

MEETING NOTES: SW Crown Collaborative Meeting
September 14, 2010
Supervisor's Office, Lolo National Forest

Attendees – Anne Dahl, Tim Love, Amber Kamps, Jon Haufler, John Manz, Kevin Riordan, Sarah Richey, Chris Bryant, Larry Anderson, Keith Stockmann, Scott Brennan, Debbie Austin, Gary Burnett, Travis Belote, Jim Burchfield, Dale Kirkvliet and Rich Kehr.

Review of last meeting notes - No corrections or changes noted.

Thank you celebration - Decision was made to hold the BBQ celebration on Wednesday, October 27th.

Action Item: Gary, Scott, John, Amber and Tim will organize the BBQ event. Debbie volunteered to provide meat. The group will find a location in Seeley.

Time Tracking for Match – Scott will send out a request the last work day of each month for all to list non-government time on the project to reference as match.

Committee Report – Scott will post a link on the SW Crown website to download reports. Some members of the collaborative are not able to open documents.

FY 2010 CFLRP Program - This meeting didn't occur. Direction is coming from WO on how to report match. Collaborative requests that the Forest Service walk the group through how match and reporting will work. In FY 10 the Lolo and Flathead have allocated 100% of funds. Helena is at 80%. Recommend a small committee for FY 10 accomplishment reporting. It was noted that this is likely a responsibility of the monitoring committee. Amber shared a spreadsheet summarizing FY 10 CFLRP funding. It is unclear when the match report is due. Recommend that the forest budget officers conference on handling CFLRP funds and reporting. There are many landscape efforts that are not valued and captured in the existing spreadsheet.

Action Item: Rangers, Gary, Keith, Anne and Kalee Ly-Thao (Lolo Budget Officer) will develop an overall reporting mechanism which will capture all match efforts for FY 10. Provide a specific list of questions that Scott can use to ask partners to quantify their match. He needs this by 9/30.

Public Education and Outreach – Jared White will take the lead on this effort to highlight on the ground work. He has contacted the forest public affairs officers. Intent is to highlight restoration efforts, resulting employment and the success of the SW Crown effort.

Action Item: Jared will work with other collaborative partners to identify monthly media/public education opportunities.

Mapping of all FY 10 and 11 Project Locations – Minor amount of progress made to date.

Action Item: Bo Wilmer will ensure mapping occurs before October meeting.

Charter – Scott sent out a draft for review. Draft is written as if the Forest Service is a member of the charter. Decisions made by the collaborative are informational and recommendations. Decision authority still remains with the Forest Service. Qualification for membership was discussed. Recommend communication with RACs. The concept of membership renewal was proposed.

The group read through the draft charter and noted following edits and concerns.

- Attendance can be in person or by teleconference.
- Concern about a member who does not participate. Add sentence that it is the responsibility of members to stay current on activities. Lack of participation also makes it more difficult to reach a meeting quorum. A statement should be added to insure a diversity (representation from all involved organizations) of interests is represented at meetings. Meetings will require an attendance sheet. A record of membership will be maintained by the co-chairs.
- Forest Service legal advice is that the more rules developed the less likely that the agency can participate.
- Proxy may be allowed and designated in writing. Only a member may be represented by a proxy.
- Define the term “information.”
- Be consistent with the use of terms SWCC and collaborative.
- Executive team includes the co-chairs. The executive team will generally not make decisions for the group, but will respond to day-to-day operations. Collaborative will decide funding priorities through consensus.
- Designate co-chairs as responsible for annual reporting.
- Term limits for executive committee should be described. Use the same language as for the co-chairs. Executive committee may have more than one agency representative. Specify that the executive committee have five members.
- Change the executive committee title to that of the administrative committee.
- Continue with an agency and non-agency co-chair.
- Generally strive for consensus.
- Designate recorder.
- Concerning conflict of interest, the involved committee member should be involved with the discussion. When the group votes on the issue, the individual or group with conflict of interest should leave the room. Gary will provide the Blackfoot charter language.
- Add language on the process for revising the charter.
- Add statement about meeting announcements, which should be open to the public.

Action Item: Scott will update and send out another copy in PDF format for the collaborative team review.

Stewardship Contracting Revenues – Keith is finding out if we can use these dollars as match. He is waiting for response.

Partner In-Kind – Keith is confirming that these contributions may be used as match.

Social and Economic Monitoring – Keith would like a clear record on what we are communicating to contractors and determine opportunities for employment feedback as a result of CFLRP funding. Joe will provide input for the Condon October 7th meeting with contractors.

Selection Criteria – Keith working with others to create a survey to determine what the public and partners want as selection criteria for projects and monitoring efforts.

Summary of Existing Monitoring – Keith has summarized many of the existing monitoring efforts in a PowerPoint presentation with internet links. Scott asked if some of these efforts could be referred to as match for the SW Crown. This will need to be checked out with the WO.

Monitoring Committee – Jim provided an update. Meeting was held on the 13th. At this meeting the draft monitoring committee charter was reviewed. They reviewed Keith's 70 slide power point summary on existing monitoring efforts which range from global to local efforts. Monitoring is happening at different scales among many parties. Ilana is reviewing and about complete with compiling local monitoring efforts. She is finding a large amount of aquatic monitoring data. The committee plans to use existing efforts and fill the gaps to add value to the overall SW Crown landscape. The committee would like to generate some immediate monitoring successes but focus on the long term. A linkage needs established to help determine priorities for treatment to provide for success in landscape restoration.

The monitoring committee recommends that a monitoring coordinator be hired. The position may start out as part time. The position would provide staff time to coordinate monitoring efforts, develop a web page, provide some GIS assistance, and build communication channels. Who hosts the position and how it is paid for is an unknown. Jim has a \$10,000 grant available to start investment in such a position. The committee would like to start recruiting soon. Jim has capacity to hire positions on a temporary basis. Estimated cost of a full time position is \$50,000+. The University can hire under year by year letters of appointment.

The committee needs to be strategic in selecting the variables that are important to track. Fuels, weeds and aquatic seem to be important resources to monitor. There presently is not a coordinated monitoring system for weed management.

Next monitoring committee meeting is October 7 or 8th to make decisions on monitoring priorities and whether or not to hire a coordinator.

Jim needs direction from the collaborative on two points. One, do we recruit a monitoring coordinator? Two, do we start immediately with capturing early successes with monitoring including involvement with the public. Debbie recommended identification of IT assistance for monitoring, possibly from the Forest Service. Jim mentioned the capabilities of Google Earth and portable data collectors.

Decision: The collaborative concurred on moving forward with Jim's two priorities.

Match

How do we build up partnership resources? It is to the SW Crown's advantage to demonstrate solid partnerships that contribute match. RMEF and Trout Unlimited are two examples. The work has to occur on National Forest Lands. Agreements within the SW Crown count as match so long as it is project oriented, not planning. Work to carry out implementation (survey, design, sale layout, contract administration, sale administration, agreement development) counts as match. If a strong argument can be made for counting a match, document it and refer to it for project match. It is unclear if the work of this collaborative group counts as match.

We need to form a committee to identify and quantify collaborative non-federal contribution to the SW Crown effort. This effort should describe the leverage capability for the overall project for FY 11 and beyond. Purpose of this effort is to display to the Forest Service Regional Office that the SW Crown has the capability to provide match so there is minimal impact on the rest of the regional programs. This effort will also describe the level of regional appropriated match needed. **Action Item:** The same group describing match for FY 10 will also do so for FY 11 and beyond. Determine which agency investments in the landscape may be used as match, investments such as land acquisition.

FY 2011 Prioritization

John handed out and reviewed the draft priority criteria for treatment selection. (See attached.) John recommend being deliberate with our investments for FY 2012 and beyond. Scott reminded us of the table of commitments we set for ourselves in the project proposal. We need to consider the land management activities occurring on neighboring resource lands.

We need to be able to describe in simple language what our goals are for the SW Crown. Fire has a fairly good description. Aquatic can be described. The terrestrial piece needs further staff work. List values at risk.

Districts need to map their projects.

John's criteria should be boiled down to a simple list for FY 2011. For 2012 priority areas need to be established on which the criteria will be used to prioritize projects.

Action Item: For FY 2011 a small committee with the three rangers, John, Keith, Travis, Gary and Kara was assigned to establish a clear set of criteria and prioritize the projects. It was requested that the set of criteria be reviewed by the larger collaborative.

Long Term Stewardship Contracting

In 1999 Forest Service was authorized to enter into long term stewardship contracts. In 2003 the authority was further described. The Forest Service was slow to use this authority. Only three long term stewardship contracts exist. There is a penalty against the agency if the agency doesn't deliver expected outputs to the contractors. The penalty requires the agency to pay the contractor. The Regional Forester decides whether or not to use long term stewardship authority.

Stewardship authority was requested of the Regional Office for the SW Crown eliminating the need to request authority each time stewardship authority is considered for a project in the landscape. The Regional Office hasn't approved this request. Amber will check on the status.

Partner Coordinator

Gary introduced the need for a partner coordinator. This position would take care of administrative duties. This could be the same person who is needed to help with the administrative duties with the monitoring committee. The intent is to fund this position with outside dollars. The collaborative will provide input on the duties of this position and possible funding.

Action Item: Scott will coordinate input for the partner coordinator concept.