

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 10/26/2022, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Meeting Brief

- FPP Phase 1 team requesting consensus recommendation from work group for ACCG support of the project.
- Update on ACCG Shared Vision on Tribal Engagement.
- Continuation of internal work group discussion on FPP Phase 2.
- Upcoming general meetings and topics.
- Participant and project-related updates.

Action Items

Actions	Point Person(s)
Post September meeting summary as final to the ACCG website.	Layhee
Follow up with Becky Estes about getting ENF 2019 LiDAR products.	Layhee (ongoing)
Finalize revised draft DM and revised draft ACCG LOS before ACCG Nov. 16 th general meeting.	FPP Phase 1 team
Bring FPP Phase 1 updated draft decision memo and updated draft ACCG LOS and other project materials to full membership to seek consensus support	Planning WG FPP Phase 1 team
Continue revising shared vision document based on feedback from comments received during the October general meeting. Bring to full ACCG at November 16 th general meeting.	Rich Farrington John Heissenbuttel
Formation of Ad Hoc group to the Planning work group -- CSO-related Forest Plan Amendments Ad Hoc group. Send out doodle poll to Ad Hoc group asking for best monthly meeting.	Layhee Ad Hoc group members
Bring suggested modifications to the Panther Project decision document to the Planning Work Group to ask for consensus recommendation on the expansion of the herbicide treatments in the project area.	Layhee Brian Brown Jesse Plummer
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
Provide Carinna with Patrick's contact info to learn more about SNA fellowship program.	John Buckley
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 October work group agenda and the September work group meeting summary. Megan will post those as final on the ACCG website.

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 10/26/2022, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

FPP Phase 1

Presentation/Discussion purpose: Phase 1 team presenting draft decision memo and seeking consensus recommendation from revised MOA signatories present at the work group meeting for support of Phase 1 planning and future implementation.

Team presenters: Richard Sykes, Karen Quidachay, Sara Reece, Chuck Loffland, Jeff Mabe, Regine Miller, and Megan Layhee

Discussion highlights:

- Aspen stands -- clarification about the limited scope of this treatment in Phase 1, and that UMRWA has been awarded a grant by WCB to complete more acreage of aspen stand restoration both on the Amador and Calaveras districts.
- USFWS consultation -- not completed as of the date of the meeting, but USFWS has at this point only one minor revision for one measure, as of now no additional conservation measures. Noted that prescribed fire treatments are the main reason for formal consultation and requesting “likelihood adversely affect”. USFWS will most likely issue 1-2 incidental takes for the project.
 - CSERC noted that for Phase 2, CSERC will be asking for additional protective measures for listed species, then what was done for Phase 1.
- BA vs. BE -- BA addressing federally listed species (regulatory agency of those species) also looking for individual effects, not population effects. BE is for assessing project effects on FS sensitive species in order to keep from being federally listed (FS is the regulatory agency for those species). Explanation about the various FS reports was described (e.g., MIS, Migratory bird report), and that MIS report is more interested in larger trends of a range of species, so effects are varying.
- Implementation costs, resources, focus – mention about implementation funding, contractors and FS staff future uncertainties; also, clarification on where implementation prioritization would occur. Team clarified that the implementation prioritization would be focused on the WUI and around PACS, but that the team would continue to work with the ACCG on Phase 1 implementation prioritization and the development of the implementation plan. Team also clarified that although capacity is limited, hopefully will continue to increase, this project also frees the FS up to use appropriated funds and prioritize work into our project area over other projects that do not have planning complete.
- Revisions to the draft DM:
 - Need for max dbh limit clarification in the draft DM including on page 23 under protection measure 42 and on page 5 – after discussion the draft dm was revised during the meeting to update CN 42 to “10” dbh” instead of “12” dbh”.
 - Lodgepole pines – third paragraph on page 5 of the draft DM was revised during the meeting and the phrase added to the end of the last sentence, “...or to remove lodgepole pines, where deemed appropriate.”
 - Mention of “Georgetown” RD on page 11 of the draft dm needs to be updated to “Amador” RD.
- Revisions to draft ACCG LOS:

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 10/26/2022, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

- Added “and Mr. Sykes” to the *Dear* line.
- Added “allowing up to 25,700 acres of” and “implementation of” and removed “implementing” to line 2 of the second paragraph of the letter body.
- Added an additional sentence at the end of the third paragraph of the letter body saying, “The ACCG appreciates the level of time and effort UMRWA and the USFS has put in with the collaborative to reach consensus on this project, and looks forward to working in a similar level of collaboration in the next phase(s) of the project.”

Action items:

- Team needs to review the Georgetown RD reference on page 11 of the draft dm, and make a revision, if needed.
- Bring forward the project to the full membership at the November 16th general meeting to seek consensus support of the planning document, project and future implementation.

ACCG Shared Vision on TEK and Tribal Engagement

Ad Hoc members: Rich Farrington, Thurman Roberts, Waylon Coats & Meredith Sierra

Rich gave a brief update on where we are at with the revised draft shared vision. Issue of concerning and focusing on one single member (tribes). Rich will continue to work with John Heissenbuttel to revise the shared vision statement and then bring it to the full membership for consensus support at the Nov. 16th general meeting.

Action item – Rich Farrington will work with John Heissenbuttel to address John’s concerns and make revisions to the shared vision statement. Then the revised shared vision statement would come before the ACCG at the November 16th general meeting to seek a consensus support.

Phase 2 Internal Discussions

Discussion highlights:

- Pillars, Regional Resource Kits and Planscape -- John Buckley is still networking with John Battles to get more clarity on the pillars and tools.
- STF SERAL project and future forest planning projects – The After Action Report (AAR) will be available soon, and may help guide the forest in helping to determine the path forward for future forest planning projects, like Stanislaus Landscape Project (SERAL 2 - S side of Hwy 108) and FPP Phase 2. It was noted that forest wants consistency across planning projects, which is the directive from the Washington office.
 - However, there is the acknowledgement at STF that state and funders may be directing the use of the pillars, but that there would be flexibility in which pillars. It’s also not clear if STF Forest Supervisor has reached out to the acting ENF Forest Supervisor to discuss on how to move forward with Phase 2.

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 10/26/2022, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

- Sierra Forest Legacy has suggested confining the analysis process to SERAL until there is a larger review (formulation of desired conditions and how that links into the modeling). Added that in terms of consistency, SERAL is not consistent with Sierra and Sequoia or the rest of bioregion. A lot of things in the table are dependent on the scenario tool.
- It was also mentioned that SERAL was not necessarily a consensus process.
- FPP Phase 2 potential components and ACCG stance on them --
 - group decided that until there is more clarity on the landscape planning framework chosen for FPP Phase 2, it's difficult to perform the exercise of filling out the table in supplemental material 12.
 - However, the group decided it was important to create an Ad Hoc group to the Planning work group to talk through CSO-related Forest Plan Amendments that could be part of FPP Phase 2. And use the refinements that come out of the November objection meetings for the Sierra and Sequoia Forest Plan amendments as examples for the Ad Hoc group discussions.
 - CSO-related Forest Plan Amendments Ad Hoc group - Sue, CSERC, Kelsey (Calaveras RD), Chuck, Carinna, Brian Brown, Rich Farrington – Megan will send out doodle poll to group asking for best monthly meeting.
 - Efforts to reach out to R5 about forest plan amendments
 - FPP Phase 2 team that were participating in the meeting discussion mentioned that it would be most critical to understand the work group's "ideal scenario" and topics "lacking agreement", more than topics they can live with.

Action items:

- John B. will continue to reach out to John Battles about the pillars, resource kits and Planscape.
- Megan will send out doodle poll to group asking for best monthly meeting for the formation of the CSO-related Forest Plan Amendments Ad Hoc group.

Upcoming General Meeting Topics & Work Group Ongoing Action Item List

- 11/16/2022 – **Consensus item** – UMRWA-Amador RD seeking ACCG support for Forest Projects Plan (FPP), Phase 1 draft decision
- No December meeting

Participant/Project Updates

- Brian Brown – possible revision to the Panther Fuels Reduction decision by increasing herbicide treatment buffers (which is currently 0-200ft from main roads and 0-75ft on minor roads) and to effectively double that size. **Action item** -- Brian and Jesse will plan to come back to the work group to discuss and get a consensus recommendation on the change.
 - Chuck – if folks want to get on the ground and see it now before the snow falls and the roads close.

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 10/26/2022, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

- Rich – association of CA Water Agencies are getting more interested in fuels reduction and protecting Sierra Nevada. Region 3 held a workshop in Murphys last week and presentations on past fires and impacts on water costs and contamination and talked about fire and smoke impacts on vineyards. HR5118 ([Continental Divide Trail Completion Act](#)) was passed by the house and currently in senate, but it does seem to be all that helpful to reducing threat of megafire.
- Carinna – hazard tree issue on district (fir in higher elevations). Hemlock hazard tree sale along 7N09. Another hazard tree sale in campgrounds and snow park, and mentioned the regional hazard tree NEPA, and how to best quickly address hazard trees.

Next Planning WG meeting is November 23rd via Zoom.

Meeting Participants

#	Name	Affiliation	Miles (N/A-online)	Hours
1	Megan Layhee	ACCG Administrator (facilitator)	--	3.0
2	Manny Eicholz	CSERC	--	3.0
3	Rich Farrington	UMRWA Board	--	3.0
4	Chuck Loffland	ENF, Amador RD	--	3.0
5	Terry Woodrow	CFSC, Alpine Co. BOS, UMRWA Board	--	1.5
6	John Buckley	CSERC	--	3.0
7	Carinna Robertson	STF, Calaveras RD	--	3.0
8	Richard Sykes	UMRWA	--	3.0
9	Karen Quidachay	UMRWA Phase 1 Team	--	2.5
10	Regine Miller	UMRWA Phase 1/2 Team	--	2.5
11	Sara Reece	UMRWA Phase 1 Team	--	1.5
12	Karl Goodwin	ENF, Amador RD	--	1.5
13	Coleen Shade	UMRWA Phase 2 Team/Cardno	--	3.0
14	Brian Brown	ENF	--	3.0
15	Jeff Mabe	ENF	--	1.5
16	Sue Britting	SFL	--	3.0
17	Tim Cox	EBMUD	--	3.0
18	Jesse Plummer	UMRWA Phase 1 Team	--	1.5
19	Kelsey Retich	STF, Calaveras RD	--	2.75
20	Ray Cablayan	STF, Calaveras RD	--	2.75
21	Bob Broderick	UMRWA Phase 1 Team	--	1.5