

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Meeting Brief Summary, 01/22/2025, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Meeting Brief

- Presentation by Matt Brown on herbicide drizzle application technique.
- ACCG Ad Hoc update
- MAC Project: aspen restoration, fuelbreaks

Housekeeping:

Drizzle Herbicide Application presentation by Matt Brown (ENF)

This method is covered under NEPA for use on the Eldorado NF for invasive species management.

Directed foliar application is high volume/low concentration application (<1-4% solution) and requires uniform coverage on target veg with a fan spray pattern typically.

In comparison, drizzle technique is a low volume with a higher concentration (8-20% solution) via backpack, does not require full coverage and can reach up to 20 feet away. Delivers same amount of herbicide as directed foliar application. Big advantage is that you can treat veg further away and not require full coverage.

Chat- It sounds like drizzle uses higher concentration, less volume than directed spray technique, but if the same number of plants were treated both techniques would potentially use essentially the same amount of active ingredient/herbicide chemical per acre?

- Yes.

Drizzle pros/cons: less travel time (greater reach), good for difficult-to-access areas (steep slopes). Also, efficiency- one backpack could treat more acres and lower cost/acre (\$152/acre vs \$65/acre). Good for perennials and woody species, not appropriate for annuals. Requires more training and guidance's when setting up/calibrating,, also potential for mis-application/ over application- indicator dye in foliar spray method is helpful to reduce overapplication, but drizzle application you don't get that feedback.

Jeff- is there increased likelihood of runoff of herbicides, especially on steep slopes. Matt says it probably isn't a big issue, but yes, that would be something worth considering.

Chuck- expand ability to apply with higher wind? Matt- Didn't cover that in the forest-wide EA. Chat (Cjhuck)- Looks more like a "jet" or concentrated "stream" application than a "drizzle"...

John- concern over who is applying the drizzle, e.g., FS staff versus contractors. Matt- why we haven't used this method more, treatment of broom is not worth training crews in a new method, they already know. Did want more seasoned applicators to do the work.

Observation- efficient touch-up treatments in FB maintenance of shrub regrowth.

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Meeting Brief Summary, 01/22/2025, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

Ad Hoc Update:

Propose that the Ad Hoc discuss a realistic timeline for coming up with recommendations for the MAC Project.

Adjustments of RO CSO policy? Yes, can change. Chuck- best way to proceed with Ad Hoc is what they would like to see, and compare that to the eventual finalization of RO CSO/ USFWS guidance. Change in Deputy Regional Forester and other staff, so don't know where this is going. Work on proposed action and range for alternatives, regardless of specifics that might change

- **"CSO listing.** The internal national FWS listing database is currently showing a listing decision date for California spotted owl as April 1, 2025. However, the dates shown in the FWS listing database are not binding and could be changed/moved back. Direction from the new administration could also affect listings and listing dates. So we do not have certainty on when a listing decision might occur, and FWS and I will provide listing updates as we receive any information.
- To recap, at this time we anticipate that any FWS listing decision for California spotted owl will be published after April 1, 2025."

Aspen restoration:

Megan reviewed discussion points from Nov. work group meeting.

John- try to minimize controversy.

Michelle, Matt- Caldor NEPA coverage for aspen restoration, Caples watershed assessment-wide (action item)

Chuck- bring this to MAC PT

Rich – what about piling for aspen restoration, mechanical in particular to reduce the fire threat? John B.- hand piling, yes.

- Matt- not sure if there is a fuels issue in the Caples Creek proposed wilderness.
- Michelle- have FS Fuels Specialist look at the stands within IRAs for whether prescribed fire could occur without mechanical treatments.
- John- more that we minimize controversy will lead to a better outcome.
- Stan- hand thinning more appropriate in a lot of aspen stands because of the wet soils.

MAC Project Fuelbreak widths (Rich Farrington)

- Yes, group agreed that this is a next topic for the work group to discuss.
- Map and acreages.

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Planning Work Group Meeting Brief Summary, 01/22/2025, megan.layhee1@gmail.com

- Get Fuels folks on that call – Kellin, James
- Megan remind Chuck, Carinna that we want Kellin, James etc at Feb. Planning WG meeting.
- Megan follow up Hannah with SPI FB specs.

FS Funding

- Michelle-
 - MAC project is on our ENF Program of Work so staff should have capacity to weigh in - we focused our capacity to MAC and the other 9 projects that made the POW. Anyway, don't feel like you have to take a backseat because our capacity is lacking. The POW helps decide where we prioritize capacity.
 - Won't know for a couple more months about funding
 - Effort for Prop 4 funding proposal for Consumnes, Mokelumne watershed
- Admin WG- get topic on Feb. GM agenda
- Michael- working under assumption that there will be continued broad support for forest resilience/ fuels reduction work. Completed NEPA will make projects more competitive. So, see MAC is critical and faster that we can get it done is critical.

Meeting Participants

#	Name	Affiliation
1	Megan Layhee	UMRWA, meeting facilitator
2	Carinna Robertson	STF, Calaveras RD
3	Chris Shull	Mason Bruce Girard
4	Chuck Loffland	ENF, Amador RD
5	Hannah Grabowski	SPI
6	Jeff Mabe	ENF
7	Stan Dodson	CSERC
8	Matt Brown	ENF
9	Kelsey Retich	STF, Calaveras RD
10	Rich Farrington	AWA, UMRWA Board
11	Marc Young	ENF
12	Michael Jow	STF
13	Ray Cablayan	STF, Calaveras RD
14	Michelle Wolfgang	ENF