Technical Discussion and Agreement on Future Amendments

- John proposed a brief summary of the key points of the PAC retirement and Survey requirements at the 9/20 GM.
- Megan suggested a brief overview of the ad hoc group's work and reform.
- John proposed that Chuck, with his technical expertise and clear communication skills, should take the lead on presenting to ACCG.
- They will bring PAC retirement for consensus and survey requirements (discussion only).
 The PAC amendment language is in italics at the bottom of the page. The next step would be handing over the phase 2 team for discussion into the NEPA document.

Territory Discussion and Focus Discussion

- Megan asked the team to decide whether to specify the next topic for the ad hoc meeting or keep it open.
- Chuck suggested discussing the HRC and territory delineation, which had been agreed upon earlier. John raised questions about focusing on Forest Plan amendments, specifically regarding the Stanislaus Forest and whether the ad hoc committee should broaden its scope.
- The team agreed to proceed with the territory conversation but also agreed to revisit the question of the committee's focus at the next meeting.
- The team discussed the potential changes to the CERAL 2.0 project, specifically regarding the delineation process of Home Range Core Areas (HRCA) and territories.
- Kelsey was asked to provide more insight into this topic at the next meeting.
- The group also discussed broadening the ad hoc group's scope beyond forest plan amendments.
- They agreed to use the majority of the meeting time discussing the HRCA vs. territories topic and possibly touching on additional CERAL 2.0 changes and the possibility of a broader scope towards the end of the meeting.
- John clarified that the discussion is about whether to keep HRCAs as they are or switch to territories, and whether these should be circular or shaped like amoebas.

Forest Plan Consistency and Proposal

- John requested that the leadership team make the Stanislaus forests management plan consistent with the CERAL 1.0 model but acknowledged that changes might be necessary.
- Kelsey agreed to touch base with John and other key players to get a clearer idea of the situation.

 Megan suggested that the group develop a consensus based on available science and then present it to the phase 2 team, rather than strictly adhering to the CERAL 2 plan.
 She believed that the phase 2 team would be interested in hearing what the ad hoc group had to propose.

Policies

John asked Chuck if he could put together a short summary of current policies for the Amador district.

Technology, Scheduling, and Field Trip Plans

Lisa and Chuck will reach out to Carinna about bringing the technology to replace the Owl at the 9/20 mtg.

10/10 Ad Hoc may conflict with internal field trip. The team decided to keep the meeting date as is but plans to revisit it in a few weeks. Megan and Chuck agreed to follow up on the field trip details.

Next Steps/Actions

- Lisa will include supplemental material number 3 (PAC and Survey) in the packet for next week's general meeting.
- Lisa will post Ad Hoc draft summary 9/11/23 mtg to website
- Kelsey will try to get in touch with Jason and other key players to gather information on the Stanislaus Forest's leadership team's stance on the plan.
- Chuck will create a short summary of current policies and their differences with the discussion topics.