

Southwestern Crown Collaborative
Executive Committee
Meeting Notes
July 12, 2011

Present: Megan Birzell, Scott Brennan*, Michele Wasienko-Holland, Gary Burnett*, Cory Davis, Sandy Mack, Amber Kamps*, Mo Bookwalter*

**Indicates voting member.*

- I. Review/Revise Agenda
 - a. Agenda additions:
 - i. Discussion of Executive Committee's vision for Sandy's role as FS SWCC coordinator.
- II. Review monitoring proposals and make recommendations
 - a. Process
 - i. The Executive Committee began by discussing the filters each member used when individually reviewing the monitoring proposals. Some members used a draft rubric that Gary provided last week.
 - ii. Filters applied included the following:
 1. Did the principal investigator (PI) follow the process and answer all the questions in the request for proposal (RFP)?
 2. How is the proposal applicable to CFLR goals and objectives (the Act)?
 3. If it is a project-specific proposal, how will the results of the monitoring be transferable to the SW Crown landscape-level?
 4. Will the proposal need funding in future years?
 5. Are there opportunities to combine proposals to improve cost efficiencies?
 6. Are all resource groups represented in our funding recommendations?
 7. Does the proposal flow out of conversations within the Monitoring Committee over the past year?
 - iii. The Executive Committee used a process in which each participants who so chose populated two lists: "must fund" and "must not fund" based on their individual review of the proposals.
 1. "Must fund" proposals included the following:
 - a. Proposal #1: Coordination and Data Management of Overall SWCC Monitoring Program (Cory's Salary; Jim Burchfield lead; original request \$71,500)
 - b. Proposal #2: Understanding Residents' Attitudes about the SWCC and acceptance/support of natural

and prescribed fire inside and outside the WUI (Joe Kerkvliet lead; original request: \$39,600)

- c. Proposal #3: Fire Management Options and Costs (Keith Stockmann lead; original request \$5,100)
 - d. Proposal #4: Developing, Testing, and Implementing Sampling Protocols to Assess the Efficacy and Ecological Effects of Forest Restoration and Fuels Treatments (Andrew Larson lead; original request \$55,014))
 - e. Proposal #5: SWCC Meadow Smith Old Growth Monitoring (Renate Bush lead; original request \$14,000)
 - f. Proposal #8: Swan Valley Cutthroat Trout Genetic Health – Baseline Monitoring (Beth Gardner lead; original request \$22,000)
 - g. Proposal #14: Development of Habitat Models and Identification of Vegetation Parameters for Monitoring Wildlife Responses to SWCC Treatments (Jon Haufler lead; original request \$33,970)
2. “Must not fund” proposals included the following:
- a. Proposal #5: SWCC Meadow Smith Old Growth Monitoring (Renate Bush lead; original request \$14,000)
 - b. Proposal #6: Fire History and Fire/Fuels Monitoring (John Ingebretson lead; original request \$40,000)
 - i. *The “must not fund” provision applies ONLY to the fire history portion of this survey. Fire/fuels monitoring is deemed worthy of discussion for funding.*
 - c. Proposal #8: Swan Valley Cutthroat Trout Genetic Health – Baseline Monitoring (Beth Gardner lead; original request \$22,000)
 - d. Proposal #9: Synthesizing Aquatic Monitoring Data with Existing Reporting Frameworks (Shane Hendrickson lead; original request \$14,000)
 - e. Proposal #10: Demonstration of NetMap spatial watershed tool to determine aquatic effectiveness and to guide restoration prioritization at the landscape scale (Bruce Rieman lead; original request \$3,500)
 - f. Proposal #12: Piloting a chronosequence approach for monitoring the effectiveness and ecological

effects of management activity (Dick Hutto lead; original request \$62,051)

- g. Proposal #15: Meadow Smith Old Growth Avian Monitoring (Steve Anderson lead; original request \$13,000)

b. Discussion and Consensus Recommendations regarding monitoring proposals (see previous section to refer back to proposal titles):

i. Proposal #1

1. Everyone agreed that funding the position of the monitoring coordinator is our highest priority.
2. **Recommend to fund at 100% (\$71,500).**

ii. Proposal #2

1. The group recognized this as a high priority that is tied directly back to FLRA. There were some questions about the feasibility of the survey given recent new information regarding Office of Management and Budget regulations pertaining to using FS funds to survey the public. There were also questions about who the actual PI will be and where the match will come from.
2. Sandy mentioned that there may be an effort to develop a standard survey of resident perceptions and attitudes across all 10 CFLR programs.
3. **Recommend to fund at 90% (\$35,600) with the caveat that we need a clearer understanding of the feasibility relative to OMB regulations as well as who will serve as the PI and where the match will come from.**

iii. Proposal #3

1. Everyone agreed that this is a high priority for funding as it ties directly back to FLRA's direction to reduce firefighting costs.
2. Amber reported that this was regarded as a high priority at the Denver national monitoring workshop and is being pursued at a national level.
3. **Recommend to fund at 90% (\$4,590).**

iv. Proposal #4

1. The group agreed that, of all proposals, this one represented the most integrated approach across resource groups and also will have the best opportunity to fit in to the yet-to-be-determined long-term, landscape-scale monitoring framework.
2. The group saw this proposal as a good 'umbrella proposal' under which other proposals should be integrated.
 - a. The group agreed that the fire/fuels monitoring portion of Proposal #6, as well as Proposal #7

(First-year Post-treatment Monitoring of Roadside and Aerial Herbicide Treatments; Cara Nelson lead, original request \$61,635) should be integrated with Proposal #4. The purpose for this integration is to improve our cost efficiencies and not use two or three crews to accomplish what we could accomplish with one crew.

- b. The group also agreed that Proposal #13 (Multi-Species Carnivore Baseline Inventory in the SW Crown Landscape; Scott Tomson lead, original request \$25,000) and Proposal #14 should work in concert with Proposal #4 to ensure that they are as complimentary as possible. The group recognized that it is unlikely Proposals #13 and #14 can be fully integrated with Proposal #4.
- c. The group also expressed a desire for Proposal #4 to add an old-growth monitoring component within the integrated design.

- 3. **Recommend to fund at \$140,984 (this figure represents 90% of the sum of the original requests for Proposals #4, #6, and #7) with the caveat that the PI work with the PIs of Proposals #6 and #7 to integrate their work under Proposal #4's overall framework.**

v. Proposal #5

- 1. On behalf of Rich, Amber expressed that this proposal is a high priority for the Swan District.
- 2. The pluses for this proposal are that it is tied to big trees, which are a focus of FLRA, and that it has protocols already developed. Minuses are that it didn't adequately address all the questions in the RFP, it didn't develop collaboratively out of the Monitoring Committee, and it shows no match.
- 3. There was discussion about whether this could/should be integrated with Proposal #4, but ultimately the group decided that was not appropriate because the protocols for this proposal have already been developed and implemented and can't be changed to integrate with Proposal #4.
- 4. **Recommend to fund at 45% of original request (\$6,300) and ask the PI to produce the remaining funds as match.**

vi. Proposal #6: Fire History and Fire/Fuels Monitoring (John Ingebretson lead; \$40,000 original request)

1. The group agreed that this proposal needs to be split into two proposals: one for fire history and one for fire/fuels monitoring.
 2. While the group recognizes the importance of fuels monitoring relative to the FLRA, they felt that it could and should be more integrated with Proposal #4 to ensure that it is as cost effective as possible moving forward.
 3. **Recommend to integrate under Proposal #4.**
- vii. Proposal #7: First-Year Post-Treatment Monitoring of Roadside and Aerial Herbicide Treatments (Cara Nelson lead; original request \$61,635)
1. The group recognizes this as a good proposal but would like to see it integrated with Proposal #4 for cost-efficiency.
 2. **Recommend to integrate under Proposal #4.**
- viii. Proposals #8, #9, #10, and #11 (Calibration and use of GRAIP for use in the SW Crown for Project and Site Scale Effectiveness Monitoring; Tom Bansak lead; original request \$41,000) – Aquatics Proposals
1. The group recognizes aquatics monitoring as immensely important for the SW Crown. However, they were not satisfied with the four aquatics monitoring proposals presented.
 2. The proposals presented, for the most part, did not answer all questions in the RFP. The need was well articulated, but it was not clear how the requested funds addressed the need. Further, Proposal #8 seemed disjointed from the other aquatics proposal, and it was not clear whether or how the information obtained would be transferrable to the landscape scale.
 3. **Recommend setting aside \$50,000 for the Aquatics Working Group to develop one new proposal (can have multiple parts) by July 22nd that does the following:**
 - a. Responds to the specific RFP questions
 - b. Shows match and partnership, particularly maximizing the match provided by the GNLCC grant.
 - c. Connects project-level work to the landscape-scale
 - d. Realistically addresses the projected need for future expenditures
- ix. Proposal #12
1. Because this proposal appeared on the “must not fund” list and did not appeal on the “must fund” list, it was

removed from consideration and was not specifically discussed.

2. **Recommend to not fund.**

x. Proposal #13

1. The group liked this proposal and its direct method of monitoring carnivores. There was some concern about its ability in the long-run to integrate with the other monitoring work in the SWCC, and thus they recommend working with Proposal #4 to ensure that it is as integrated as possible. This proposal was not incorporated into Proposal #4's budget because the group thought it would not be possible to fully integrate the two.

2. **Recommend to fund at 90% of original request (\$22,500).**

xi. Proposal #14

1. There were concerns about whether this proposal is actual monitoring because it does not incorporate a field component. After reviewing the congressional committee report concerning FLRA, the group agreed that it does fit within the broad monitoring criteria. Further, the group felt that this work would set the SWCC Monitoring Committee up well to conduct wildlife monitoring in the future, and they would like the PI to work with the PI from Proposal #4 to ensure that field protocols going forward are integrated.

2. **Recommend to fund at 90% of original request (\$30,573).**

xii. Proposal #15

1. Because this proposal appeared on the "must not fund" list and did not appeal on the "must fund" list, it was removed from consideration and was not specifically discussed.

2. **Recommend to not fund.**

xiii. Note on 90% funding levels:

1. In order to meet the targeted 10%, \$350,000 monitoring allocation and to set aside \$50,000 for the Aquatics Working Group to redevelop their proposal, most other proposals' funding levels were reduced by 10%.

c. Next steps

- i. The Executive Committee recommends that proposal revisions, where necessary, be submitted to the FS by July 22nd.
- ii. The Executive Committee recommends that all funded proposals refine their budgets in the format of the template used for FS partnership agreements and that the PIs (including those internal to the FS) work with the FS Grants and Agreements specialists to identify specific deliverables and dates for getting their work

done. This information will be incorporated into the agreements (where appropriate) and kept on file.

- III. FACA and FOIA training
 - a. The Executive Committee requests FACA/NEPA/FOIA training for the full collaborative as soon as is feasible to ensure full compliance and understanding of these important laws.

- IV. The meeting adjourned at 12:45pm.