

Science & Monitoring Team Meeting

September 12, 2012

Attendees: Gali Beh, Leslie Ellwood (USFWS), Rob Addington (CFRI), Claudia Regan (RO), Greg Applet (TWS), Jenny Briggs (USGS), Rich Edwards (CSFS), Hal Gibbs, Dick Edwards, Lynne Deibel, Peter Brown (Rocky Mtn Tree), Casey Cooley (Colorado State), Lori Huckabee

- CFLR Monitoring Protocols (Hal)
 - Status of Wildlife Monitoring Sub-team (Lynne)
 - Proposed New Name for Team/Work Group Restructuring
 - Updates to work plan
-
- CFLR Monitoring Protocols (Hal):
 - At the end of July, the Washington Office (WO) sent information about the national CFLR monitoring protocols. Hal will send the document out to the team through Gali. In October, we need to discuss further and decide how to move forward
 - ☞ There are 5 monitoring areas associated with CFLR
 - Collaboration
 - Measure of how well the collaborative is working. They won't monitor at the national level; we will monitor at project level. Kathy is already working on something with that via interviews, etc.
 - Leveraged funds/Jobs and economic indicator
 - Every year, we have to put together annual report. The WO will collect and create a document of CFLR expended funds, non-CFLR matching funds, and partner funds brought in.
 - Job/economic: have spreadsheet that data is entered into that cranks out a number (treat model). We send off how many acres were treated and what was turned into various products. The WO spreadsheet formulates the number of jobs created. Only 3 people in the Forest Service have permission to operate the spreadsheet, so numbers are submitted and other folks accumulate and get a value. At local level, we will get a lot more information than that and do a more local level analysis.
 - Fire cost
 - RCAT Model: Tool that figures out how fire costs might change as treatments are completed. Each project is scheduled to provide information/GIS data to Missoula to inform the national team about fire costs. Aaron Ortega of the PSICC is coordinating to provide data, but our project hasn't been scheduled yet.
 - Ecology
 - Tracking and reporting guidance paper will be distributed
 - Goal of protocol is to assess ecological outcomes of CFLR projects relevant to individual collaborative groups. Each

collaborative will have different objectives, but will have to merge them at the national level to make 1 objective

- The first report is due in FY14 (5-year report)
- We probably have through this winter to determine what we need to derive to feed into project
- Desired conditions: collaboratives must identify desired conditions for 4 areas – fire regime restoration, fish & wildlife habitat condition, watershed condition, and invasive species severity; the WO has suggested protocols for all

- ☞ Fire regime restoration: Desired condition should identify objectives for restoring fire behavior characteristics and/or forest structure important to fire behavior within the NRV for each landscape

- 7 or 8 items for each one
- Going to figure out how national format fits into percentage and what it really means; will require time and thought with team
- Landscape level scoring (good, fair, or poor): Good = Expected progress being made toward desired conditions of % of CFLR area; Fair = Same with different percentage; Poor = Same with different percentage. Will use 3, 5, 7, and 10 year data.
- Project-scale scoring: Good = 75% or more of implemented treatments results in measurable progress in individual project level desired conditions; Fair = 26-74%; Poor = 25% or less
- How to make a report that was meaningful at national level – middle ground between “hard data” and “soft feeling” of group.

- ☞ Fish & Wildlife habitat condition: desired conditions within indicator should identify the species or suite of species presumed to be associated with the habitat in question – clearly articulate structural and compositional components of those habitats that should be present

- ☞ Watershed condition: utilize watershed classification and tracking tool; overall score (project proposal that didn't address watershed or water quality, function doesn't have to be addressed)

- Terrestrial habitat is a small consideration in tracking tool of the watershed; unlikely we would have major change
- Guidance provides opportunity to pull portion of tool out; may just pull

terrestrial or fire component out. Need to discuss further

- ☞ Invasive species: restoration outcome for unit's program and address infestation or improving resilience of site. Restoration performance will be summarized in performance accountability system for all invasive species treatments conducted within landscape
 - Need to look at it in terms of what we want to set as objectives; we talk about invasive species in proposal – if fewer large fires, have fewer invasive species. There is no specific objective to address invasive species.
 - Monitoring understory plants – specific to treatment area, but not at landscape level
 - Different scoring system for invasive species
- National format for reporting at landscape level: desired conditions targets for "x" (all 4 reporting areas) blank change relative to desired conditions occurs across blank percent across landscape area by blank date
- The WO provided a common national glossary of 7 terms, which include: CFLR landscape, project level, landscape, treatment area, desired condition, indicator, and metric.
- ☞ The Forest Service determined how to address at national level; local level has flexibility on how to monitor, but some will have to fit into national protocols
- ☞ Next steps:
 - More in depth discussion of individual indicators and determine how to address them. We may need a group to address each one. We should talk about this in October because everyone will have had a chance to review the letter and guidance
 - Talk about what objectives are and how to fit in with protocol
 - Figure out desired condition of each in terms of how to report it up
 - If more data collection needed, have to figure out how to get that done. Should occur by spring to monitor in field season.
 - Jenny will send year-1 report
 - Key indicators for October – may need longer meetings in future months
- ☞ We do the ranking; report whether we're doing good/fair/poor
- ☞ The WO hasn't said what the format will be, but they will send out another letter with more information.
- ☞ Trying to gauge success of program overall came forward after legislation was passed. Attempting to determine whether it is a good program or not. Brand new methods; consistent with evolution of program
- ☞ Desired conditions for economic impact component? Group hasn't defined any; the desired condition is having more jobs and better economic conditions, but there isn't any baseline data to look for a desired condition. There is nothing to indicate if money invested is

“new money” or “recolored”. Economic portion of monitoring plan has yet to be determined.

- ☞ The \$10,000-15,000 that was offered to help collaboratives determine desired conditions was used to run the Roundtable
 - ☞ Do you distinguish the degree to which the money is “recolored”? No, the forest just reports on how much money was spent, which includes CFLR matching and NFS funds spent; a database tells us what to report. The only thing we add is what money comes from partners, which is very general. Hal will send out annual report to Gali to distribute so the group can see what numbers go into it right now.
 - ☞ Report was submitted by Jenny Briggs for supplemental grant that has information that might help. By November, year-1 and year-2 data can be shared with the group. Wildlife, understory, stand structure, etc. in supplemental grant, some which might fit into metrics that are required nationally. The landscape was not very large. Need \$6,000 to hire someone to keep the monitoring going into out-years.
- CLFR Wildlife Monitoring: 3 goals - Narrow species considered major indicator to determine what expect species to do
 - Held kick off meeting in April/May
 - Need team leader
 - Workload issues – Craig may be available at times to provide history
 - Set goals, what direction want to proceed, information from national level is timely
 - Rick would be happy to participate and contribute, but he doesn’t want to lead the team or be a “task master”
 - Is it necessary to have a lead for project? Can there be co-leads or points of contact with one person holding it together? This could shift some of the burden around by splitting the leading duties up amongst several people
 - Since is it Forest Service driven, Forest Service biologists should be the leaders of the group
 - Gali – Happy to make action plan/work plan, but won’t take notes for the group
 - Pull sub-team together within next couple weeks to month to discuss logistics – lead/leads should be on Science & Monitoring team
 - Who wants to/needs to be involved in smaller subgroup – Casey, Hal, Felix, Lynne, Leslie, Leeba Goldstein, Rick, Claudia, Jenny, Gali
 - Next steps: Set up Doodle
 - Workgroup restructuring: Proposal – instead of 4 workgroups, there will be 3: BUS team will continue (Craig and Jon Johnson leads), Outreach & Policy disbanded – policy issues will be addressed within each sub-teams, Community Protection (used to be IM Team), and Landscape Restoration (used to be SM Team)
 - Expand executive team with a representative from each working group – Megan Davis is community protection representative, Carol Ekarius will serve as new treasurer role on executive team, Pam Motley will be representative/liaison for Landscape Restoration team
 - Relationship of sub-teams to each other and leadership? (Bin Item)
 - The collaborative that is discussed in proposal is the Roundtable. The RT could decide to make Landscape team its representative, but we would have to get Roundtable to make that decision. This could be a discussion item, but at this time the Roundtable is identified as the collaborative for CFLRP.
 - The Landscape Restoration group will report to the Roundtable
 - Formalize decision making process for sub-teams (Bin Item)
 - Team will have to provide a document prior to Roundtable meetings

- The final proposal is on the website, so if people need to review it to see how fire regimes were integrated into the proposal, you can access it there.
- Provide narrative to go with the diagram, implications for decisions in diagram. Could inform the development of true decision making process
- *Update work plan:*
 - *Establishing plots: Collected 72 plots half-hectare plots this summer; trying to get samples, cores, and plots. 12 plots between Manitou (experimental forest) and 6 plots east of Woodland Park, other plots on BCOS*
 - ☞ *Next steps: data analysis presentation after new year – end of March*
 - *CFRI data: In the field still doing monitoring of post-fire – supplied portion of data to Ben/Tony. Hal will schedule meeting w/ Ben/Dave/Dick to figure out where we are.*
 - *Summer studies: Finished working on data from 2011; data entry and analysis for 2012 data. Will present year 1 and year 2 data at October meeting*
 - *Ecological monitoring requirements: completed*
 - *GIS database: waiting for prior step; shape files or uploaded to myUSGS database?*
 - *Analyzing data for study: After Ben gets FS data finalized and Jenny finalizes data, then will hold mtg to go over all of it*
 - *Exploring CFLR monitoring – what social info and public engagement needs most relevant: Put on December schedule for RT*
 - *Drop fire cost task*
 - *Upward reporting on collaboration: progressing*
 - *Sub-team around framework for landscape scale monitoring: progressing*
 - *Presenting breakdown of costs for CFLR monitoring: Try to get something together by October or November*
 - *Hear from Yvette, Jenny, Kathy, Hal, 4 national indicator discussion, decision making process for CFLR (October/November mtg agenda topics); pre-reading material, come to meeting ready to vote. October 10th meeting will be from 9:00-3:00, November mtg will be 10:00-2:00. October agenda: national indicators, CFLR decision making authority, October and November 14 (Yvette, Kathy, Jenny (Nov))*
 - *Adaptive Mgmt: Narrative to accompany diagram. New deadline – October and then to RT for Nov/Dec*
 - *High Park fire: Kathy liaison for High Park*
 - *Hal will describe monitoring and data methods for 2012: Drop into existing monitoring plan – may need to print it or change on website. Addendum to plan will be posted to website. Deadline: Sept. 30*
 - *Understory group: Revisit goal*
 - *Wildlife group check-in: completed*
 - *Addendum to CFLR monitoring plan: In Progress*
 - *Intro/Overview rewrite for CFLR plan: Looking for volunteer*
 - *2 variable – Discuss in Nov/Dec.*
 - *FS move data to myUSGS – Oct. 31*
 - *Protocols for data collection and storage – Completed*
 - *Job description for data entry volunteer work – Paige will post after receipt*
 - *Outline: Next step - to SM Team*