

SWCC Prioritization Committee
Meeting Notes
January 4, 2011

Present: Sandy Mack, Tim Love, Adam Rissien, Gary Burnett, Cory Davis, Carolyn Mehl, Jon Haufler, Megan Birzell, Rob Ethridge, Amber Kamps

- I. Approve notes
 - a. The notes from the December 5th meeting haven't been sent out. We will approve them at the next meeting.

- II. Update on EMRI's progress
 - a. Jon, Gary, and Amber met with the three district silviculturists on December 15th. At that meeting, agreement was made to use EMRI's historical conditions descriptions as a reference point for restoration. There was a caveat that may not be able to achieve them due to other factors. At this meeting, the fuels reduction goals were also simplified.
 - b. Fuel Goals
 - i. Each district silviculturist is providing their goals for 10 year accomplishment for their respective district.
 - ii. They discussed the goal of treating 80% of the high-risk fuels in the WUI and agreed that, while still possible, this goal may need to be refined to address only "treatable" acres.
 - c. Restoration Goals
 - i. EMRI produced estimates of large tree stands and their current condition, estimated how many need restoration when compared to historical conditions, and discussed with the silviculturists the goal of achieving 10% historical representation across ecological sites.
 - ii. After the December 15th meeting, the Swan and Lincoln district silviculturists provided EMRI with their recommendations for % historical representation goals for their respective districts. Their recommendations were quite different. The Swan suggested that they could only achieve 5% historical representation, while the Lincoln suggested that they could achieve up to 25% historical representation, depending on ecological site.
 1. There is a desire to have more consistent goals across the districts. Ultimately, the Committee agreed that it is best to think in terms of a landscape goal rather than three separate goals for the three districts.
 2. EMRI recommends that 10% should be the minimum goal based on scientific literature.
 3. Under a landscape goal, it would be possible for each district to contribute different levels of restoration as long as the overall goal is still reached at the end of 10 years.
 - iii. EMRI has scheduled meetings with each District later this month to move forward.
 - iv. EMRI expressed concern over an apparent discrepancy between the number of treatable acres (roughly 100,000 acres) according to their

analysis and the SWCC's stated goal in the CFLR proposal to treat 199,410 acres.

1. Discussion and research showed the Committee that the roughly 200,000-acre figure cited in the CFLR proposal includes acres that will receive restoration treatments other than vegetative treatments (i.e. weeds, wildlife habitat security, etc.) while EMRI's estimated 100,000 treatable acres refers only to vegetative treatments (thinning of trees, etc.).
2. The Committee concluded that EMRI's figure is not as far off from the SWCC's CFLR proposal as originally thought, and thus not a cause for concern at this time.

d. EMRI's work will ultimately yield two documents:

- i. A landscape assessment of the SW Crown with information to be used in prioritization process (e.g., historical conditions, current conditions, and differences between the two – what has changed) not broken out by districts. It will not contain recommendations other than an example of how you would use it in a prioritization process.
- ii. A recommendation for spatially prioritizing where restoration treatments could occur.

III. Addressing the following questions re EMRI prioritization:

a. *How do we prioritize aquatics and terrestrial goals relative to available funding?*

- i. For Seeley and Lincoln, we have measures of aquatic value and level of disruption based on road indices summarized in small watersheds. (We are still waiting on aquatics information from the Swan.) We can overlay this with terrestrial opportunities. There are some watersheds where we can focus efforts to get to an ecologically functioning watershed from both a terrestrial and aquatics perspective.

IV. Discussion about prioritization process moving forward after we have prioritization results.

- a. At the January 10th meeting, we will focus on reaching agreement regarding a % historical representation by ecological site goal. We will suggest 10% as a starting place.
- b. Once that goal has been agreed to, we can start thinking about other factors (e.g., weeds, biomass, socioeconomic, roads, wildlife security) in February when we're looking at spatial recommendations.

V. Next meeting: Feb 10th, 10am – 2pm, Seeley RD