

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Forest Plan Amendments (FPP Phase 2) Ad Hoc Meeting Summary, 2/13/2023

Action Items

Actions	Point Person(s)
Ad hoc group next steps: tentatively hold next Ad hoc meeting April 10 th after ENF/STF leadership team meeting on the direction of FPP Phase 2.	All
Send SPI Habitat Conservation plan link to Megan.	Luke
Have internal discussions with Phase 2 core team about 2023 surveys needed.	Loffland
Communicate meeting take-aways to FS leadership and Phase 2 team.	FS staff in attendance
Get status update on guest presentations on modeling approaches to be hosted at the ACCG general meetings. Request a component of each presentation be about their	Layhee

Agenda Review, Ad Hoc Next Steps

The Ad Hoc group met via Zoom. The group confirmed the agenda and approved last month's draft ad hoc meeting summary.

Phase 2 update

Group reviewed the draft Phase 2 partnership diagram and reviewed what was discussed at the January Planning work group meeting in regards to Phase 2. A point of clarification was made about how the Ad hoc group and other groups interact. At this time, it is not exactly clear how the Phase 2 team will order this process, but in theory the core team (e.g., UMRWA/FS) would vet various components of the project through the TAG first, then, present to the Stakeholder group and Planning work group, and the Ad Hoc would convene the following month to review and discuss that component of the project to bring back to the Planning work group.

The group also discussed that without having the FS leadership convene and determine the Phase 2 direction, it's difficult to have our Ad Hoc discussions. Some of the possible scenarios the Phase 2 direction could go, pointed out by John B., are:

1. 1 project, 2 districts
2. 1 analysis, 2+ RODs with different components (e.g., amendments)
3. 2 analyses, 2+ RODs with different components (e.g., amendments)

And that it's also unclear if there is any room for modification/changes to the SERAL framework for at least the STF portion of Phase 2, or if Phase 2 on the STF has to strictly adhere to SERAL. Carinna added that there might be another way to frame that – that is there any ways to redefine SERAL, not add to it. ENF staff in attendance reiterated that they would like to know of any “non-starter” amendments for the ACCG.

Potential Phase 2 Forest Plan Amendments: Discussion continued

- Retirement of PACs: Group discussed specifics of 3 vs. 5 years of surveys, and protocol surveys vs. ARU's. Kelsey mentioned that in her initial analyses there are 57 PACs on the STF Calaveras RD and 16 of those have not been surveyed since the 1990's. Luke provided details on SPI's PAC

Amador-Calaveras Consensus Group (ACCG)

Forest Plan Amendments (FPP Phase 2) Ad Hoc Meeting Summary, 2/13/2023

retirement process -- under the direction of their [Spotted Owl Habitat Conservation Plan](#), including 3 years of protocol surveys followed by 2 years of pre-implementation surveys, using occupancy data to determine whether to retire a PAC. The group came to an agreement on the following approach to a Phase 2 PAC retirement amendment. However, it was noted that the treatments proposed in, and management of, these retired PACs, needs further discussion and may be linked to other amendments.

- Retirement allowed after 5 years of surveys (e.g., protocol-surveys, using ARUs as an additive tool) indicating non-occupancy by CSO (e.g., territorial singles, pairs).
- Territory/HRCAs and PAC delineation: discussion centered around the issue of designating circular territories instead of staying consistent with the 2004 framework. This conversation led to a discussion about this being an example of a topic where a slight modification to the SERAL amendment may not be enough to reach consensus in the ACCG, but that without knowing the Phase 2 direction from FS leadership, it makes having these discussions especially difficult.

Next steps

The Ad Hoc group discussed whether it would be of value to continue discussions in March on other Phase 2 topics (e.g., NRV vs. SDI, condition based NEPA) instead of amendments, as we wait for the FS leadership team meeting to happen. It was suggested that for the topic of desired conditions that we request a component of each guest presentation on the different modeling approaches be to touch on how they would characterize desired conditions, and use those guest presentations to help guide this discussion in particular. The group agreed to not have a March 2023 meeting, and, instead to tentatively meet on April 10th, assuming the FS leadership team meeting has happened.

Meeting Participants

#	Name	Affiliation	Hours
1	Megan Layhee	ACCG Administrator (facilitator)	2.0
2	Rich Farrington	UMRWA Board	1.0
3	John Buckley	CSERC	2.0
4	Stan Dodson	CSERC	2.0
5	Chuck Loffland	ENF, Amador RD	2.0
6	Carinna Robertson	STF, Calaveras RD	2.0
7	Sue Britting	Sierra Forest Legacy	2.0
8	Brian Brown	ENF	2.0
9	Kelsey Retich	STF, Calaveras RD	2.0
10	Luke Wagner	SPI	2.0