



SNAMP 2014 2nd Quarter MOU Partners Meeting

Wednesday, July 22, 2014, 2:00 pm to 3:30 pm, conference call

Notes

In attendance:

Michael Anderson – CA Dept. Water Resources

John Battles – UC Berkeley

Rebecca Ferkovich – CAL FIRE

Patricia Flebbe – USFS Region 5

Cay Goude – US Fish and Wildlife Service

Russ Henly – CA Resources Agency

Peter Hopkinson – UC Berkeley

Susie Kocher – UC Cooperative Extension

Anne Lombardo – UC Cooperative Extension

Pat Manley – USFS PSW Research Station

Debra Whitman – USFS Region 5

1) Update on UC Science Team progress towards the SNAMP final report (John Battles).

John Battles described the recent progress of the UC Science Team. The UC Science Team is working hard to generate the integrated assessment and the individual resource team chapters. The integrated assessment and succinct integrated management recommendations are central to the SNAMP final report.

September 15, 2014, is the date by which the UC Science Team plans to submit the draft final report for peer-review and for review by the MOU Partners and stakeholders. Most teams are on target to finish their individual resource chapters by the deadline of September 15. But the UC Science Team is worried that we will not be able to meet the September 15 deadline for the integrated assessment.

The Fire and Forest Ecosystem Health (FFEH) team have produced three iterations of the Last Chance vegetation map and fire modelling, with input from the Spatial and wildlife teams. The Owl and Fisher teams are now using those products to analyze SPLAT impacts on habitat

for the integrated assessment. FFEH has also created a Leaf Area Index model for the Water team's integrated assessment. Phil Saksa of the Water team is now calibrating the model and is about ready to start running scenarios.

The UC Science Team is further behind on the Sugar Pine analyses. FFEH is still working to create the Sugar Pine products and has yet to finish modelling runs. Wildlife and Water are not able to start their Sugar Pine analyses until they receive the vegetation map and modelling products. Sugar Pine's treatment implementation was always a bit behind Last Chance's treatment schedule, and this contributed to our being behind. Because many of the methodological problems have been solved while working on Last Chance, we are optimistic that Sugar Pine should proceed faster than Last Chance.

That said, at the next UC Science Team conference call on July 30, the UC Science Team will have to evaluate whether we can meet the September 15 deadline for the integrated assessment. We have arranged with the University of California Office of the President to administer the peer review process for the individual resource chapters and plan to start that process on September 15. We also planned to deliver the entire draft final report to the MOU Partners and the public stakeholders but are now not sure we can meet that deadline and want to give the MOU Partners advance notice of this. The UC Science Team will immediately notify the MOU Partners about the decision made on July 30.

The wildlife teams are also working to pull together the fisher metrics for the integrated assessment. Zach Peery and his team at University of Wisconsin are collaborating with Craig Thompson at the PSW Research Station to develop the fisher integration metrics. The Public Participation team is on schedule to complete their individual report by the September 15 deadline. They are also finishing up their final survey.

By the very nature of this kind of project, there is a lot of data crunching happening at the last minute.

We are all ready for the mid-August Ecological Society of America annual meeting session on collaborative adaptive management.

Russ Henly asked John to elaborate on the ramifications of slippage in the timeline. John responded that the UC Science Team wants to finish SNAMP by December 2014 in part because the budget will be finished at that point, but that contractually, the project comes to a close by

September 2015. After December 2014, however, SNAMP will lose many of its core project staff members because they are funded by SNAMP.

The UC Science Team hopes to proceed with the SNAMP Annual meeting on November 6, 2014 – it would be difficult to reschedule – at which we would present and seek feedback on the integrated assessment, but that may provide only a month or less for review of the final report by the MOU Partners and stakeholders, if we have to postpone release of the report.

The UC Science Team's All Scientists Meeting, at which we will meet to produce the integrated assessment, is scheduled for August but may have to be rescheduled. That may prove difficult because the fall academic semester will start shortly after the currently scheduled date.

Although the UC Science Team is about a month off-schedule, we probably can meet the December 2014 deadline for the final report. However, we don't want to speed through this process and not come up with a good product. If we can't make the December 2014 deadline, we lose many of SNAMP's science and support staff, but the Public Participation team is 3 months out of phase with the other teams so they will be able to continue SNAMP outreach through March 2015, while, if necessary, the UC Science Team Principal Investigators work on completing analyses and the final report.

Bill Frost of the University of California Office of the President is flexible about the start date for the peer-review process, but we have to give the peer reviewers reasonable advance warning of when they will be asked to review the chapters.

As noted above, the UC Science Team will make a decision on July 30 about the timeline so that we can tell everyone as soon as possible whether there will be a delay.

Patricia Flebbe asked John for further details on producing the Sugar Pine fisher metrics. John replied that the wildlife team has the fisher metrics, but that Zach was hoping to be able to refine these metrics with ground/understory vegetation data, especially ground cover data. A recently published paper co-authored by the Fisher team (SNAMP PUB #27: Wengert et al. 2014. Using DNA to describe and quantify interspecific killing of fishers in California. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 78: 603-611) demonstrates that fisher mortality is primarily caused by bobcats and mountain lions, and the fisher scientists think that ground cover is an important variable in that mortality. The Fisher team has characterized den sites, including the ground cover, but has not characterized non-den sites. FFEH did not measure ground vegetation

variables in their plots. FFEH and the wildlife teams are wondering whether to make some measurement of the ground cover this summer.

The owl metrics are the product of 2 years of effort with the retrospective analysis. The Owl team had more data [20 years' worth from the Eldorado Study], and also Doug Tempel was focusing on this specific topic for his dissertation. The Fisher analysis may have to be more generic. It is important to remember, however, that the Sugar Pine fisher study is still on-going, and after three years of post-treatment data collection, we'll be hearing more about the fisher.

2) Upcoming SNAMP dates:

- -Thursday, July 31, 2014, 9 am-4 pm: Fisher Team IT meeting, UC Merced Center, Fresno;
- -Wednesday, August 13, 2014, 8-11:30 am: SNAMP-related Oral Session at Ecological Society of America annual meeting, Sacramento Convention Center;
- -Thursday, September 4, 2014: Water Team IT meeting, Merced;
- -Thursday, November 6, 2014: final SNAMP Annual meeting, McClellan.

July 31, 2014 Fisher Team IT meeting, Fresno

Anne Lombardo reported that 40 people have already RSVP-ed for the Fisher Team IT meeting, and she anticipates that there may be 50-60 attendees in total.

John said that last spring, he met with Craig Thompson and Wayne Spencer about sharing SNAMP fisher data. He wants to make sure that everyone is still okay with the fisher data-sharing agreement. Specifically, SNAMP fisher data are being used by non-SNAMP scientists/agency staff before appearing in SNAMP reports or published articles. Is that still okay? Patricia said it was fine, and Cay Goude said it was okay with the Fish and Wildlife Service. Pat Manley noted that she has spoken with Craig and Wayne about the need to be conservative with releasing information from the unpublished SNAMP data.

August 13, 2014 SNAMP-related Session at Ecological Society of America (ESA) annual meeting, Sacramento

Patricia said that she is working on a paper for the ESA session and invited other members of the MOU Partners to contribute to the paper. Her paper focuses on agency perspectives, especially

- 1) the collaborative process, and
- 2) new science that contributes to management.

Patricia asked that people send her an email if they want to contribute to the sponsoring agency perspective. Cay said that she had sent Patricia a contribution a while ago.

John noted that the ESA session has a good mix of process and science in the talks, and includes several outside perspectives, including Bernard Bormann. All UCST teams are represented except for Spatial and Fisher, and Sue Britting is providing the stakeholder perspective. Susie Kocher said that the Public Participation team is focusing their talk on what it means to involve stakeholders in science.

John reminded session presenters to leave time for questions at the end of their talks – 15 minutes for the talk and 5 minutes Q&A. Peter said he would email the MOU Partners a link to the ESA webpage for the session, which includes all the talk abstracts [<http://eco.confex.com/eco/2014/webprogram/Session9762.html>].

3) MOUP response to the SNAMP final report (Patricia Flebbe).

Patricia briefly reviewed the history of the idea of a MOUP response that would become a part of the final record of SNAMP (although not part of the final report itself). The idea was initially brought up at a MOUP quarterly meeting last year. For the April 2014 MOUP quarterly meeting, Patricia sent out a mock-up of the MOUP response, but not many people were on the April conference call, and she only has a couple of responses. She hasn't had a response yet from the California Resources Agency. Patricia is still putting together the Forest Service response so she is not yet able to share it with everyone. She noted that it would be difficult to respond in any detail to the scientific results because SNAMP results are just being reported to the agencies now.

Patricia asked whether the MOU Partners should still try to integrate their responses or just compile individual responses; or whether the MOU Partners really need to produce a formal response at all.

John said that he thinks there is value in a MOUP response if the MOU Partners are willing. The response would ideally be permanently archived along with the SNAMP final report. Cay agreed that a MOUP response was important and suggested that Patricia send out the mock-up again with Cay's comments as an example. Russ Henly said that he would try to get the state response rolling forward. Each state department will contribute its perspective, and the California Resources Agency will pull together the state's response.

Patricia suggested that the MOU Partners set some deadlines for themselves. **The MOU Partners need to provide:**

- 1) input for the ESA talk within the next week or so; and
- 2) their contribution to the MOUP response.

Patricia will send out an email re: needs for the ESA talk. Cay asked Patricia to send her any clarifications that she needs for the MOUP response.

4) Will this be our last quarterly call?

Patricia, Cay, and John all expressed the opinion that it would be a good idea to have a final meeting of the MOU Partners. John said that it would be a good idea also to talk about those parts of the SNAMP project that are on-going and also about how SNAMP data will be archived, etc.

Patricia suggested that there be two more meetings:

- 1) a brief (~1 hour) meeting between the MOU Partners and the UC Science Team immediately before or after the Annual meeting in early November; and
- 2) a face to face, all-day meeting sometime nearer December, perhaps in the first week of December. Patricia said she will send out a Doodle poll for the December date. Peter said the UC Science Team will decide whether they prefer to meet before or after the Annual meeting and report back to the MOU Partners soon.

5) New business

Open discussion of other topics raised by participants.

John reported that Carlos Ramirez of the USFS Region 5 Remote Sensing Lab had received additional money for a recent lidar flight of the Tahoe National Forest, including the post-American Fire area of the northern SNAMP research site.

John also said that he has been granted funding to resample the American Fire area and that field crews are sampling right now, before salvage logging occurs. The salvage logging has been held up by litigation.

DECISIONS and ACTION ITEMS:

1) The UC Science Team will make a decision on July 30 about changes to the SNAMP timeline and will tell the MOU Partners as soon as possible thereafter whether there will be a delay.

2) Patricia asked the MOU Partners to send her an email if they want to contribute to the sponsoring agency perspective paper for the ESA session.

3) The MOU Partners need to provide:

1) input for the ESA talk within the next week or so; and

2) their contribution to the MOUP response.

Patricia will send out an email re: needs for the ESA talk. Cay asked Patricia to send her any clarifications that she needs for the MOUP response.

4) Patricia suggested that there be two more MOUP meetings:

1) a brief (~1 hour) meeting between the MOU Partners and the UC Science Team immediately before or after the Annual meeting in early November; and

2) a face to face, all-day meeting sometime nearer December, perhaps in the first week of December. Patricia said she will send out a Doodle poll for the December date. Peter said the UC Science Team will decide whether they prefer to meet before or after the Annual meeting and report back to the MOU Partners soon.