



**Summary Notes
February 26, 2008
SNAMP Q3 meeting
Merced Tri-College, Merced**

UCST Attendees: John Battles, Philip Saksa, Sarah Martin, Ann Huber, Sheila Whitmore, Vince Berigan, Doug Tempel, Martha Conklin, Adriana Sulak, Marek Jakubowski, Anne Lombardo, Scott Stephens, Kevin Krasnow, Hong Yu, Kim Rodrigues, Rick Sweitzer, Reg Barrett, Lynn Huntsinger, Roger Bales, Susie Kocher (Susie will be UCST in April)

MOUP Attendees: Frank Gehrke (DWR), Mike Chapel (USFS), Karen Jones (USFS), Dave Martin (USFS), Crawford Tuttle (CalFire, afternoon session only)

Public Attendees in afternoon session: Sue Britting and Darca Morgan from The Sierra Forest Legacy

SUMMARY OF KEY AGREEMENTS

- 1) MOU attendees agree that Q3 MOUP report with Table 2 (which shows specific funding sources and amounts) can be shared with public.
- 2) UCST and MOU members present agree on importance of public participation work and support idea behind PPT proposal for updated PPT budget.
- 3) Agreement to move forward with updated PPT budget plan for one year since there is currently enough funding in Year 2 budget. Plan may be modified for future years based on results of needs assessment.
- 4) MOU members present at meeting believe additional funds for PPT work is a good fit for foundation funding.
- 5) Agreement between UCST and MOU members present to suggested process for new funding requests.
- 6) UCST and MOUP members present define roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of Grants Team
- 7) UCST and MOUP members present define roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of MOUP Support Team
- 8) USFS fire crews can help with road clearing in the northern site for specific areas identified by Owl Team. Owl team will communicate directly with Karen next field season.
- 9) MOUP members present and UCST support the creation and purpose of the Integration Team. Agreement that a clear road map towards achieving a truly adaptive management process needs to be developed.

- 10) Agreement to hold a 2 hour annual SNAMP meeting with agency decision makers to bring them up to speed on SNAMP. Suggested time for meeting is in November.

SUMMARY OF ACTION ITEMS

- 1) John will revise Table 2 to include 300K USFS contribution of plane expenses before posting report to SNAMP website.
- 2) Mike will forward PPT funding plan to MOUP to seek advice on PPT's proposal and solicit feedback from MOUP on suggested process for new funding requests. (Done)
- 3) Between now and next quarterly meeting, UCST will clearly identify to MOUP any work needing additional funding, why it is needed, and what additional benefits will be gained. At next quarterly meeting (Q1 2008) MOUP and UCST will report on this issue.
- 4) Defined roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of Grants Team will be reviewed by rest of MOUP at next Q.5 meeting.
- 5) Defined roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of MOUP Support Team will be reviewed by rest of MOUP at next Q.5 meeting.
- 6) Kim and Anne L. will work with each PI to identify possible indicators of interest to begin discussion on Integration Team. Forest (FFEH) or Fisher teams will be first.
- 7) Scott will let Dave Martin know if they intend to use Westfall bug lab next summer.
- 8) Lynn will share with Reg any local history information they have collected so far for southern site.

MEETING NOTES

Morning Session 10:30 - 12pm

I. Status of Budget

- A. John gives summary of current status of budget
 - Year 2 is fully funded, Year 3 has deficit.
 - UC second biggest contribution to SNAMP with its no cost extension agreement. Have pending DFG grant, contingent on UC Merced accepting waiver. Will apply to Sierra Nevada Conservancy for Year 3. MOUP report Table 2 was added to Q3 MOUP report by Beth Pendleton's request. Resources Law Group said they would give SNAMP a small amount.
 - Mike states how difficult the execution of the delivery of funding has been for this project. John adds that the cost sharing elements make things complicated.

KEY AGREEMENT: MOU attendees agree that Q3 MOUP report with Table 2 (which shows specific funding sources and amounts) can be shared with public.

ACTION ITEM: John will revise Table 2 to include 300K USFS contribution of plane expenses before posting report to SNAMP website.

B. Updated PPT Budget

- PPT handed out summary of funding request ('Outreach funding proposal.doc').

- Request for approximately \$24,000 addition per year to cover a half-time Program Representative to conduct outreach at the northern site, and a half-time UCCE Advisor position to conduct a needs assessment and supervise both Program Representatives at the northern and southern sites.
- This request is a result of the SNAMP project requiring more effort than anticipated. Kim expressed that it was difficult to conduct all that SNAMP requires on top of her full time job. She would continue her PI work on the Public Participation Team, but new advisor position would lead outreach efforts.
- Carryforward from Year 1 will cover these needs for Year 2, but additional funding will be needed for 2009 and subsequent years. This is a short term plan in place for one year, then change plans according to results of needs assessment.
- Sierra Nevada Conservancy and Resources Law Group were suggested organizations that could be asked to help fund it.

KEY AGREEMENTS:

- UCST and MOU members present support idea behind PPT proposal for updated PPT budget.
- Agreement to move forward with updated PPT budget plan for one year since there is currently enough funding in Year 2 budget. Plan may be modified for future years based on results of needs assessment.
- MOU members present at meeting believe additional funds for PPT work is a good fit for foundation funding.

C. UCST requests for increased funding

Meeting attendees agree to suggested process for new UCST funding requests:

1. Unless all MOUP agencies are in attendance at the meeting, the proposal will be sent to all MOUP members for their concurrence.
 2. If the MOUP agrees that the proposal has merit, the proposal will be forwarded to the Grants Team. The Grants Team will be asked to secure funding for the new proposal.
 3. If funding is found, it will be used to pay for the new work. If funding is not found, the MOUP/UCST will work together to consider if there is existing work that might be adjusted to provide additional funding for the new proposal.
 4. If no new funding is identified, the proposed new work will be denied.
- Mike believes that Beth would support the PPT proposal. His sense is that it would be something for which the Grants Team could find a source of funding.
 - John says if hard limits to funding are reached in the future, it would be very difficult to decide what to cut, as the easy cuts have already been made (cuts to admin budget). Hopes that other solutions would also be explored, ways to reduce cost, such as not being charged rent (on FS property).
 - Frank supportive of the public participation work, it is key to the whole project. He believes it fits well with a lot of grants being solicited; good match for foundations.

The following were discussed earlier in the meeting:

- Kim stresses the importance that UCST communicate to funders the benefits of acquiring increased funding when gaps are identified, the cost, and what is lost if the gaps are not met.
- Kim stated that the public at Q2 sensed that the MOUP fund-raising arm needs to develop a long term support strategy. Need to address how the grants team or core support team will address this.
- FFEH request presented at Q1 for extra \$20,000 because of need for Cedar Valley data has not been paid and no source has been identified yet.

KEY AGREEMENTS:

- UCST and MOU members present support idea behind PPT budget request. MOU members present at meeting believe it is a good fit for foundation funding.
- Agreement between UCST and MOU members present to suggested process for new funding requests.

ACTION ITEMS:

- Mike will forward PPT funding plan to MOUP to seek advice on PPT's proposal and solicit feedback from MOUP on suggested process for new funding requests. (Done)
- Between now and next quarterly meeting, UCST will clearly identify to MOUP any work needing additional funding, why it is needed, and what additional benefits will be gained. At next quarterly meeting (Q1 2008) MOUP and UCST will report on this issue.

II. Grants team update

- By request, Mike gives an overview of what the purpose of the Grants Team is, its current members, and relationship to UCST
 1. Role: sort out the field of private donors, how to approach them, etc. Charged with seeking funding support for SNAMP work plan.
 2. Responsibility: to apply and find private funding to support SNAMP Work Plan. The MOUPs are responsible. (John states that UCST has never accepted a role to be on Grants Team.)
 3. Relationships: UCST support
 4. Current Members: Cay Goude, Amy Fesnock, Crawford Tuttle, Beth Pendleton, Peter Stine, Mike Chapel, Keith Gillless (CNR Interim Dean), and Todd Ferrara (proposed).
- Funding for SNAMP project initially agreed between MOU and UC that it would have diverse funding in order to prevent a perception of conflict of interest between UCST and USFS. Funding sources would include federal and state agencies and outside sources (non-governmental). USFS has now committed almost \$1.5 million a year.
- Current foundations the grants team is approaching and/or working with already include Pew Charitable Trusts, The Packard Foundation (which is leaning toward a small but consistent contribution), Sierra Nevada Conservancy, Resources Law Group, and Rockefeller Family Fund. Challenging work. Illegal for federal employees to ask for money.
- Long term funding strategy. Discussion about suggestion from public at Q2 (Steve Self, Sue Britting, others?) that the Grants Team work on long term funding strategy to address future gaps in funding (that is planned for foundation / outside support). Mike believes we already have a long term funding strategy in place. Science team members believe MOUP should give a response to the public and should ask them what they want (in terms of a long-term funding strategy). No next step identified.

KEY AGREEMENT: UCST and MOUP members present define roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of Grants Team

NEXT STEP: Defined roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of Grants Team will be reviewed by rest of MOUP at next Q.5 meeting.

III. MOUP raise issues – a chance for MOUP members to raise any issues they would like to discuss.

MOUP core support team discussion

- Purpose: Logistical support for MOU meetings with science team. Team created to help keep UCST meeting costs down, and provide support to Q.5 meetings. Also a way for SNAMP issues to get elevated above an individual agency.
- Members: Amy Fesnock, Dave Martin, Jan Cutts, Mike Chapel, Crawford Tuttle (Crawford has been asked but he has not given confirmation yet that he is on team)
- Duties : agenda development, logistics, meeting follow-up, as well as monitor SNAMP to make sure that communication and issue management are effective.
 - The core support team is not in any way attached to Grants team
 - Frank would like someone from the California Resources Agency on the team. That would be Todd Ferrara.

KEY AGREEMENT: UCST and MOUP members present define roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition of MOUP Support Team

NEXT STEP: MOUP Support Team roles, responsibilities, relationships, and composition will be reviewed with MOUP and next Q.5 meeting.

IV. Science team logistical issues

- Scott – Housing at northern site needs to be addressed; still do not know if mold at French Meadows will prevent housing at barracks there. (This issue was addressed after meeting).
- Dave Martin – wants to know if science team intends to use “bug lab” at Westfall, which is intended for UCST to use as office space and they are paying DSL. Scott said they would let him know.

NEXT STEP: Scott will let Dave Martin know if they intend to use Westfall bug lab next summer.

- Owl Team concerned with storms, heavy winds, downed trees. Concerned they will be chain-sawing a lot of trees again. Would like to know when USFS crews can get in. Could identify specific areas that USFS crews could target. Karen Jones said that only fire crews would be available, and they don't come on board until May or June. Owl team should communicate with Karen first next season about road clearing, and then Karen will discuss with Jan.

KEY AGREEMENT: USFS fire crews can help with road clearing in the northern site for specific areas identified by Owl Team. Owl team will communicate directly with Karen next field season.

- PPT presents matrix for evaluating meetings to MOUP, as a way to standardize meeting evaluation and to get feedback on the meeting. Due to lack of time, Kim suggests we spend some time at next quarterly meeting to work through the matrix.

V. Update on Structured Facilitation Workshop / Integration Team

Kim discusses outcomes of February 20, 2008 workshop, which was a mini facilitation training and workshop on how to use facilitation methods in the Triggers and Thresholds (T/T) work. She shared the T/T name change to Integration Team (IT) and the newly defined role to work to close the gap on the left side of the AM circle. This is becoming an increasingly important topic as data is accumulating and the ability to identify “indicators” develops. Discussion produces the following.

- How to get from collecting scientific data to actually affecting management decisions?
- How to integrate with large decision makers within their constraints of budget, legislation, litigation and regulation?
- The adaptive management challenge is to take what is often internal and make it external by involving the public.
- Meetings will be open to MOUP, UCST and the public as a broad representation is essential. A meeting needs to be scheduled before Q4.
- We start the process knowing everyone has their own constraints and it will take a good deal of dialogue to work through everyone’s concerns.
 - Purpose/Role: To close the gap of the left hand side of the Adaptive Management circle, integrating scientific findings and mutual learning into management decisions
 - Composition: UCST, MOUP, and Interested Public Participants
 - Roles, Relationships, Responsibility: to be determined
- Kim states that to be frank the interested public wants joint decision making. Her sense is that support for this project is still very fragile. Working out the goals of the IT group is really important. How is learning shared, how is decision making changed within the Forest Service once they get results from the UCST. What the IT group is talking about is what happens after results are reported and the adaptive management part of the circle comes in to play. IT group will work on the adaptive management process necessary to make SNAMP a success.
- Mike supports the name change, and goals of the IT group. Some MOU members were not comfortable with the terms triggers and thresholds.
- UCST members express support the purpose of the IT group. Visualizing the adaptive management circle is helpful to identify what type of integration we are talking about (other kinds of integration with SNAMP include data integration, integration with public, etc.). Goals of IT group finally make sense to UCST, as framed in terms of the “left hand arrow” part of the AM circle. We also have better understanding what needs to be done and what’s at stake now then did before.

KEY AGREEMENT: MOUP members present and UCST support the creation and purpose of the Integration Team. A clear road map towards achieving a truly adaptive management process needs to be developed.

NEXT STEP: Kim and Anne L. will work with each PI to identify possible indicators of interest to begin discussion on Integration Team. Forest (FFEH) or Fisher teams will be first.

PUBLIC SESSION 1 – 4pm

I. Science Team Updates: All PowerPoint presentation slides available on SNAMP website.

Project Integration Team/John Battles

- Gave overview of work accomplished and new UCST – USFS timeline.

USFS Treatment schedule:

- Southern site: Sugar Pine timeline is September 2008 to snow 2010.
- Southern site: Fish Camp is scheduled for August 2010 until snow 2011.
- Northern site: Last Chance will occur June 2010 until snow 2011.
- Bear Trap is planned for August 2010 until snow 2011.

Water Team/Roger Bales

- There are four meteorological stations in place with data available on the California Data Exchange Website at <http://cdec.water.ca.gov>.
- Additional equipment is on order.
- Sediment basin permits are still in process as three agencies are involved.
- Yosemite High School science class will do a macro invertebrate study in the spring.
- There will be a summer intern through a National Science Foundation grant.
- Phil Saksa has joined the project as a research hydrologist.
- Working on setting up the modeling framework.
- Received partial year 1 funding from DWR, working on blanket agreement for balance and coming years.
- Both sites: Pre- treatment data collection 2008 – 2010 with monitoring continuing through out SPLAT implementation.
- Both sites: Post treatment data will be collected from snow 2011 until 7/2014..

Spatial/Qinghua Guo:

- The southern site lidar data in and paid for!
- Draft Lidar review posted to SNAMP website.
- Lidar data set large and computationally expensive. Data will be made public or explained as to why it can not be released.
- Developing methods to extract elevation and detailed vegetation structures (crown closure and tree heights etc.).
- UCST will discuss costs and benefits of Lidar flight at northern site to include Owl buffer area.
- A question was brought up about whether Lidar is being considered for the fisher range. Fisher response: Fisher does not think they need lidar data for their expanded study area. Current plan is to use existing USFS data or analyze digital data themselves. At this point we don't know what the fisher study area will be – depends on where fisher are found.
- Sue Britting encourages Fisher to address adequacies or inadequacies of FS data they end up using.

- High resolution imagery is available also but maybe somewhat dated.
- Draft metadata protocol developed with different sharing levels: Internal, UCST, MOU, and Public.
- Updated study area boundaries.
- Part time Research Associate has been hired.

FFEH (Forest)/Scott Stephens:

- Appreciation for all involved.
- Pre-treatment data collection 2007, 2008.
- Post-treatment data collection 2012, 2013.
- There are 200 sample plots in both Sugar Pine and Foresthill with 50 in Cedar Valley.
- Fuel loading results for Last Chance study area were presented.
- Discussed fuel loading hour-fuel classification as a measurement of moisture content and thereby fire danger in forests.
- Scott is considering different models to test the effectiveness of treatments on potential fire behavior: Fire BGC v2 and Arcfuels FVS. Both have pros and cons. Fire BGC hydrology component is skimpy; it does have a wildlife module; it needs soil moisture. Some potential to use if for climate change study. Arcfuels FVS is fire simulator for forest growth. It does not explicitly model wildlife habitat suitability. There does not appear to be a single fire model that integrates as much as we want.
- They have shared data from northern site with USFS.

Fisher/Reginald Barrett:

- Will test Wayne Spencer model.
- First Fisher killed on Hwy 41, sent as soon as possible to Davis for necropsy.
- They have 59 cameras, traps and 9 collared animals (7 male, 2 female)
- 3 cameras stolen
- Hope to identify den trees and kits.
- Purchasing a stuffed Fisher from Maine for educational purposes.
- The airplane is working well.
- Purchased snowmobiles.
- Looking for new housing for the field station crew in Bass Lake or North Fork.
- Expect first full season of data in winter/spring of 08/09. Will monitor until 2015, 7 years.

Owl/Doug Temple:

- Only 1 or 2 owl sites at northern site.
- If El Dorado study is included brings the number to about 16 which should be sufficient.
- Historic timber harvest information from El Dorado and Tahoe NF received.
- There will be some difficulty to determine if past harvests were “SPLAT” like.
- Names of recent or planned SPLATS at northern site available on power point presentation.
- They will examine Dr Hines’ program to estimate required sample sizes for territory occupancy models.

- Proposed explanatory variables for statistical models will be posted on the web for public comment.
- Need help getting roads cleared of fallen trees in northern site.
- Pre-treatment data collected 2007, 2008.
- Post-treatment data collected 2012, 2013.
- Monitoring will continue during treatments.

Public Participation:

- Outreach efforts near the southern site continue through presentations at local group meetings. Educational opportunities with local schools are being developed.
- Our second newsletter was produced along with a couple different posters for different audiences. Latest newsletter provides education on tree varieties found in study sites.
- Additional funds have been requested for outreach efforts for the northern site to include Susie Kocher acting as academic advisor and the hiring of an additional part time representative to do outreach work. It is a one-year, temporary plan. A needs assessment will be performed to determine recommendation for years 3 and beyond.
- A conference call was facilitated with the owl group and interested public to discuss sampling size issues.
- The first in a series of facilitation and adaptive management training sessions occurred on Feb 20th (see Integration Team notes above).
- A periodic conference call with the Forest Service offices in both the northern and southern sites has been developed to facilitate communication and sharing.
- An evaluation matrix for meetings has been developed and is being tested among UCST and MOUP, to be shared with public at Q4.
- Reg requested to see what local history information PPT has collected for southern site.

NEXT STEP: Lynn will share with Reg any local history information they have collected so far for southern site.

Discussion about PPT work with Integration Team

- Sue Britting asks how work of IT connects up to decision makers. Also wants to know if PPT is adequately funded to make sure this works. Kim's response is that in the long term we do not know if it is adequately funded; this work has taken much more than we ever guessed. For now we have full support for year 2.
- Mike states that the USFS needs to be brought into the IT group as well. He supports the bottom up approach of coming up with ideas in meetings like these and send them to a higher level if needed.
- Dave Martin mentions that the FS already responds to the public and data that suggests that they change their practices. However, he is eager to continue discussion with the IT group
- Sue's point is that what is needed is for the process of implementing adaptive management needs to be articulated, not just for this project (SNAMP).
- Mike stresses that this is what we really need to do with IT group – carve out how to do things differently at the project level to find a new way for public to evaluate work of the

FS. The adaptive management framework model role for agencies. The process needs to be defined, they do not know how to do it themselves at this point.

- The IT cannot come up with a process for implementing adaptive management for the Forest Service, because they are a federal agency with accountability. They cannot give license to an independent group to come up with a process. However, that does not preclude the FS from working with the IT group on a proposed process. They very much support the idea behind the IT group and consider it very important work.
- Kim plans next set of IT meetings will be to work with science teams to identify potential triggers
- Sue stresses the importance of the IT to start working on this purpose (of the IT group articulating the AM process) as soon as possible. She would rather know that the AM process work is going forward before spending her time meeting with the science teams.
- Crawford Tuttle explains that agencies policies are a result of a legal, judicial, and financial process. The same will be true for the FS to implement any proposed change in product / action.

II. SNAMP Meeting scheduling:

4/17 Q1 '08

6/17 Q1.5 '08

8/1 Q2 UC Davis

9/18 Q2.5 USFS Regional Office, Sacramento

11/5 Q3 UC Merced

12/9 Q3.5 USFS Regional Office

1/15/09 Q4 Foresthill

Note written March 18: After the meeting, UCST and MOUP suggested that we hold quarterly meetings once or twice a year, and keep all existing dates as placeholders for additional meetings if needed.

Meeting Suggestions:

- Mike and Crawford suggest an annual, 2-hour SNAMP meeting with agency decision makers to bring them up to speed on project.
- A handout of John's presentation for future use so he does not have to repeat to similar audience each time.
- Time allotment for science team updates too short, 1 hour, suggest 2, as discussion time is critical.

KEY AGREEMENT: Agreement to hold a 2 hour annual SNAMP meeting with agency decision makers to bring them up to speed on SNAMP. Suggested time for meeting is in November.

Thanks to all who gave their time!