

# ACCG | Admin Meeting | July 8, 2021

## Action Items

Actions	Responsible Parties
<p><b>Speakers</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop and issue press release (very similar to previous releases). Give Admin WG a day to review.</li> <li>• Hold prep sessions w/ July panelists; Connect with Tania prior to July 21 General Meeting w/ questions or takeaways from prep session w/ speakers.</li> <li>• Coordinate w/ Alissa Fogg to confirm if Megan can extend Monitoring WG meeting invite to full ACCG for her presentation (that's been rescheduled to occur at a Monitoring WG meeting instead of the General Meeting)</li> <li>• Add to a future Planning WG agenda: revisit what TEK issues might be of high interest and timely for the ACCG (e.g., integrating TEK with pyrosilviculture?)</li> </ul>	Megan
<p><b>In-Person / Hybrid Meetings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continue to research venues with high-quality/reliant AV capabilities to support a virtual participation option.</li> </ul>	Megan
<p><b>MOA Signatory Status</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Continue to reach out to two signatories who have not attended the General Meetings since December 2020 to explore <u>why</u> their participation has dropped (e.g., zoom aversion, project-specific interest, etc.) and desired path forward; report back to Admin WG and at General Meeting.</li> <li>2. Richard S to reach out to Terry W to explore Alpine County BOS' interest to become MOA signatory and/or how to broaden outreach to other BOS.</li> </ol>	<p>1. Regine</p> <p>2. Richard S</p>
<p><b>ACCG Administrative and Facilitation Support</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop presentation summarizing recommendations based on survey responses, Planning WG input, and Admin WG discussions.</li> </ul>	CBI

## Other Next Steps / Notes

*(Due to lower-than-usual attendance, more detailed meeting notes are provided below):*

### Materials

Agenda:

01-July 8, 2021 ACCG Administrative Work Group Meeting Agenda

Supporting documents:

- 02-DRAFT Agenda ACCG General Meeting July 21, 2021
- 03-DRAFT ACCG Press Release – July 21st panel
- 04-ACCG future facilitation and admin options

### Updates on upcoming presentations/panels

- **July 21<sup>st</sup>, 2021, Virtual Herbicide Alternatives Panel** (via Zoom): (Dan Macon; Sean Kriletich; Dr Robert York) –
  - Panelists confirmed; prep sessions scheduled. Megan can follow up with Tania (who’s on vacation next week) about remaining questions and key takeaways from the prep calls.
  - Draft press release is very similar to previous versions; however, due to low attendance, allow the Admin WG a day to review the press release.
  - Due to schedule conflicts, Alissa Fogg (presenting on indirect effects of herbicide treatments on birds) will occur at Monitoring WG meeting instead; possibly extend invite to full ACCG.
- **August 18 and September presentations** – speakers confirmed.
- **Future TBD topics: Traditional Ecological Knowledge (TEK).** Previously CHIPS planned to share insights from cultural burning; however, CHIPS does not yet have sufficient info to share. Megan can bring this topic to the Planning WG to revisit TEK topics of interest. Given recent efforts by the pyrosilviculture subcommittee, perhaps connecting TEK with using fire as a restoration tool and how that may contribute to increase pace and scale goals.

### General Meeting Agenda

- No additional comments to draft agenda

### Discuss future, in-person 2021 General Meetings

- ACCG members have expressed interest in meeting in person; while there is also a desire to retain the benefits that virtual participation offers. In-person often supports more relationship-building and engaging discussions; and allows those who do not have the technical capabilities / resources to participate via phone or internet. Virtual participation benefits those who normally can’t attend in person (e.g., travel logistics), which has broadened the number and diversity of guest speakers and expertise; and offers additional travel cost/time-savings.
- CHIPS and CBI have been discussing and researching different hybrid meeting design options and venues that could support a hybrid set up. One of the biggest challenges is ensuring the quality for virtual participation (stable internet, good sound quality, etc.). Expectations for quality virtual participation options are higher than pre-COVID (where hybrid meetings often did not prioritize quality of virtual participation equally to in person). Whichever venues we select, we should conduct dry runs to ensure the AV operates smoothly for our meeting design.
- County buildings may offer good options (Board chambers have had to adjust to support remote participation and likely have upgrade AV systems, have clear COVID safety protocols, free of cost to use for ACCG, etc.). Would be nice to know if venues have dedicated IT staff who can help problem solve.
- At the June meeting, federal agencies stated they’re unsure if they can attend in-person meetings in the near term (leadership has not given clear direction to date).

- Given that the July-September speakers have been scheduled, some organizations do not have clear COVID policy direction yet, and the meeting logistics are still being researched, the Admin WG members indicated they would rather maintain the original meeting approach for July-September. The group should continue to explore and plan for transitioning to offer both in-person and virtual participation options for October and November.

**[Admin WG Recommendation]:** Continue to meet virtually through September, meanwhile continue to explore hybrid meeting design options, and aim to transition to support in-person options in October. Also ask entities like USFS and BLM to periodically update the group on their organization's COVID policies.

### MOA Signatory Status

- No new signatories since USFS signed.
- Per revised MOA membership attendance requirements (Admin WG will discuss how to address signatories who have not attended a General Meeting in the last 6 months). Three individuals have not attended in past 6 months. CHIPS reached out last month; they have heard back from one of the three entities.
- Report back on conversation with that person: The individual stated that they still have a strong interest to remained involved, but they were finding the virtual meeting tech challenging and would be interested in reengaging once in-person options are available again. CHIPS confirmed with the individual that ACCG isn't proposing to remove signatories who have been absent for more than 6 months – the group is still researching and reaching out to these signatories to better understand potential barriers to participation and explore what might help attendance.
- The other two entities that have not yet responded to voice mails may be preoccupied with the busy field work season.
- Richard S offered to connect with Terry Woodrow to discuss interest/opportunities for fostering more County Boards' participation.

### Continue Discussion on Future ACCG Administrative and Facilitation Support

- CHIPS/CBI worked with the Admin WG to develop initial recommendations last month; the Planning WG discussed and agreed with the recommendation for a moderate level of facilitation support for the Planning WG (e.g., professional facilitator is not needed to attend each Planning WG meeting, but will help with regular planning discussions and available if needed for more complex issues).
- Reminder to separate the roles/responsibilities from the current individuals staffing them. If there are different individuals/groups taking on new roles and responsibilities after 2021, CBI and CHIPS committed to help ensure a smooth and responsible transition.
- Other entities used to provide the facilitation and admin support (e.g., Foothill Conservancy), so transitioning roles to new ACCG members is not unprecedented and aligns with the ACCG's goal to expand its self-capacity. However, reminder that the scope of activities and complexity has increased over the years (particularly with increased scale of projects and increased competition for funding).
- Consider that some of the ACCG Administrator's current responsibilities may be allocated across multiple individuals (e.g., one individual willing to facilitate Planning WG meetings, but not manage the day-to-day administrative tasks).

- The July meeting won't be the last opportunity for the full ACCG to provide input on future administrative and facilitation support. Discussions will continue into August. Given several agencies' funding and contracting cycles, suggest aiming to have sufficient details fleshed out by September to potentially pursue grant funding.

**[Admin WG Recommendation]:** Objectives for July General Meeting presentation and discussion – elicit initial feedback on the recommendations; reach shared understanding on the next steps and process for fine-tuning future administrative and facilitation support; and ask members to begin considering what tasks they might take on and potential funding mechanisms. Continue these discussions at August meeting.

## Conference Call Participants

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Time (Hours)
Sue	Holper	ACCG	1.5
Megan	Layhee	Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions	1.5
Regine	Miller	Calaveras Healthy Impact Product Solutions	1.5
Tania	Carlone	Consensus Building Institute	1.5
Stephanie	Horii	Consensus Building Institute	1.5
Richard	Sykes	Upper Mokelumne River Watershed Authority	1.5