

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

Notes

Date and time: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 1:00- 2:30 pm

Participants:

UCST: John Battles, Rocky Gutiérrez, Anne Lombardo, Susie Kocher, Lynn Huntsinger, Adrianna Sulak, Kim Rodriguez, Maggi Kelly, Ann Huber

MOUP: Kim Squires (FWS), Patricia Flebbe (USFS), Rob MacWhorter (USFS), Mike Chapel (USFS), Frank Gehrke (DWR), Crawford Tuttle (CA Resources Agency)

Summary of Main Outcomes

1. SNAMP YR3 budget projections are on track. DWR has approved core funding for YR3.
2. John described several current and proposed projects that are leveraged on SNAMP funding.
3. Sugar Pine Project has received appeals. Bass Lake is still hopeful that they can begin treatments this year.
4. Last Chance Project is still on track for implementation in late 2010.
5. Reminder that the Statement of Neutrality is limited to SNAMP study areas and SNAMP data.
6. UCST has agreed to add Dr. Rick Sweitzer (SNAMP) as a PI on the Fisher Team and Dr. Zach Peery (University of Wisconsin, Madison) as a PI on the Owl Team. They will not become official PIs until they have been added to their respective contracts, hopefully in October 2010.

Summary of Next Steps and Agreements

1. Mike will ask Dave Martin if it has been decided yet if a third year of treatments in Sugar Pine is needed.
2. Ann will ask Rocky if there is any new information from the Owl Team that would warrant an Integration Team meeting.
3. John agrees that a SNAMP poster or presentation at the upcoming CA Biodiversity Council meeting is a good idea. Ann will track the progress of the development of the focus for the meeting.
4. Ann will send the UCST response to recent challenges from stakeholders regarding UCST neutrality to Maggi to post to the SNAMP website.
5. Mike will work with John to form a subgroup from USFS and UCST come up with a process for a mutually agreed-upon policy to help guide future requests for information and management recommendations from USFS to UCST.

Full meeting notes begin on next page.

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

Meeting Notes

1. 2010 Budget (Battles, Tuttle, Gehrke)

John reviewed the current status of the SNAMP budget.

- Projected expenditures for YR3 are on track.
- DWR has approved the core (original) amount that was allocated to the Spatial Team. John is waiting for the individual task orders.
- Next step is to plan for YR4 budget.

Crawford stated that the Resources Agency is committed to keeping the state funding on track. Frank stated that the reason that DWR had reviewed the SNAMP contract is that the level of oversight of CA bond funds is very high.

Research projects that are leveraged on SNAMP (Battles)

- The California Energy Commission's efforts to understand the sustainability of forest biomass utilization are very dependent on the SNAMP infrastructure. Pat Manly (USFS PSW) has received over a \$1 million grant to study the effects of biomass on wildlife. (Pat's study is using the SNAMP research design at Sugar Pine.) Bill Kinney with the CA Energy Commission is a program leader for the Commission's biomass economics sustainability research. SNAMP is lacking economics research, so will be complementary to SNAMP / make SNAMP a better product.
- There is also interest within SNAMP and USFS in building on the Public Participation Team's research within USFS that will make SNAMP a better product.
- The Water Team has also leveraged other work on SNAMP.

Crawford – Jim McKinney is the project manager with the Energy Commission. The project is investigating how to confirm whether their projects are sustainable, and have contracted some of the work to USFS. Jill Fagan is another project coordinator involved in the work. The Commission is looking at other sites including SNAMP.

2. Timeline updates on Sugar Pine and Last Chance Projects 1:25 - 1:35pm (District Rangers/ Reprs)

Mike Chapel filled in for the ranger districts and gave an update based on his knowledge of the status of the projects. Chris Fischer, American River District Ranger, joined the call towards the end and gave an update on Last Chance. Dave Martin, Bass Lake District Ranger, sent an update on Sugar Pine to Mike Chapel after the call. Chris's and Dave's updates are summarized below.

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

Sugar Pine Project (Dave Martin via email)

- Appealed by John Muir Project (Chad Hansen) and the Sierra Club (Richard Kangas).
- On track to prepare the contracts for this year but this will take longer now that they will also need to spend time responding to the appeals.
- “Of course, if we are upheld in the appeal, we might still be litigated by either party. We all hope that does not come to pass. It is a great project, supported by a great cross-section of the public and interest groups. The truly uplifting part is that the people who are actually participating in the collaborative process, engaging in an open discussion and working hard with all of us are not only supportive but have made the project better in every way, ESPECIALLY for the betterment of science and our precious natural resources.” - quoted from Dave Martin’s email to Mike Chapel, April 28, 2010.

Last Chance (Chris Fischer)

- Comment period closed late March – mid April. They hope to have the responses to the comments completed and the decision signed by next week.
- Still on track to implement treatments in late 2010 (if unlitigated).
- Due to the pending lawsuit (by Sierra Forest Legacy) the Regional Forester has told the District not to award any contracts yet.

3. Impact of recent legal challenges to USFS forest management on SNAMP

Ann and John ask USFS for their opinion on what will happen to SNAMP if Sierra Forest Legacy’s motion is upheld (recent motion for an injunction pending appeal on all logging projects under the 2004 Framework).

Rob MacWhorter (Interim Deputy Regional Forester) reports that the case has not been heard yet. USFS is in discussions with the plaintiffs and timber industry. That is all he can say – the rest is confidential. There have not been legal challenges against Sugar Pine or Last Chance specifically, but there is the suit against the 2004 Framework.

Crawford reminds everyone that when the MOUP was being formed they talked about how SNAMP would be neutral as to the treatment. The project is not specific to a decision; it is testing whatever plan is in place at the time.

John adds that if there is another delay to treatment implementation then SNAMP research will be impacted. This has been understood from the beginning. We just need to maintain our transparency (in decision making).

4. Proposal to add a third year to treatments in Sugar Pine

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

Ann and John recap the request by Bass Lake that UCST select areas in Sugar Pine for a third year of treatments.

The Science Team's initial response was not to identify areas because of financial and scientific concerns with a longer treatment period. Dave Martin repeated his request, in terms of a case in which it was necessary for a third year. Each team weighed in, and the response was drafted in a letter to Dave Martin on April 2nd (appended to these notes). The Science Team identified the treatment units in the Big Sandy area for a third year of treatment, if needed. This decision was based on low fisher activity in the area and willingness of the Water Team to have treatments delayed until 2012 in Big Sandy (Big Sandy is the Water Team's treatment catchment in the southern study site). The consequence of a third year of treatment is that SNAMP will need an additional year of funding to complete post treatment data collection, and also increases risk of natural events such as wind storms or insect outbreak, which could weaken the study.

Mike adds that the request was spurred by the low market value of timber.

Crawford will connect with Mike later about his questions / thoughts on the topic. He adds that the price of timber has stabilized and looks to be heading toward a better direction. If there is an issue with cost next year, he would like to know about it.

Mike will ask Dave whether it has been determined yet whether a third year of treatments will be required for Sugar Pine.

John states that a decision to have a third year of treatments is not just of interest to UCST, but also to other research projects using the SNAMP study design.

5. Plans for Integration Team (IT) meeting for 2010 (Susie Kocher)

Susie explained the purpose of the PPT Outreach team, an overview of previous Integration Team meetings, and an update on the current plans for IT meetings in the near future.

- Fisher IT meeting July 22nd.
- Owl Team would like feedback from stakeholders on what the theme should be for the next Owl IT meeting. They will host a field trip in June.
- Water Team would like to wait until spring 2011 for their next IT meeting, to give them time to complete some of their modeling for the meeting.
- Spatial Team is planning for a summer 2011 IT meeting, at which point they expect to be able to show some of the integrated research projects they are working on with the other teams.
- PPT is planning to hold an IT meeting in fall of 2010 on their survey research.

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

- FFEH has already hosted an IT meeting this year. Susie plans to hold a post-treatment field trip with FFEH once implementation is completed.

Susie requests input from MOUP on what the next Owl IT meeting should focus on.

- Mike suggests that it should focus on any new, substantive, findings.

Ann will follow up with Rocky on Mike's suggestion.

Crawford encourages UCST to present SNAMP at the CA Biodiversity Council Meeting on October 12-13 in Graeagle. Topic is Forestry Management. Exact focus has not been defined yet. Well attended by federal and state agencies, so could be good forum for a SNAMP presentation. Mike thinks that at least a SNAMP poster would be beneficial.

John agrees that this could be a good opportunity to present SNAMP, either as a poster or with a presentation. Ann will keep in touch with Mike on the focus of the CA Biodiversity Council Meeting to determine which would be more fitting, a SNAMP poster or a presentation.

6. UCST research updates 2:05 – 2:15pm (Huber)

a. Brief summary of work completed and new research findings since last reported in January (see attached).

b. Reminder that SNAMP study areas are expanded for Fisher and Owl Teams. These expanded study areas are subject to the SNAMP Statement of Neutrality.

Ann reviews the basic elements of the Statement of Neutrality, as a reminder. (See SNAMP website <http://snamp.cnr.berkeley.edu/about/> for the document.) The UCST will update the Statement of Neutrality to reflect the current SNAMP study areas.

7. Review recent challenges to UCST neutrality 2:15 – 2:25 (Huber)

a. Nature of the challenges. UCST has received two comments from stakeholders in the past couple of months challenging the neutrality of UCST scientists.

- Steve Brink (CA Forestry Association) remarked on Reg Barrett's letter to the Dept of Fish and Game Commission's decision not to list the Pacific fisher.
- Ed Murphy (Sierra Pacific Industries) pointed out several quotes from SNAMP scientists that appeared in Sierra Forest Legacy's brief that criticized the 2004 Framework.

b. UCST response

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

- John and Ann investigated each complaint, researching every instance in which SNAMP scientists were quoted, and Reg's letter. There were no violations of the Statement of Neutrality because SNAMP study sites and SNAMP data were not invoked. The scope of the Statement of Neutrality is limited to SNAMP study sites and SNAMP data. Also, the comments quoted in the brief pre-dated the Statement of Neutrality. The only conflict so far has been the testimony given by Doug Tempel, which UCST has already addressed (in 2008).

Mike requests that John notify him whenever someone challenges UCST neutrality. He also requests that these communications are posted on the website.

Ann will post the emails to the website.

Pat states that the USFS has asked for management recommendations from the UCST in the past and the scientist has refused, citing the agreements in the Statement of Neutrality.

John responds that requests for data are ok but the UCST has made it a policy not to provide management recommendations because of the experimental nature of SNAMP. In the past Rocky provided information for the USFS by bringing them to an offsite-SNAMP area to provide them examples of what he knows about Spotted Owl habitat preferences.

Pat requested management recommendations from Rocky on the Eldorado Demography project, which is a part of the agreement that USFS has with University of Minnesota for the project. NEPA requires that USFS use the best available science and that is coming from SNAMP right now. USFS needs SNAMP recommendations in order to fulfill their obligations to the NEPA process.

Mike recommends that a subgroup from USFS and UCST come up with a process for a mutually agreed-upon policy to help guide future requests for information and management recommendations from USFS to UCST.

John agrees. He understands the USFS position, and also pushes hard to maintain the rigor of the research design. Need to have at least the fire, fisher, PPT, and owl teams (input). This issue will only become more urgent as the project continues.

Pat agrees. There is a difference between management recommendations and advocacy. Need to clarify where that line is drawn.

8. Discuss proposed PI additions 2:25 – 2:30 (Huber)

SNAMP QUARTERLY MEETING – Q1 2010

UCST has proposed to add Dr. Rick Sweitzer (SNAMP) as a PI on the Fisher Team and Dr. Zach Peery (University of Wisconsin, Madison) as a PI on the Owl Team.

John explains the reasoning and that they will not become official fiduciary P.I.s until they can be added to the SNAMP contracts in the next round of USFS funding. John explains that he contacted Mike because he needed to seek his approval, since Mike is the contract officer.

Mike says that the USFS was supportive of adding Zach and Rick, but as they investigated the mechanics of adding them to the existing contracts they realized it was a complicated and time-consuming process. The Forest Service has recommended that the new PIs be added when annual contracts are updated around October of this year. The UCST agreed that waiting was appropriate.

UC Science Team Updates for SNAMP 2010 Q1 Meeting

Main research findings and work accomplished since last reported to MOUP on January 11, 2010
April 26, 2010

Project Integration and Management Team

Budget

- Providing bimonthly budget projections to PIs.
- Processed Year 4 subaward for PPT outreach to PI Rodrigues via UC Davis.
- Prepared and processed DWR Task Agreement for Spatial Funding
- Provided background on agreements regarding spatial objectives and funding.
- Organized close-out of SWIG grant from DFG.

Research

- Presented SNAMP poster at UC/USFS Pre and Post Wildfire Conference February 9-11.
- Investigating possibility of an integration project with the SNAMP wildlife teams, other UC researchers, and PSW researchers to evaluate the approach of occupancy analysis as a method to assess change in population rates. Note: Integration project on hold while MOUP and UCCE discuss potential role in Sagehen Experimental Forest.

UCST Coordination

- Planned and lead monthly UCST conference calls; distribute monthly team updates.
- Check PI statements for adherence to SNAMP neutrality agreements.
- Review UCST draft manuscripts.
- Working with Public Participation Team to find venue for SNAMP Annual Meeting in October.
- Online UCST document archival management (manage bSpace site).

Communication with MOUP and SNAMP stakeholders

- MOUP quarterly meeting in January: wrote notes and followed up on action items.
- Request to USFS Contract Officer (Mike Chapel) to add Sweitzer and Peery as PIs on SNAMP.
- Coordinated team response to SNAMP stakeholders questions about UCST neutrality that arose from recent decision by CA Fish and Game regarding the status of the Pacific fisher.
- Responded to CNR Dean's inquiry regarding role of SNAMP in current controversies with the California Department of Fish and Game.
- Coordinated team response to SNAMP stakeholders questions about UCST neutrality that arose from recent legal challenges to the USFS 2004 framework.
- Coordinated team response to request from Bass Lake to identify Sugar Pine units to be treated in a third year of treatments.
- Coordinate communication with science team and Patricia Manly (PSW) regarding request to use SNAMP study sites / study design for a USFS small mammal and bird study.
- Requests for spatial data from Bass Lake Ranger District.

Other

- Repeated request to UC Division of Agricultural Resources to form SNAMP Oversight Committee.

Spotted Owl Team

- Rocky has received notice that the Eldorado demography study will be fully funded for the coming year.
- Sheila is updating the Owl habitat vegetation map to reflect recent timber harvests.
- Submitted a SNAMP manuscript to Journal of Forest Ecology on the use of Lidar to characterize wildlife habitat (using spotted owl nesting habitat as a case study) by C. Garcia-Feced, D. Tempel, and M. Kelly. The manuscript was rejected by the Journal of Wildlife Management.
- Hiring for the 2010 field season is completed. Field season data collection begins May 3.
- The Eldorado demography field season is underway, but off to a slow start because of snow and wet weather conditions.
- The UC Science team approved Rocky's proposal to add Dr. Zachariah Peery (Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison) as a co-PI on the SNAMP Owl Team. Dr. Peery will most likely not officially become PI on SNAMP until 2011, when he can be added to the USFS contract.

Fire and Forest Ecosystem Health

- We produced the first draft of a conditional burn probability map for the southern SNAMP site. We shared the map with Sierra National Forest.
- We continue to work on fuels modeling for the southern SNAMP site and the development of a succession of fuels models for existing and post-treatment conditions.
- Brandon submitted a revised SNAMP manuscript to Forest Science titled 'Simulating fire and forest dynamics for a landscape fuel treatment project in the Sierra Nevada' by Collins, Stephens, Roller, and Battles.
- Shared vegetation summaries with Pat Manly (PSW) for bird and small mammal study that uses the Sugar Pine study site.
- Tree core processing continues for forest health pre-treatment conditions.

Fisher Team

- Camera survey work for project year 3 is progressing very well. All 1km² grids within the Key Watersheds portion of the fisher project study area have been resurveyed for a 3rd time as part of the BACI study design. Results were that fishers were detected in 68 of the 119 survey grids (naïve occupancy = 57%). The 57% occupancy of surveyed grids in the Key Watersheds was intermediate between the 61% and 55% occupancy rates for project year 1 and project year 2, respectively.
- Winter season trapping was a major activity by the Fisher Team during January to mid March. We were successful in recapturing all but one fisher that needed to be fitted with new radiocollars, including male fisher M02 in Yosemite National Park.
- There were no mortalities of collared fishers during the reporting period (12 January to 21 April), and we are currently monitoring the movements, survival, and reproductive activities of 30 radiocollared fishers.
- USDA Forest Service Aviation Supervisor John Litton worked very hard to acquire and outfit a backup airplane (Piper Super Cub) in support of the Fisher Project while the Cessna 185 is down for major repairs/maintenance. Forest Service support of our aerial telemetry work has been outstanding and is very greatly appreciated.

- The major current focus of the Fisher Team is tracking and closely monitoring the activities of 17 radiocollared adult+subadult fishers during the Spring 2010 denning season. Denning activities by female fishers commenced around March 25, and will end in mid June. As of April 21, 14 of 17 adult+subadult females were localized to den trees. Over the last 3 weeks we located 18 different den trees (14 natal den trees, 4 maternal den trees), and anticipate that another 10-20 maternal den trees will be used by the known denning females before the end of the denning period.
- Among the 18 den trees we already know of, 3 are within the Sugar Pine treatment area, and 3 are very near the Sugar Pine treatment area. We are cooperating with the Forest Service by providing their wildlife biologists with the coordinates of den trees so they will be able to develop habitat buffer zones around den trees.
- In 2-3 weeks we will begin the process of climbing den trees in order to locate den cavities and count the number of kits each female produced.

Water Quality and Quantity Team

- We are continuing to collect bi-weekly stream grab samples for suspended sediment concentration, ionic content, and isotopic analysis. Sampling began Jan 2010. It will continue until we have our automated ISCO water samplers. Snowpack ion and isotope samples were also collected during peak accumulation.
- A technical report on soil bulk density distribution from our soil moisture sensor installations has been completed by an undergraduate student. It will be available to SNAMP as soon as it undergoes some modification and refinement.
- Analysis of the 2008 Last Chance snow survey around Duncan Peak is in progress. Distribution of snow depth and comparison with MODIS and LandSat Snow Covered Area remote sensing products are being analyzed. If results prove favorable, they may be included in a larger manuscript to be submitted to a journal.
- Soil samples from soil moisture sensor installations will be processed for texture analysis by the UC Davis ANR Lab as soon as this year's DWR funds become available.

Public Participation Team (PPT)

PPT: Website

- Continue to maintain website.
- SNAMP newsletter focused on the fire integration meta-replication study between SNAMP and USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station.

PPT: Research

- Archiving SNAMP materials on SNAMP data server.
- Working on manuscripts in collaboration with all members of the PPT.
- Working with the California Agriculture journal on a news article and possible research article.
- Data analysis.
- Targeting follow up interviews.
- Longer term: program evaluation matrix refinement.
- Working with PPT outreach members on evaluation email survey proposal.
- Presented a SNAMP poster at the National Society for Range Management meeting in February.

PPT: Outreach

- **SNAMP article in Forestland Steward newsletter will be published in spring issue.**
- **Planning Fisher Integration Team (IT) meeting in Fresno on July 22nd, 2010.**
- Working with the Owl Team to host an Owl IT meeting tentatively in early August 2010.
- Planning Water IT meeting in early 2011.
- Planning Owl and Water field trips at the northern site in 2010.
- Planning with Sierra and Tahoe National Forests to hold outreach events around project implementation (timeline uncertain).
- Hosted Forest Team IT meeting on February 17th in Davis.
- Editing SNAMP videos for the website using already filmed clips.
- Developing a method to track and analyze participant demographics (after suggestion at the annual meeting).
- Working on venue selection for October 2010 annual meeting.
- Planning an evaluation survey to gauge stakeholder opinion of SNAMP outreach and collaboration so far.

PPT: Outreach at Northern Site - Kim Ingram

- Met with Pam Flick from Friends of Wildlife to film her talking about public participation.
- Met with staff from the Indian Development Resources & Services Inc.
- Kim I. will represent SNAMP at a Placer County Water Agency Forum on April 29th.

Presentations at the Northern Site:

- El Dorado County Fire Safe Council Annual Gathering, El Dorado County
- Auburn Sierra Club General Meeting, Placer County
- Sierra County Firesafe and Watershed Council in Sierraville, Sierra County
- Sierra Foothills Audubon Society in Nevada City, Placer County
- Yuba Watershed Protection & Fire Safe Council in Dobbins, Yuba County
- Amador County Fire Safe Council, Amador County

PPT: Outreach at Southern Site – Anne Lombardo

- Filmed Dave Martin on fuels treatments for a SNAMP video.
- Working on a children's book about fisher. Illustrations will be drafted by children in the local elementary school, high school students and local artists groups. The children are using the Fisher Team's mounted fisher specimen as a model for their drawings.
- Fisher drawing/awareness opportunities have been offered to three art classes in the local high school.
- Meeting with the local biomass operation/community development group started by the Sierra Nevada Conservancy.
- Met with the local game warden and CalTrans office regarding Fisher road kill.
- Met with the tribal liaison for the Sierra National Forest in Clovis as well as the chairman of a local Mono tribal group.
- Represented SNAMP at three different earth day celebrations.
- Completed certification as a Project Learning Tree environmental education workshop facilitator.

Presentations at the Southern Site:

- Reedley College Watershed Ecology class with Sarah Martin from the Water Team.
- Central Sierra Watershed Committee Meeting.
- Plan to give a SNAMP presentation to the Tuolumne Board of Supervisors in a few months.

Spatial Team

- We continue to develop and refine the SNAMP data server.
- We are in the process of verifying LiDAR results from the southern site, where there are some very large trees.
- We are working on upscaling the northern site LiDAR data. We have finished the regression analysis on the plot level data, and have begun to map the vegetation parameters across the whole study area.
- We continue to extract the spatial distribution of fuels information from LiDAR according to Scott & Burgan's 2005 fuel models set.



Center for Forestry
137 Mulford Hall #3114
Berkeley, CA 94720-3114

April 2, 2010

Dear Dave:

This letter is in response to your email on March 1st, regarding the Sugar Pine Project area:

Ann/John... Here is a question that might not be easily answered but I might as well ask it: If we needed to delay any part of the treatments into year 3, what types/locations might they be? The reason I ask is that shorter contract lengths in today's market will likely cost more. Food for thought.

The UC Science Team (UCST) discussed this question on March 17th. As you know, your question is not the first time that the UCST has considered the consequences of delays in the treatment. We strongly prefer that treatments be completed in two years, as laid out in the SNAMP workplan (2007). The workplan was a collaboration that tried to balance scientific rigor against the practical constraints of forest operations while also obtaining information in a timely fashion. Moreover, delay in treatments extends the study and thereby significantly increases the necessary funding to complete the project. However, we understand that the essence of balancing is constant adjustment. So rather than simply repeat our concerns about further delay, we try to inform the decision regarding a third year of treatment at Sugar Pine.

Each team evaluated the management plan and evaluated the consequences.

The **Public Participation** Team can continue its research and outreach if extended funding is made available. However, the team cautions that stakeholder belief and confidence in the process has a lot to do with the ultimate success of participatory efforts, and a readjustment of expectations could erode the relationships that we have been trying to build.

The **Fisher** Team does not have specific areas within the Sugar Pine area to recommend for a third year of treatment, since the animals are widespread (see "AnnH_Fishers_Treatments1.jpg", attached). Dots on the maps represent fisher locations both from aerial telemetry and camera surveys. However, the team has identified areas NE of Speckerman Mountain near the Big Sandy

campground where there is very limited fisher activity. Rick has circled the treatment polygons in this area where they do not have significant fisher activity in the second attached map, "AnnH_Fishers_Treatments2.jpg". This includes the following units: T-33, T-32, T-35, T-34, M-24, M-25, T-24, T-26, T-30, RX-08, M-11, M-16, T-37, T-23, P-22, P-30, P-38, P-39, and P-40. The Fisher Team's opinion is that delaying treatments in this area (Big Sandy) would not be a big problem for SNAMP Fisher. In contrast, any further delay in treatments planned in the "Sugar Pine" area has the potential to require an extension in the term of the project for understanding treatment effects on fishers.

The **Owl** Team is not affected directly by delayed treatments at Sugar Pine. However, it does raise the question of symmetric design for the Last Chance study area if Sugar Pine is delayed. That is, the team would want to consider whether data collection on the Last Chance study should be extended for the same number of years as Sugar Pine if Sugar Pine were extended by a year.

The **Water** Team is okay with delaying treatments in Big Sandy until 2012 as long as LiDAR is not flown until after the treatments are complete.

The **Spatial** Team noted that LiDAR data will be collected once all treatments are complete. If a third year of treatments is deemed necessary, the potential consequence is a need for two different post treatment LiDAR flights, one for Last Chance and one for Sugar Pine. The savings of flying both sites at the same time is approximately \$100,000. The lost savings of a single LiDAR flight is a significant consequence of delayed treatments in Sugar Pine.

The **Fire and Forest Ecosystem** Health Team conducted fire modeling of the Sugar Pine Project to give you estimates of treatment units with high and low conditional burn probabilities. It turns out that the Sugar Pine units with the highest average burn probability are in the northern end (M9=.0015, M10=.0038) and the eastern edge near Speckerman (Rx1=.0022, M5=.0027, T2=.0014). Units with the lowest burn probability are on the western and southern edges (M12-13; T7-T11=0-.0004). For the Big Sandy area, the average conditional burn probabilities were generally higher. Units with the highest averages are in the northeastern (RX-08, M-11=.0058-.0075) and western edges (M-16, M-25=.0057-.01). The lowest averages are in the southeastern edge (T-33 thru T-37=.0011-.0024).

Based on these analyses, the Big Sandy treatment units (identified by the Fisher Team above) are the best candidates for delay into the third year (2012), if needed. However the units are not ideal given the higher than average burn probability noted by the Fire Team. If the treatments are delayed, we request that they are completed in the same year. If it looks like the third year will begin after 2012, then the UCST will need to reassess the situation and our decision. We trust that you will let us know if it looks like that will be the case.

We are copying this letter to Mike Chapel, as coordinator of the MOUP, to forward to the MOU Partner members. A major concern of the UCST is that **if treatments are extended into a third year, the SNAMP project will need an additional year of funding to complete the study.** We fully understand that there is no guarantee of funding beyond any current fiscal year, since the federal and state agencies operate on yearly budgets. However, in order to fulfill one of the primary objectives of SNAMP, to deliver an integrated assessment of the effects of Forest Service management on forest resources, each team in SNAMP will need to complete two years of post treatment data after a year of ecosystem recovery. We will recommend that Mike seeks input from the MOUP, as a delay in treatments and subsequent extension of the SNAMP project will mean increased cost and time to complete the project.

Thanks for your support of SNAMP. Please let us know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



John J. Battles



Ann Huber

Attachments:

AnnH_Fishers_Treatments1.jpg

AnnH_Fishers_Treatments2.jpg