

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 07/26/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Meeting Brief

- FPP Phase 2 updates, discussion: debrief on recent FS discussions on direction of Phase 2, debrief TAG meeting discussions on FPA Ad Hoc PAC retirement draft amendment and models discussion.
- July 19th General meeting presentation debrief.
- Upcoming General Meeting Topics.
- Participant 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
Review and discussion ACCG's Pyrosilviculture Shared Vision and discuss request by Pyrosilviculture Ad Hoc group to consider inclusion in Phase 2 project.	Phase 2 team
Develop ppt slides of recent field tour of STF prescribed burn project area and send to Administrator and figure out which upcoming ACCG meeting CSERC would like to show these slides at (e.g., GM, PWG meeting)	Buckley
Send funding opportunities to Administrator.	Wolfgang
Connect with Jesse Plummer about fire-related technologies presentations	Layhee

Agenda Review and Meeting Summary Approval

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

Forest Projects Plan (FPP) Phase 2

Debrief on June FS leadership meeting: there will be one joint EIS, but separate Record of Decisions (RODs) for the two forests. At this point, nothing is off the table. Discussion about timing, including Project Initiation Letter (PIL). The draft PIL is currently being circulated internally within the FS. As part of the PIL development, Forest ID team primary and secondary roles are being defined and will probably include folks from both forests. NEPA leads will be Susan Durham on the Eldorado and Katie Wilkinson on the Stanislaus, but unknown at this time which will be the primary point-of-contact for the project. Concerns about the NEPA process timeline so far, and importance of expediting the process as much as possible.

Debrief on July 19th TAG meeting: group reviewed the discussions regarding models, including the benefits of utilizing decision support tools for such a large landscape project such as FPP

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 07/26/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Phase 2. Also, the benefits of analyzing alternatives, quantify baseline and existing conditions, assess for desired outcomes, and being able to use highest resolution data (e.g., LiDAR) to assess at scale that is most useful and effective at determining where to treat and protect assets and resources. Discussions shifted to comparison of the two different model paths, including on cost-benefit and being able to re-run the models down the road, particularly after initial treatments have been completed (equates to changing baseline conditions), warranting the need to re-run the ode. Discussion on whether or not state funding entities will require to the use of particular datasets (e.g., ACCEL data/RRKs) or particular models (e.g., Planscape) to be used when going after funding, some suggested that this will not be the case.

The group also debriefed on the feedback the Forest Plan Amendment Ad Hoc group received from the TAG on the Ad Hoc's draft PAC retirement amendment. The TAG was supportive of the draft amendment, including John Keane and Becky Estes. John Keane stressed the importance of considering an additional criterion in determining whether PACs are eligible for retirement, and that is taking into consideration PACs as a network at the landscape-scale. Ad Hoc members also reiterated that the language as it stands defines PACs that are eligible for consideration of retirements, and that then next steps of a more landscape level analysis needs to happen (e.g., topography, biology, fuels treatments). Group also reiterated that they heard Keane say that ARUs were a responsible tool to use for three of the five years. It was added that it's probably best to keep the order of ARUs vs. protocol-levels surveys open in how they are used. There was a question about next steps for the AD Hoc and if the group would be addressing treatments in PACs. The answer was yes, but the Ad Hoc wanted to first get a clear sense from the two forests on the direction of the project (i.e., whether or not both forests are even wanting to incorporate CSO-related forest plan amendments), before starting those complex discussions. It's also an issue of differences between the two forests, particularly the amount of each district/PACs within the WUI – Amador RD has the capacity to have positive PAC treatments already without needing to do forest plan amendments, different scenario on the Calaveras RD. Potential next steps, conversations for Ad Hoc group: Get in to surveys, how much of the PACs should get treated.

Update on Pyrosilviculture outreach to Phase 2 team: Megan sent email with Ad Hoc cc'd to Phase 2 core team, received response that the August Stakeholder meeting agenda is full, but the Phase 2 Partnership team will begin discussing the request at their August meeting.

July 19th General meeting presentation debrief

Group discussed Curtis Kvamme's presentation on biochar. Group thought it was a great presentation, and look forward to getting another presentation on the study once field collection is finalized. Discussion on how piles are currently constructed may have to be reevaluated in the future were if the intent was to produce biochar from the piles. But since there is really not a market yet for pile conversion to biochar, this is a topic for down the road if/when it does become more cost effective.

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Zoom Meeting Summary, 07/26/2023, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Upcoming General Meeting Topics & other opportunities

- Aug. 16th- Planscape/Regional Resource Kits
- Sept. 20th - Dr. Robert York, *Interactions of the Mosquito Fire with Forest Management Alternatives at Blodgett Forest Research Station*. Lisa will work with Rich Farrington to reach out to Dr. York as they get closer to the presentation date.
- Discussion on presentation on wildfire detection system ([Silvanet Wildfire Solution | Dryad Networks](#)) and BurnBot (<https://burnbot.com/>) for upcoming general meeting.
- Discussion on CSERC providing a brief ppt slide on the recent YSS, STF field tour of the prescribed burning done recently on Hwy 108.

Participant Updates/News, Next Meeting

- Chuck Loffland and Kelsey Retich had a field site visit with USFWS staff to CSO PACs where they discussed PAC status, treatments, surveys, and overall management of CSO, all in light of potential listing.
- Michelle Wolfgang mentioned that there's a lot of funding opportunities. She will share those with Megan for distribution to the full ACCG.
- Chris Trott discussed changes happening at GSNR, including the stepping back of the President and VP. RCRC has taken over the role of overseeing completion of CEQA and getting facilities permitted. Building of plants will be postponed, not specified a timeline for completion yet.
- Next Planning meeting via Zoom, Wed., 8/23, 10:45am-12pm, following the FPP Phase 2 Stakeholder Meeting from 9:00-10:30am.

Meeting Participants

#	Name	Affiliation	Minutes
1	Megan Layhee	ACCG Administrator (facilitator)	105
2	Rich Farrington	UMRWA Board	78
3	John Buckley	CSERC	105
4	Chuck Loffland	ENF, Amador RD	101
5	Stan Dodson	CSERC	105
6	Michelle Wolfgang	ENF	105
7	Zach Browning	Sierra Institute	67
8	Kelsey Retich	STF, Calaveras RD	102
9	Jesse Plummer	ENF, Amador RD	47
10	Chris Trott	CT Bioenergy	105
11	Aaron James	STF	105
12	Brian Brown	ENF	103
13	Regine Miller	Headwaters Environmental	90