# **Meeting Brief**

* Meeting facilitator: Michael Pickard
* FPP Phase 1: Consensus on support of the decision and future implementation.
* FPP Phase 2: Discussion on proposal by Phase 2 team to use the Planning work group meeting forum as a place to hold Phase 2 stakeholder meetings.
* ACCG TEK shared vision: Consensus on shared vision statement.
* 2023 ACCG general meetings: Discussion on meeting format.
* 2023 ACCG Priorities: Discussion on defining priorities.
* Work group updates.
* Roundtable updates.

# **Action Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Responsible Parties** |
| Post final version of meeting agenda and last month’s meeting summary to the ACCG website. | Layhee |
| Finalize FPP Phase 1 ACCG LOS and send to FS and UMRWA. | Layhee |
| Post TEK Shared Vision to ACCG website. | Layhee |
| Develop FPP Phase 2 Stakeholder charge and bring to ACCG Planning Work Group November meeting to aid in continued discussions, and continue discussions on using the Planning work group meeting forum as a place to hold Phase 2 stakeholder meetings, and what other entities should be included on the stakeholder list. | FPP Phase 2 team  Planning work group |
| Develop poll and send out to full ACCG listserv to help determine general meeting format for 2023. | Admin work group |
| Add 2023 ACCG Priorities as a consensus item on the January general meeting agenda. | Admin work group |
| Continue discussions on how to initiate the TEK shared vision and keeping the ad hoc group together. | Rich Farrington  Planning work group |

# **Summary**

## Modification and/or approval of agenda and last month’s meeting summary.

There were no suggested modifications to the agenda or last month’s meeting summary. Megan will post final versions of these documents on the website and remove the “DRAFT” watermark before doing so.

## Presentations & Discussions

## Consensus item -- Forest Projects Plan (FPP) Phase 1.

## FPP Phase 1 team presenters: Megan Layhee, Pat Ferrell, Richard Sykes, Regine Miller, Brian Brown

Discussion highlights:

* Based on the ACCG’s Planning work group consensus recommendation, the ACCG unanimously reached consensus on supporting the FPP Phase 1 decision, future implementation and the draft ACCG letter of support that was presented at the meeting.

**Action item:** Megan will finalize the ACCG letter of support and send it to the FS and UMRWA.

## FPP Phase 2: Discussion on proposal to use the Planning work group as forum to hold Phase 2 stakeholder meetings.

## Presenters: Richard Sykes and Coleen Shade

* Phase 2 team provided an overview of project and proposal to host the Phase 2 stakeholder meetings during quarterly Planning work group meetings, in an effort to find a way to maximize common stakeholder time. Marine Wainwater would be the facilitator for stakeholder group meetings, and Cardno would developing meeting materials. Team highlighted the importance of the fact that the stakeholder meetings would not interrupt the ACCG’s regular collaborative process, and to make clear to stakeholder attendees the ACCG has its own process for reaching consensus.

Discussion highlights:

* Determined that it would be helpful for the Phase 2 team to develop a draft charter for the stakeholder group to present to the Planning work group in November.
* Question about whether Phase 2 will be one or multiple EIS’, and what the plan for CEQA coverage was (e.g., EIR or project by project) – team responded that those aren’t decided yet.
* Specific concerns about were raised by John Heissenbuttel that were received via email and already shared with the Phase 2 team that were read aloud to the meeting participants
  + *I am fine with the Phase Forest Projects Plan (FPP) Phase One stuff. A couple of concerns I have raised with Richard Sykes are:*
  + *The 10” diameter limit is okay for treating understory fuels in Phase One, although if full treatment (Phase Two) requires reentering the same stand, this is inefficient spending.*
  + *Diameter limits on full treatment (Phase Two) is the antithesis of science. Diameter specifications were wrong back-in-the-day when they were used to justify cutting all the big trees, they are just as wrong today trying to “protect” all the big trees. Professionals should be able to remove any trees to achieve the desired results.*
* The Claremont Project (Plumas NF) was brought up as an example of a forest plan revision where they are not bound by dbh but shooting for basal area targets.
  + Brian – (1) SDI – easiest metric on implementation and planning level, and it would be great to showcase SDI, canopy cover, dbh limits at a site visit; (2) strategy for maintenance of treatments (e.g., herbicide).
* It was suggested that any topic that would involve forest plan revisions under Phase 2 needs to get in front of the ACCG as soon as possible, including forest plan amendments that aren’t directly involved with CSO, and herbicides.

**Action item:**

* Phase 2 team to develop a draft charter for the stakeholder group to present to the Planning work group in November.
* Planning work group will continue discussions with the Phase 2 team about the proposal, including who should be on the stakeholder list, including how to involve local elected officials (e.g., BOS).

## Consensus item -- ACCG Shared Vision on Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK)

## Presenters: Rich Farrington

Overview and discussion highlights:

* Rich provided an overview and background on the development of the shared vision, explaining that it all started with TEK panel hosted by the ACCG in spring of 2022. And that the panel scratched the surface on an area that warranted more thought and discussion. Added that there were concerns over the initial version of the shared vision about singling out tribes and whether the intent was to conduct engagement in a different way than status quo.
* Other Ad Hoc members, Thurman Roberts and Waylon Coats, who weren’t in attendance at the meeting, signed off on the revised document and sincere appreciation for the development of this shared vision.
* Agreement that Thurman and Waylon would be the best place to start in terms of who to reach out and protocols. Since they know what the purpose of this group is.

**Action item:**

* Maintain TEK Ad Hoc group to eventually formulate objectives to meeting the vision.
* Add shared vision to website.
* Add item to November planning work group. – how do we start implementing this? Start with solid contacts.

**ACCG General Meeting Format and Priorities for 2023**

**Action item:**

## Admin work group will use the December work group meeting to develop a poll to send out the full ACCG to solicit feedback on 2023 general meeting format. Some initial recommendations:

## Quarterly all in person general meeting and virtual for the remainder of the year, including in-field general meetings.

## Break out rooms for after virtual meetings.

## During meeting 5-10 min break(s).

## Michael Pickard will reach out forest biomass in Calaveras County to see if they will present at an upcoming general meeting.

## Proposal to add a new priority to the first section - “Encourage development and continue to support fuels reduction and forest health projects on all lands in the ACCG landscape.”

## Determined that the 2023 ACCG Priority List will be a consensus item at the January 2023 meeting.

## UPDATES

## Administrative Work Group Update

Admin work group met last on November 7th via Zoom. The group discussed this general meeting agenda and topics. Also, quick discussion on items still needs to be discussed in more detail by the work group including the C&E plan. The work group will prioritize this discussion, along with developing the poll to determine general meeting format for 2023. Next meeting is Dec. 12th.

**Planning Work Group Update**

The Planning work group met last on October 26th via Zoom. The group came to a consensus recommendation for the FPP Phase 1 project and future implementation, along with approving the draft ACCG LOS that was shown today. The group also heard an update on the revision of the ACCG TEK shared vision statement. The group continued internal discussions on FPP Phase 2 and through that determined the need to develop an AD Hoc group to begin discussions on CSO-related Forest Plan Amendments. Group will meet next on November 23rd via Zoom.

**Monitoring Work Group Update**

Supposed to have Caldor Fire field trip, weathered out. Had a monitoring meeting in lieu, talked about spring trip to Caldor, and monitoring data to pull together for that field trip.

* Helen added that Monitoring WG is going to stay engaged with the Planning WG to ensure monitoring is components of implementation grant applications.
* Chuck – look at long-term monitoring funding, don’t have mechanism built to monitoring 5-15 years after implementation.
* Jim Suero – CAL FIRE FRAP long range monitoring program/Safford Lab at UC Davis – Prescribed Fire Monitoring Program (Joe Restano, [Joe.Restaino@fire.ca.gov](mailto:Joe.Restaino@fire.ca.gov)). Don’t know if there are possibilities of working with FRAP. <https://frap.fire.ca.gov/>

**Funding Coordination Work Group Update**

* Did not meet.

**Roundtable**

Chuck Loffland – Wrapping up field season and got a significant amount of snow and doing pile burning.

Sue Holper – enthusiastic about ACCG and what they accomplish.

Helen Loffland – IBP started on a project with UMRWA on Aspen Restoration in Upper Moke. Hopefully present on the project to the general meeting early next year.

Linda Diesem – drawn to ACCG to understand how to help heal the land and learn more about forest resilience and fire safe communities locally.

John Heissenbuttel – Amador FSC wen tout with a project bid for 200 acres of mastication around River Pines – 18 different contractors show up.

Jim Suero – Couple of successful understory burns in the North Grove and in San Antonio units north of highway 4. Transition in pile burning now. Added that prescriptions that cut off at a certain dbh limit limits operations.

Jeff Mabe – South Zone Aquatic Biologist for ENF working on FPP. New to participating in ACCG meetings.

Gerald Schwartz – no EBMUD updates.

Manny Eichholz –No CSERC updates.

Rich – concerned about finding funding for FPP. Patrick Wright recently presented to UMRWA board, and asked the boar what would they do with $14 million? Rich replied that just for Phase 1 is $60 million. AWA Strategic Plan for this year added mega-fire damage and forming partnerships to protect AWA facilities.

Regine Miller –

Richard – administering grant for CCWD, and for CPUD for water treatment work for them (funded by DWR), and facilitating grant application AWA and FC aimed at water conservation measures.

Michael – SNC December board meeting in a couple of weeks to award grants under the Rec and Tourism and Land Conservation proposals, including one project in Calaveras County. Also currently scoring grant applications for forest health program, and will be making determinations on those in early-mid December, which will go to March board meeting. Opening up next round of forest health concept proposals in March-June 2023, with full proposals in summer 2023.

Next meeting is January 18th, 2023.

# **Meeting Participants**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Count** | **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Meeting Time** |
| 1 | Megan Layhee | ACCG Administrator | 3.0 |
| 2 | Michael Pickard | SNC, guest facilitator | 3.0 |
| 3 | Rich Farrington | UMRWA Board | 3.0 |
| 4 | Bud Hoekstra | Private citizen | 3.0 |
| 5 | Coleen Shade | Cardno, FPP Phase 2 team | 3.0 |
| 6 | Kelsey Retich | STF, Calaveras RD | 3.0 |
| 7 | Chuck Loffland | ENF, Amador RD | 3.0 |
| 8 | Linda Diesem | Private citizen | 3.0 |
| 9 | Craig Case | CHIPS | 3.0 |
| 10 | Richard Sykes | UMRWA | 3.0 |
| 11 | Matt Brown | ENF | 1.0 |
| 12 | Jeff Mabe | ENF | 3.0 |
| 13 | Gerald Schwartz | EBMUD | 3.0 |
| 14 | Sue Holper | Private citizen | 3.0 |
| 15 | Brian Brown | ENF | 3.0 |
| 16 | Pat Ferrell | FPP Phase 1 team member | 1.0 |
| 17 | Sara Reece | FPP Phase 1 team member | 1.0 |
| 18 | Jim Suero | CA State Parks | 3.0 |
| 19 | Regine Miller | FPP Phase 1/2 team member | 3.0 |
| 20 | Marie Davis | Placerville Water Agency | 1.0 |
| 21 | Manny Eicholz | CSERC | 3.0 |
| 22 | Karl Goodwin | ENF, Amador RD | 2.0 |
| 23 | James Thornock | ENF, Amador RD | 2.0 |
| 24 | Justin Mynk |  | 2.0 |
| 25 | Helen Loffland | IBP | 3.0 |
| 26 | Chris Trott |  | 2.0 |