# **Meeting Brief**

* Panther Project presentation and discussion on expanding herbicide treatments.
* FPP Phase 2 stakeholder group forum discussion.
* Update on Forest Plan Amendments AD Hoc group.
* Update on next steps of ACCG Shared Vision on Tribal Engagement.
* ACCG 2023 Priorities: review draft list, including additions from 11/16 general meeting.
* Upcoming general meetings and topics.
* Participant and project-related updates.

# **Action Items**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Actions** | **Point Person(s)** |
| Post last month’s meeting summary and this month’s agenda as final to the ACCG website. | Layhee |
| Continue work group discussions at the January work group meeting on the Panther project and expansion of herbicide treatments. | Planning work group |
| Host first Phase 2 stakeholder meeting during the February 22nd work group meeting starting at 9am. | Planning work group |
| Follow up with Becky Estes about getting ENF 2019 LiDAR products. | Layhee (ongoing) |
| Perform follow up on potential 2023 potential general meeting topics, including panel (i.e., Richard Sykes). | Layhee (ongoing) |
| Reach out to Michael Pickard to better understand Planscape/SN Resource Toolkit and which 3 pillars are available and can be used in Planscape. | Layhee |
| Commit for CSERC to reach out to John Battles and others associated with the Resource Kit for answers to some of the questions that have been raised, and I will provide any answers to Megan for her to share. | John Buckley (ongoing) |
| Inform the ACCG is the CBTSP will have a field day for the public around their scheduled prescribed burning days in November 2022. | Marcie Powers (ongoing) |

## 

## Agenda Review and Meeting Summary Approval

The Planning Work Group (WG) met via Zoom video-conference. The WG confirmed the November work group agenda and the October work group meeting summary. Megan will post those as final on the ACCG website.

## Panther Fuels Reduction and Forest Health Project

**Presenters**: Brian Brown, Jesse Plummer, Karl Goodwin

Presentation highlights:

* Follow up treatments already approved include targeted grazing, (no market exists, competing grazing rights), prescribed fire (red card personnel in high demand during fire season), mechanical removal (cost prohibitive), hand tool removal (capacity, cost prohibitive), application of herbicide (available, cost effective - $400/acres).
* Proposing addition of areas eligible for herbicide treatments: (1) up to 500 ft from the centerline of major ridgeways, (2) allow application of herbicide up to 150 ft from the center of the selected roads. Doubles the area eligible for herbicide to 2,054 acres, but may not double the volume of herbicide – herbicide will be confused in unshaded areas (areas with undesired new growth). Map depicts authorized area, but actual application in the field will be a portion of that.
* FS not required to involve the public after a decision is made, but in the collaborative spirit bring this info to the ACCG. Pathway chosen for moving forward --
* Supplemental Information Report (SIR)/Interdisciplinary Review will be conducted, including review and documentation of new information received after decision.
* New information/change in conditions
  + New information -- Bipartisan infrastructure law (2021) section 40806 authorize FB up to 1,000 ft wide (conclusion- likely to be effective), explicitly authorizes of herbicide, indication of leader’s intent
  + Changed conditions, including sustained preparedness level, FS capacity, market conditions, recent history of extreme fire behavior
  + 233 ft (minimum distance for effective fuelbreak) – a crown fire switch to ground fire.
* FS staff stressed the important for FBs to work effectively.
* ACCG is invited to make a recommendation on the proposed addition, and feedback will be documented n the SIR. IF review of the NI, CC identified a need for supplementation, a revised FONSI and DN will be drafted.

Discussion highlights:

* CSERC comments:
  + CSERC, FC and SFL – strongly opposed any herbicide treatments in the Panther project, and even had meetings with former District Ranger of the time (Rick Hopson) about the herbicide issues. CSERC also noted that they sued the FS over 30 years ago over herbicide usage.
  + This will require full discussion by not only the Planning work group, but also the full ACCG general meeting.
  + 11,000 acres of FB approved in SERAL, but no herbicide. Believed not worth the controversy.
  + 3 key issues: set precedent for other ARD projects this is controversial; this goes back on carefully crafted consensus agreement and their will be concerns; need to get more fire back on the landscape and saying herbicide instead of Rx fire is frustrating to CSERC.
  + Brian invited John to draft his concerns and send them to Brian. Noted that the treatments wouldn’t’ be a second follow up treatment in the already treated area, instead the second follow up treatment would be in a different place;
* Rich – support expanding the fuel breaks and also supportive of Rx burning but because of moratoriums and need to continue discussing the capacity issue for getting Rx fire done; ask Brian to put PSW report available to the ACCG.

**Action items:**

* Set aside time at January planning work group meeting for continued discussion; then agenda item on Feb general meeting. ACCG is invited to make a recommendation on the proposed addition; feedback will be documented in the SIR.

## Forest Projects Plan (FPP) Phase 2

**Team presenters**: Richard Sykes, Coleen Shade, Regine Miller

Presenter highlights:

* Presented on the screen the FPP Phase 2 Stakeholder charge.
* Asked to 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.

Discussion highlights:

* Participants stressed the importance of a clear distinction between the two meetings.
  + Agreed that the stakeholder meetings will go before the planning work group meeting with 2 different agendas, but same Zoom link, with stakeholder agendas and materials on UMRWA website; Planning work group agenda and materials on ACCG website.
* Participants asked for a distinction between the TAG, the stakeholder group, the ACCG PWG.
  + Phase 2 team will develop a flow chart to describe the relationship between the TAG, stakeholder group, ACCG planning work group, ACCG full membership.
* It was suggested that a fire specialist be on the TAG.
* ARD (FS) staff suggested that at this time they don’t see the need for a lot of the controversial elements of SERAL on the Amador RD for Phase 2.
* Participants also stressed the delicate balance between getting people engaged and keeping on schedule. For instance, informing BOS would be at a BOS meeting instead of inviting them to a stakeholder meeting.
* Team noted that there will be a separate tribal engagement process, so not sure if they will be a part of the stakeholder process.

**Action items:**

* Phase 2 team will develop a flow chart to describe the relationship between the TAG, stakeholder group, ACCG planning work group, ACCG full membership.
* Hold first Phase 2 stakeholder meeting at the February 2023 planning work group meeting.
* Participants send any suggestions for additional stakeholders to Phase 2 team.

## ACCG Forest Plan Amendment Ad Hoc update

Discussion highlights:

* Challenge –how do we come up with non-controversial CSO FPAs in Phase 2.
* For now, the ad hoc group is focusing on CSO-related FPA, but there are other topics that the Ad Hoc group hope to cover later on -- ForSys, NRV, condition-based management, focused analysis.
* Ad hoc group discussions would benefit from understanding the Phase 2 purpose and need, and how the planning will be done (e.g., one EIS, Phase 2A and Phase 2B)
* It was noted that the STF and ENF will be having an internal FS meeting soon.

## ACCG Shared Vision on TEK and Tribal Engagement

Discussion highlights:

* Need to start building personal relationships.
* Make this a standing item on planning work group meeting agendas to continue discussion.

**Action item**

* Make this a standing item on planning work group meeting agendas to continue discussion.

## ACCG 2023 Priorities

Discussion highlights:

* Moved the following line from the first section to the Partnerships section:

*Encourage development and continue to support fuels reduction and forest health projects on all lands within the ACCG landscape.*

* Added new topic to GM topic lists:

*Effects of large wildfires on experimental forests (e.g., Blodgett).*

**Action items:**

* Continue discussions on the list at the January 2023 general meeting, and include the suggested changes at this meeting.

# **Meeting Participants**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Name** | **Affiliation** | **Miles (N/A- online)** | **Hours** |
| 1 | Megan Layhee | ACCG Administrator (facilitator) | -- | 2.5 |
| 2 | Rich Farrington | UMRWA Board | -- | 2.5 |
| 3 | John Buckley | CSERC | -- | 2.5 |
| 4 | Richard Sykes | UMRWA | -- | 2.5 |
| 5 | Regine Miller | UMRWA Phase 1/2 Team | -- | 2.5 |
| 6 | Karl Goodwin | ENF, Amador RD | -- | 2.0 |
| 7 | Coleen Shade | UMRWA Phase 2 Team/Cardno | -- | 1.5 |
| 8 | Brian Brown | ENF | -- | 2.5 |
| 9 | Jesse Plummer | UMRWA Phase 1 Team | -- | 2.5 |
| 10 | Kelsey Retich | STF, Calaveras RD | -- | 2.5 |
| 11 | Tatiana | CSERC | -- | 2.5 |
| 12 | Chuck Beckman | EBMUD | -- | 2.5 |