**April ACCG Monitoring WG Meeting**

**Wednesday, April 9, 2025**

**9:00 AM**

**Attendance:** Zac Croyle, Matt Brown, Stan Dodson, Tom Hofstra, Megan Layhee, Helen Loffland, Chuck Loffland, Ty McCarthy, Sue Britting, Michelle Wolfgang, Kaitlyn Garber, Ben Campbell

**Video Recording:** [Location on Box](https://usfs.box.com/s/poobmqpkifg2vkl4b2nm0pxloacyb1ex)

**General Updates/Update from Past Meetings:**

* Schedule for developing Monitoring Strategy in 2025:
	+ Next meeting, May 14th, tentatively in Jackson. Room isn’t available after 12:30pm on those dates, so right now location is TBD. **Becky, Ty, Megan- determine if we end meeting at 12:30 or find another location.**
	+ Workshops will be hybrid. Goal for May-July workshops is to be hybrid, ideally in person with a goal to establish key questions and indicators, metrics and remaining metadata to have a draft monitoring strategy developed by the end of the calendar.
	+ Break in August and September 2025.
	+ Oct. and Nov. 2025- Hold workshops to draft preliminary proposal and engage in iterative drafting and review of strategy plan.
* **Becky- coordinate with Chuck to get meeting owl ahead of May meeting. Chuck will be in Italy that week.**
* Red Fir Treatment effectiveness (Becky)– draft report is out for review with the Forest Health and Protection group. Anticipate presenting final report to Monitoring WG and the full group. Next up- remote sending validation and mixed conifer monitoring.

**MAC Monitoring Strategy – Guiding Questions**

* SMART Criteria: specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound
* CFLRP Strategy Key Lessons: keep it simple, standardize indicators, emphasize landscape-scale monitoring, improve adaptive management, and reduce redundancy.
* CFLRP Key Lesson, Emphasize landscape-scale monitoring: Get clarity from Becky on what the emphasize landscape-scale monitoring, and how the temporal aspect should be considered.
	+ Is this insinuating we should be monitoring outside of the project area? Like with control sites outside of treatment units…
	+ Prioritize monitoring that can be scaled up to landscape level, combined project areas, and provide longer term trend data and impacts to larger landscape through time.
* Should be looking at data sources available before developing questions?
	+ May miss ways to synthesize results if we only focus on developing question on data we have available.
	+ Iterative process- as we develop questions, we think how to make it more specific based on the data available.
	+ Starting with the question, as there are often new or innovative ways to use existing data, modeling, or developing tools/data sources.
* How many questions should we have? This will probably be iterative to get to our final number of questions. Suggestion was 2 questions per theme. Also, suggestion to have work group send important questions and then maybe rank them.
* Questions should harken back to the purpose and need statement. Should the themes be the purpose and need components?
* Tie questions to desired condition, which will get to the adaptative management. Concern was also raised about if desired conditions are too nebulous, but others pointed that we should used the MAC NEPA proposed action desired conditions that will be specific to help drive these questions, and will be specific to treatment type, forest type, ecological conditions, etc.
* Discussion about whether we could reduce the 5 Forest Resilience questions. Argument for leaving them as is. Another comment, question 4 is more a social question and that question 2 and 5 should be combined. Sticking to common metrics (e.g., fuel loading, canopy cover) can provide information to address other questions, like increasing forest health.
* The purpose of the land allocation will drive the desired condition.  Fuel breaks purpose to slow fire, and deploy suppression resources safely and reduce fire size, on the general landscape we're looking to create more resilient/resistant landscape less prone to large scale high severity fires... Different for PACs/Territories/HRCAs where both protecting but also retaining high quality habitat, and species occupancy through time.
* **Ty- put questions on the Monitoring Box site and ask group to provide comments, edits ahead of May workshop**

**MAC Monitoring Strategy- Approach and Critical Path**

* **Ty, Megan, Becky- Review current questions and run them through the SMART criteria. Send out to work group 1-2 weeks ahead of May meeting.**
* Wildlife/Habitat theme – update to “Biodiversity”
* Check any changes to Purpose and Need (removal of meadow restoration) from monitoring question.

**Updates from the Group:**

**Matt**

* ENF Botany program task in MAC project going to existing rare plant population monitoring, especially ones that they haven’t visited in 10+ years.
* Also doing annual invasive plants treatments,
* Matt and Sue will coordinate to see the CNPS Eldorado Chapter.