Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 1/25/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Meeting Brief

- FPP Phase 2 stakeholder group forum discussion.
- Panther Project presentation and discussion on expanding herbicide treatments.
- 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 revised meeting summary and this month's agenda as final to the ACCG website.	Layhee
 FPP Phase 2 Partnership Diagram-related discussion: Add additional bullet under ACCG Responsibilities to suggest that the ACCG will go through their own consensus-based decision- making process to reach a consensus opinion on the project. Add TEK expert to TAG and potentially add another bullet under TAG responsibilities stating that the topic of how to incorporate TEK into the project will be a discussion topic in the TAG meeting setting. Not sure how this would be incorporated into the diagram, but at a minimum the core team should discuss their approach to working with the ACCG (i.e., will they be looking for consensus support from the ACCG on the project like UMRWA and the FS did in FPP Phase 1?) 	Phase 2 Core Team
Bring the work group's suggested recommendation regarding the Panther project proposed changes to herbicide treatments to the full membership at the February general meeting.	Planning work group
Host first Phase 2 stakeholder meeting during the February 22nd work group meeting starting at 9am.	Planning work group
 Planning work group's suggested objectives for the ACCG FPA (FPP Phase 2) Ad Hoc February meeting: 1. Hash out the details of the <i>possible</i> consensus-based FPP Phase 2 FPA for PAC retirement, that the group began discussing at their Jan. Ad Hoc meeting. Go into more specifics about details of what this FPA would look like: (1) how many survey years would be required?, (2) What data to use? (e.g., occupancy data), etc. 	ACCG Forest Plan Amendment (FPP Phase 2) Ad Hoc

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 1/25/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

2. Discuss and highlight any FPAs from the SERAL project that are a "no-go" for the ACCG (i.e., too controversial to get ACCG consensus on).	
Get the ENF Forest Resilience Strategy from Brian and send out to the ACCG.	Layhee
Reach out to Chris Trott (point of contact for Golden State Natural Resources) and Sherri Brennen (point of contact for Yosemite Clean Energy) to see if they could come give an update on what their entities are doing in the Tuolumne County area.	Layhee
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)
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. John Buckley had a modification he wanted made to the November work group meeting summary that he emailed to Megan ahead of the meeting, and Megan added that change to the meeting summary during the meeting, and the summary was approved with John's suggested change. Megan will post those as final on the ACCG website.

Forest Projects Plan (FFP) Phase 2

Coleen Shade (Stantec) and Katie Ross-Smith (Stantec) with the FPP Phase 2 team gave an update on the FPP Phase 2 project. The team has developed the project work plan, and organizing, pulling together and networking with the project Technical Advisory Group (TAG) and Stakeholder Group. Tribal engagement is a separate process. The team is also beginning to compile geospatial data and will be working with FS specialists to ID data gaps. Don't expect any field work to begin until 2024.

The team then went into a bit more detail about the upcoming first Stakeholder meeting, on Wed., Feb. 22 starting at 9am. Marie Rainwater will be leading the meeting, and the objective of the first meeting will be to review and define project objectives (including project purpose and need), share the process/approach to project, and to solicit feedback from the group on whether or not all the right people are in the room, or if any critical entity is missing.

Rich Farrington asked if the purpose and need will be developed as part of the step to define the project objectives.

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 1/25/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

• Coleen – Yes, the purpose and need is part of the project objectives. Right now, the team has put together the purpose and need for both the Phase 1 and SERAL to use as a starting point.

Megan and Coleen briefly went over the initial plans for the meeting logistics for the Stakeholder Group Meeting/Planning Work Group Meeting. They'll be soliciting feedback on the meeting invite process used at the Feb. 22nd meeting.

Phase 2 DRAFT Partnership Diagram

Coleen reviewed the draft partnership diagram, including distinguishing the ACCG from the other groups.

- Megan explained her initial comment to the core team to distinguish the ACCG from the Stakeholder Group, which this current diagram does. The importance of this distinction is to highlight the fact that ACCG has to go through their own consensus-based decision process that the stakeholder group does not have to adhere to.
- Regine commented that it might important to reflect in the diagram that UMRWA and FS potential goal to reach consensus with ACCG on Phase 2.
- Chuck suggested in the chat, "ACCG responsibilities: maybe a bullet indicating role in providing a consensus opinion on the project."
- John B. under CFLR, there was an opportunity for ACCG to provide a perspective to the FS, it may no longer be a directive to the ACCG.
- Chuck then added that UMRWA is the driver in the seat (getting the grant funding), and needs to identify that the ACCG is a partner and looking for a consensus. Suggest Richard weigh back in about this topic, and the team clarify and revisit the topic in the context of Phase 2.
 - Carinna added that STF is still looking for consensus on the FPP Phase 2.

ACCG Forest Plan Amendment Ad hoc January 2023 Meeting Update

Megan explained that one of the major discussion components at this month's meeting was the acknowledgement that the group is a bit stuck and that it would be helpful to know if there is wiggle room for revisions to SERAL's FPAs, and that the group would benefit greatly to hear what comes out of the FS leadership team meeting.

Jesse commented that they can do good work without the FPAs, and that may not be needed for Phase 2.

Carinna added that that FS leadership meeting will probably be a little way out. Ray, Michael and Carinna will have an initial

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 1/25/2023, <u>megan.layhee1@gmail.com</u>

Chuck clarified Megan's initial statement about the Ad Hoc meeting to say that in addition to whether or not there is wiggle room for revisions to SERAL FPAs, but if there is the option for no FPAs as part of the Phase 2 project. Additionally, he added, that it would be helpful to understand from the ACCG Ad Hoc group whether there are any completely unacceptable SERAL FPAs that the group can pin point now?

Karl added that Linda Helm will be the new District Ranger for the Amador Ranger District, but that her start date has been delayed (start date Feb. 27th).

John B. added that YSS wanted to be the least controversial as possible, including not include FPAs. But STF pointed to the 2019 CSO Strategy and that it was timely and important to address some of the strategy points into SERAL. Worked with biologists for filling in the gaps that weren't spelled out in detail in the strategy, and Carinna has shared, Forest Supervisor had indicated a general goal/strategies for future project like Phase 2, doesn't mean FPAs have to be exactly the same as SERAL, but the at leadership team meeting may help understand if there will be separate projects or combined project where FS will have to determine whether or not FPAs will be.

Jesse added that a timely response to getting more work done is more important than

Marc Young noted that the recently published ENF Resilience Strategy (2022) that FPAs are needed for large landscape planning to meet the large scale goals of forest resiliency. Personally, would focus more on PAC retirement or larger treatments within PACs, and less focus on dbh limits. And this topic should at least be discussed.

Rich added that in the AD Hoc discussions that he had noted that if the ACCG can get to consensus on some FPAs, like PAC retirement, and agree with Jesse that we need to move as fast as we can, then move forward with things that don't create a lot of controversy.

Carinna added that their objective with FPAs is to do the correct treatments in the PACs, not to do more.

Rich wanted to circle back to the topic of whether the Phase 2 project is looking for ACCG consensus support on the project, and he pointed out that UMRWA has a signed a MSA with R5 and committed to working with ACCG and get support, and the Phase 1 process analyzed and negotiate common-ground solutions. And that the UMRWA board would probably not support a project that doesn't have support from ACCG. And that UMRWA is committed to full transparency and working with the public, including like what was done in Phase 1. Rich, added that he is at least committed to this approach, and believes Richard is as well.

Rich also asked the Phase 2 team about the diagram whether there is commitment in the TAG to consider TEK as it pertains to forest management, and having tribal representation on the TAG in support of incorporating TEK into the project. Suggested adding a bullet under the TAG section in the diagram saying, "TEK".

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 1/25/2023, <u>megan.layhee1@gmail.com</u>

Action items:

- Megan will get the ENF Forest Resilience Strategy from Brian and send out to the ACCG.
- Action items from FPP Phase 2 Partnership Diagram-related discussion:
 - Add additional bullet under ACCG Responsibilities to suggest that the ACCG will go through their own consensus-based decision-making process to reach consensus on the project.
 - Add TEK expert to TAG and potentially add another bullet under TAG responsibilities stating that the topic of how to incorporate TEK into the project will be a discussion topic in the TAG meeting setting.
 - Not sure how this would be incorporated into the diagram, but at a minimum the core team should discuss their approach to working with the ACCG (i.e., will they be looking for consensus support from the ACCG on the project?)
- ACCG FPA Ad Hoc meeting for February:
 - 1. Hash out the details of the potential ACCG consensus-based FPP Phase 2 FPA for PAC retirement
 - 2. Highlight any FPAs from the SERAL project that are no-go (i.e., too controversial to get ACCG consensus on).

Panther Fuels Reduction and Forest Health Project

Planning work group came to agreement to update the ACCG letter Megan had drafted ahead of today's meeting to read, "The Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG) will not be taking a position on changes being made to the Panther project implementation related to herbicide treatments." The group will be providing this draft statement to the full membership at the

ACCG 2023 Priorities and Priority Projects

Group briefly discussed the upcoming general meeting topic about finalizing the 2023 ACCG Priorities list and also briefly touched on the comment from the Admin Work Group poll from Michael Pickard about hearing from non-Planning work group ACCG members what their top priorities, whether those be specific projects or just broader priorities to ensure these priorities are on the Planning Work Group's radar.

ACCG Shared Vision on TEK and Tribal Engagement

Rich reiterated that the ask he made to the FPP Phase 2 to include a TEK expert on the TAG, and to also have the TAG address TEK in their discussions was aligned with the TEK shared vision.

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 1/25/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Upcoming General Meeting and Planning Work Group Meeting Topics

Group reviewed upcoming general meeting and planning work group meeting topics. Group asked Megan to convey to the Phase 2 team that the Stakeholder group meetings should take as long as they need (i.e., 2 hours), that this is one of the top priorities for the work group.

Participant Updates/News

Since Chris Trott had to jump off the call before the Participant updates section of the meeting, John B. described the work Chris Trott and others with Golden State Natural Resources are doing, including wood chip rail transport to the Bay. John also mentioned that the Yosemite Clean Energy is seeking funding for \$100 million to create utilization of woody biomass converted to clean biofuel? In addition, there is another biomass facility funded that is converting waste on O'Byrne's Ferry Road – taking wood products.

• John suggested Megan reach out to Chris Trott (point of contact for Golden State Natural Resources) and Sherri Brennen (point of contact for Yosemite Clean Energy) to see if they could come give an update on what their entities are doing in the Tuolumne County area.

#	Name	Affiliation	Miles (N/A- online)	Ho urs
1	Megan Layhee	ACCG Administrator (facilitator)		2.0
2	Rich Farrington	UMRWA Board		2.0
3	John Buckley	CSERC		2.0
4	Terry Woodrow	Alpine County, Calaveras FSC		1.0
5	Regine Miller	UMRWA FPP Phase 1, 2 Team		2.0
6	Karl Goodwin	ENF, Amador RD		2.0
7	Coleen Shade	UMRWA Phase 2 Team/Stantec		1.0
8	Brian Brown	ENF		2.0
9	Jesse Plummer	ENF, Amador RD		2.0
10	Kelsey Retich	STF, Calaveras RD		2.0
11	Jeff Mabe	ENF		1.0
12	Chuck Loffland	ENF, Amador RD		2.0
13	Katie Ross-Smith	UMRWA Phase 2 Team/Stantec		1.0
14	Kimberley Petree	El Dorado Band of Miwok Chairwoman, ED of CCAWW		2.0
15	John Buckley	CSERC		2.0
16	Stan Dodson	CSERC		2.0
17	Chris Trott	Golden State Natural Resources		1.5
18	Carinna Robertson	STF, Calaveras RD		2.0

Meeting Participants