CFLRPs, \$400M for ecosystem restoration including postfire restoration; and 3) FS FY2022 Appropriations will have at least \$300M increase particularly for fuels reduction. Steve's priority for 2022- ACCG should be poised and ready to help the FS find efficient and effective ways to compete for funds and find those projects that will make a difference on the landscape quickly including MSA and Good Neighbor Authority.

Carinna Robertson – 800 acres completed for Mule Deer with new contract for additional acres, and CHIPS currently has two contractors on the ground on the Arnold-Avery project.

Ray Cablayan – urged ACCG to be poised to take advantage of the funds, and reminded ACCG about what Jason said that he is ready to receive a project from the ACCG, it looks like UMRWA FPP is the first step (landscape-level planning). Added that FS staffing is still a major capacity issue.

- Steve – percentage of additional funds has to go into the salary category, to effectively and efficiently utilize the coming funds

Chuck Loffland – Reported that the Foster and Three Meadow Project's held up during the recent big storm event (some overland movement of debris and water in both meadows, but everything held up), and also reported on the district's road and infrastructure after the big storm event and found no big problems. He added that moving forward in 2022 – the ACCG

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

should focus on the UMRWA FPP Phase 1-2, dealing with the Caldor Fire and preventing future events like that, and focusing on projects that retain water.

Rick Hopson – still figuring out their program of work; staffing is a huge issue; 2022 priorities – 1) getting back and engaged with the ACCG post-Caldor fire; 2) passed a major milestone with the CFLR program and would like to recognize that work at a 2022 general meeting early next year; 3) and reengaging on program of work and present that to the ACCG in early 2022.

Greg Suba – priority for 2022 1) landscape planning, 2) if we had the planning all done tomorrow who is going to do the implementation work and where is the non-commercial material is going to go?, 3) support increased resources to FS and build workforces to support it (timber, surface/ladder fuels), 4) SOFAR/ACCG relationship building/increased communication to work on something collaboratively if the opportunity presents itself.

Rich Farrington– UMRWA FPP is set to present to the ACCG in Jan 2022 at the general meeting; board authorized \$100K in UMRWA reserves for FPP planning projects; UMRWA was invited to submit a full application to SNC \$250K for planning and ACCG Administration/facilitation and mapping tool support; in December UMRWA will be submitting a WCB grant application for aspen stand restoration and stand inventory identification for \$1.3M. Rich's priorities: 1) push for large-landscape approaches for planning and implementation- master plan or analysis for the whole ACCG area, and 2) also at the same time focus on getting work done on the ground. He added that UMRWA's FPP Phase 1 and 2 can help with this. Also, UMRWA did apply for a previous grant with the WCB and also for a \$5M CAL FIRE CCI grant but did not get those. But there is opportunity at the beginning of 2022 with CAL FIRE to reapply.

Megan Fiske (chat) - I have to hop off - no updates other than introducing Meredith, the new watershed conservation and land use advocate for Foothill Conservancy. Priorities for 2022 - landscape scale planning, move towards a shovel ready project so we can capture available funding. Thanks all!

Sue Holper – more attention on the third bottom line on local economies and an opportunity to do that in getting more work on the ground.

Heather Reith – Natural Resources Manager for CA Big Trees SP and 13 other parks. Ben Jacobs is their Burn Boss for the program and Richard Rappaport is the Environmental Scientist for Big Trees. The last few years they have begun Giant Sequoia Forest Resiliency Project funded through CAL FIRE CCI program, focused on the North Grove area and currently working on a 5-year plan for governor's wildfire and forest resiliency program which will be \$5-8.5M for 5 years of work at Big Trees and Columbia. And their biggest endeavor is in the South Grove project changing to 1300-acre Rx fire Project and currently getting MOUs and other agreements together and have robust team to burn the south grove in spring 2022.

Meredith Sierra – New watershed conversation and land use advocate for FC. Looking forward to supporting work within the ACCG landscape.

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

Randy Hanvelt – 1) GNSR presentation with Tuolumne County BOS, 2nd site in Sept 2024. 2) lot of money coming out of the infrastructure bill.

John Heissenbuttal – 1) Cal Am Team just completed environmental work for Bummerville project on Calaveras County (SNC-funded), 2) Amador Stewardship Project on 9 BLM parcels in Amador County will be submitting implementation funding grant proposals at the first of the year for both of these projects, 3) Tiger Creek FB (SNC-funded) just put out a RFP for 80 acres of mastication and will complete mastication portion of the project; 4) RFPs released for Mitchell Mine 10.7-mile FB behind Pine Grove and will complete that project; 5) RFP released on ingress-egress project (CAL FIRE funded) for first 20 miles of about 60 miles of road in Amador County clearing brush away from evacuation routes, 6) local contractors bidding on the RFPs) – this may help with Sue’s suggestion on helping build local economies.

Bud Hoekstra – Sierra Club position (Dr. Will Russell) about thinning was not about fuels reductions, but fuels conversion. Proposed having ACCG bringing. 2) EPA stance on climate change – refugia for aquatic communities (including water temperatures changes) – pyrosilviculture will help with that by minimizing the likelihood of high-severity wildfires. Ac Hoc group should look into this.

Gerald Schwartz (EDMUD) - attended the TUCARE field symposium, if ACCG can work bigger with UMRWA, data is already out there but we need to get the work done.

The next General Meeting will take place on January 19th, 2022 and is set to be a hybrid meeting format (via Zoom and in-person- Amador County BOS Chambers) form 9am-12pm.

Meeting Participants.

Count	Name	Affiliation	Time Committed to Meeting
1	Megan Layhee	ACCG Administrator	1.75
2	Tania Carlone	Facilitator, CBI	1.75
3	Chuck Loffland	USFS ENF, Amador RD	1.75
4	Randy Hanvelt	ACL	1.75
5	Carinna Robertson	USFS STF, Calaveras RD	1.75
6	Charles Beckman	EBMUD	1.0
7	Bud Hoekstra	Landowner	1.75
8	Rick Hopson	USFS ENF, Amador RD	1.75
9	Ray Cablayan	USFS STF, Calaveras RD	1.75
10	Meredith Sierra	FC	1.75
11	Megan Fiske	FC	1.25
12	Gerald Schwartz	EBMUD	1.75
13	Steve Brink	CFA	1.75
14	Greg Suba	SFL	1.75
15	Pat McGreevy	Cal Am Team	1

Amador Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

General Meeting Notes November 17th, 2021, by Zoom

16	Jan Bray	Cal Am Team	1
17	John Heissenbuttal	Cal Am Team	1.75
18	Heather Reith	Big Trees SP	1.75
19	Ben Jacobs	Big Trees SP	1.75
20	Richard Rappaport	Big Trees SP	1.75
21	Sue Holper	ACCG member, private citizen	1.75
22	Rich Farrington	UMRWA Board	1.75
23	Scott Cones	USFS STF, Calaveras RD	1.75
24	Kellin Brown	USFS STF, Calaveras RD	1.75
25	Pat McGreevy	Cal-Am Team	1.0
26	Jan Bray	Cal-Am Team	1.0
27	Kaylee Tanner Dillashaw	?	1.0
28	Bud Hoekstra	Private citize	1.75