MEETING SUMMARY | Dinkey Collaborative Full Group

May 17, 2012

Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project, Sierra National Forest

Table of Contents

Action Items 1
1. Welcome and Introductions 1
2. Values Inherent in the Dinkey Landscape 2
3. Identify Critical Fact-Finding Questions and Bald Mountain Boundary 3
4. Updates and Member Announcements 5
5. Communication and Education 7
6. Monitoring Work Group Activities 10
7. SNF and Dinkey Budget Planning Overview 11
8. Attendees 12

Action Items

1. **Dorian and Carolyn** to confirm that the group has the latest version of the bugkill report by Beverly Bulaon.
2. **Carolyn Ballard** to draft a thank you letter to the APCD
3. **Dorian** to distribute link to the LiDAR data on databasin.org.
4. **Pam, Sue, and Marc** to discuss matching the funds for the LiDAR SNAMP workshop.
5. **Cindy Whelan** to follow-up on the reimbursement of DLRP funds allocated to KREW.
6. **Dorian** to work with Forest staff and draft a brief protocol regarding outside requests for CLFR funding to support common interests.
7. **Pam Flick** to update communication materials.
8. **Dirk Charley** to follow up with providing brochures to the Forest Service.
9. **All members** to send Ms. Pam Flick any appropriate media clips and articles for inclusion in the media archive and website.
10. **Elissa Brown** to provide information regarding the SFCC mailing list.
11. **Stan and Marc** to schedule a webinar on the monitoring work group's question prioritization.
12. **Stan and Cindy** to further discuss monitoring as part of the overall 2013 CFLR budget once supporting materials are available.

All materials and presentations are available to members on DataBasin.org

1. Welcome and Introductions, and September 19 Field Visit

Mr. Ray Porter, High Sierra District Ranger, welcomed all participants to the full Collaborative meeting. Ms. Kim Sorini-Wilson, District Biologist, stood in as project manager while Mr. Mosé Jones-Yellin, Deputy District Ranger, High Sierra Ranger District (HSRD), Sierra National Forest

(SNF), is on assignment. Mr. Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) Facilitator, reviewed the meeting ground rules and agenda items. He noted that a new field visit dedicated to examining meadows in the Dinkey Landscape had been scheduled for Wednesday, September 19.

2. Values Inherent in the Dinkey Landscape

Mr. Fougères instructed group to participate in an exercise that exhibits each member's relationship to the Dinkey Landscape. He told the group to consider the following: identify when you first became familiar with Sierra National Forest (SNF), or the Southern Sierra Region, identify any landmark events, think about ways you have used and enjoyed the land, and think about the value and importance the DLRP has for you. After members wrote their responses on a large sheet of butcherblock paper with a timeline at the top, they shared comments about their experiences:

- The Collaborative process is producing results, for example, the Air Pollution Control District has allowed important prescribed burns in the Dinkey landscape. We need to continue planning strategically for the future.
- The landscape has enriched professional and personal lives. It has its own aesthetics, regardless of how you use it. It provides solitude, scenic overlooks, and wildlife viewing. It is an inheritance for our children and future generations.
- Recreation is important, such as access to trails for off-road vehicles, horses, hikers, swimmers, anglers, and campers. Maximizing access increases the risk of visible and non-visible impacts, which must be minimized at the same time. This involves educating people about stewardship and ownership within the landscape.
    - The facilitator noted that the comment recommended that it is not about <u>either</u> access <u>or</u> environmental protection, but rather it is about <u>both</u> access <u>and</u> environmental protection.
- To be successful the Collaborative must both promote access for the public (hikers, hunters, boaters, and campers), at the same time as minimizing associated environmental impacts.
- The area's rich resources include the ability to manage wood products and other industries within the landscape.
- Industry has a valuable role to play in helping to manage the landscape in a way that avoids the extremes of either clear-cutting forests or stopping all logging.
- The research community has a role to play, too, including experimentation.
- Family bonding within the Dinkey Landscape, and passing skills from generation to generation, are important parts of the history.
- Understand the unique biodiversity within the landscape. The group should consider diverse uses, and offer appropriate management solutions.
- Tribal members have important relationships with the landscape. Certain members felt that they learned valuable lessons from the native people and applied the lessons to their work within the forest. They stated that they had a better appreciation of the area's history.

- Teach young children the value of the forest, and have them experience the landscape first hand. Taking people outside promotes stewardship and ownership.
- Promote access to gathering areas, trails, and sacred sites for the tribal communities.
- Users of the forest must be educated about how to meet their needs while minimizing environmental impacts. Collaborative members have a role to play in such efforts.
- Access for emergency response, such as public safety and fire management, is important. The Collaborative could create opportunities to divert routes away from ecologically sensitive areas, while maintaining public access.
- Promote better information and communication, so that people working on trails and roads and other activities can keep the Collaborative's goals in mind.
- Planning for roads and trails must weigh costs and benefits. This includes benefits like public health and safety and emergency access, and impacts like sedimentation and aquatic species. Once a thorough analysis is completed, the Collaborative has many options including investing in maintenance or rehabilitation, closing, or rerouting.
- The experience with travel management could have been improved. For the Dinkey Collaborative to be effective, we need better information and communication and supporting dialogue, to be site-specific in our deliberations, to have a supportive meeting environment, and to have strong leadership from the Forest.

3. Joint Fact-Finding Questions and Bald Mountain Boundary

Mr. Fougères asked members to review the Joint Fact-Finding Questions handout, and to identify (1) other technical debates that need clarification, (2) general issues that need clarification, and (3) the best approach for the group to advance vegetation issues, and to advance fisher issues? Discussion followed.

- Baseline current conditions are needed to inform work. From there, one can focus on what the desired uses and hence desired conditions are.
- With fire intervals, a longer return interval does not necessarily equal a less intense fire.
- Snags, the origin of snags, life histories, longevity associated with species and diameters, and the relationships between insects & disease and snags (including historical and current mortality rates) need further exploration. Fisher habitat elements and Lassen National Forest research could aid in understanding snag issues.
    - **ACTION ITEM**: **Dorian and Carolyn** to confirm that the group has the latest version of the bugkill report by Beverly Bulaon.
- For red fir, desired conditions should reflect a range rather than the mean. Historical and current regeneration rates, and how to improve these, also need consideration.
- Tree encroachment by lodgepole pines in meadows and how this impacts at-risk aquatic species.
- Incorporate recreation into the area's desired conditions, in order to minimize impacts. In addition, consider recreation uses based on different elevations.
- Identify the current conditions for canopy cover, and discuss whether there is enough or too little.

- Potential inter-species impacts should also be considered – actions to protect one species may detrimentally affect another.
- American marten habitat will need to be considered at higher elevations.
- Consider great grey owl habitat improvement; see Roy Bridgman's work on the Stanislaus National Forest.
- Examine how projects fit within the larger landscape, e.g., corridors.

Regarding vegetation treatments:

- Identify the range of conditions and associated timeframes.
- Aim to replicate natural variation, as well as create "emphasis areas" that can be overlaid on the general landscape.
- The group needs to be aware of and factor in limitations on the application of prescribed fire in its project planning. There needs to be a process to prioritize areas where prescribed fire should be applied, whether maintaining an existing burn program or initiating a new one.
- The mixed conifer topography-based model may be less applicable in some areas, and planning should first identify heterogeneity drivers. For example, in high elevation red fir areas topographic features and lightning may be more influential.

Regarding fisher issues:

- Develop the treatments and limitations for spotted owl and fisher areas within the site, consistent with standards and guidelines. Local biologists could offer suggestions for treatments, and review the topographic index for zoning, by Emma C. Underwood, Joshua H. Viers, James F. Quinn, and Malcolm North.
- Assess proposed treatment impacts on wildlife, including consider effects of treatments in one area on the surrounding area. One then needs to optimize/prioritize what treatments are done within the context of the landscape as a whole.

Mr. Craig Thompson, PSW, had a fisher and boundary recommendation presentation prepared for the Collaborative. To make any boundary recommendations, Mr. Thompson displayed maps of the fisher rest sites (structured areas for the fisher), telemetry (detected collared locations), and scat detections (detected droppings). Most of the fisher detections were located south of the boundary site, and possible moving to the Soaproot site. He noted that the landscape created natural boundaries due to the steep slope and other natural barriers. Mr. Thompson stated that there is another appropriate area, which is located by the Reese Unit (1500 acres) close to Camp Fresno. The location has two monitored adult female fishers. He suggested the area because observing the monitored fishers will aid in reducing future fisher impacts. The members had a variety of questions for Mr. Thompson regarding his boundary recommendations:

- In regards to the fisher research goals, the group asked Mr. Thompson if he wanted to see the fisher habitat maintained or increased. He stated that he wanted to monitor the effects of prescribed treatments, and did not want to harm the fisher's habitat.

- It was asked if the research would aid in prescribing treatments to other areas in the Sierra. Mr. Thompson noted that he would like it to be used as a tool for visualizing treatments and impacts. In addition, after a general framework is established, it could be used for detailed treatment considerations.
- It was an open question who would fund the monitoring of the fisher research, the DLRP or the PSW, as the latter ends in 2013. Mr. Porter stated that the funding would come from the Collaborative and the Forest Service, depending on priorities; it is a good investment of time and money. He added that to the research focus on the additional 1500 acres and not the rest of the site.
- It was expected that research would need to continue past 2013, regardless of budgeting.
- Note that with Mr. Ramiro Rojas is currently unavailable, the group might want to involve a silviculturist to help refine the boundary.
- In regards to prescribed fire, the group asked if the new site would be hard to burn. Ms. Carolyn Ballard noted that operationally this would be okay, but the budget and air days would be limiting factors.
- Based on the initial information presented, the group was receptive to the proposed boundary expansion. However, it was noted that one needs to determine the relative priority and risk of working in specific areas, and the value of the scale of projects relative to Bald Mountain.
    - Therefore, it was agreed that Craig should work on clarifying the objectives of the research and the Collaborative should assess over the next several weeks the difficulty and feasibility of adding this part of the project.
    - An additional field date in June was scheduled to allow the group to examine the Reese Unit earlier in the season.

4. Updates and Member Announcements

A written update on the status of projects was provided by Mr. Keith Ballard (not in attendance).

Clarence Burn and Pacific Fisher

- It was noted that the fisher moved her kit the day after the fire had burned. To be sure that this was not a coincidence, they burned another section closer to her location, and discovered that she eventually did relocate. During the experiment, they measured the carbon monoxide and temperature on the fisher den sites, and found that the cavity was stable. The amount of carbon was low, and the temperature inside the cavity stayed constant. The members had questions on the experiments results:
    - Regarding time frames for the carbon monoxide spikes, Mr. Thompson stated that the intervals were approximately five minutes.
    - Thank the Air Pollution Control District (APCD) for the ability to burn the area for the experiment.

- **ACTION ITEM: Carolyn Ballard** to draft a thank you letter to the APCD

LiDAR Data for Dinkey Landscape

- Mr. Marc Meyer stated that initial LiDAR data on canopy cover and stand height are available on databasin.org. Mr. Meyer stated that the next step is to review the stand metrics, which Mr. Rojas established, and work with Mr. Thompson and Ms. Kathryn Purcell as related to the fisher and spotted owl habitat identification. Ms. Pamela Flick commented that the SNAMP had a LiDAR workshop, which discussed opportunities for funding.

  ACTION ITEM: Dorian to distribute link to the LiDAR data on databasin.org.
  ACTION ITEM: Pam, Sue, and Marc to discuss matching the funds for the LiDAR SNAMP workshop.

Bull Creek Memorandum

- Ms. Britting stated that the Region intended to monitor the KREW project on monitoring the toad, but the monitoring did not occur. The group stated that they were unhappy with the Region because they used funds from the DLRP. The group asked if there was a way to refund their money for the toad monitoring. Mr. Thomas felt that the Region took the funds without any awareness or participation from members.
- Mr. Porter stated that there were reasons for not funding the monitoring, and now the research is continuing. He stated that the current research seemed disconnected without the monitoring.
- The group stated that there is a problem with funding and the commitment to monitor the research. Because the Collaborative advocates for Dinkey Creek area, there are certain projects that the group deems important. The group administers funds to projects that affect the Dinkey Landscape. It was noted that funding has an element of risk, especially if the project is not implemented as planned.
- Ms. Cindy Whelan stated that the funding could be reimbursed.
- **ACTION ITEM: Cindy Whelan** to follow-up on the reimbursement of DLRP funds allocated to KREW.
- **ACTION ITEM: Dorian** to work with Forest staff and draft a brief protocol regarding outside requests for CLFR funding to support common interests.

Other

- At the GTR 237 Workshop on May 3, 2012, Mr. Rojas gave a presentation on the Dinkey Landscape, and had good response. The next steps may include GTR demonstration sites and wildlife marking guidelines.
- In late fall, the National Park Service will conduct their USGS Southern Sierra Vulnerability Assessment, as well as a workshop regarding restoration for the past, present, and future.

5. Communication and Education

Ms. Pamela Flick discussed the Communication Work Group progress with the members, and reviewed the following communication materials, after which members provided comments:

Final Talking Points, Brochure, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQ)

- Recreational users and landowners should be included in all lists of interested parties.
- The description of the purpose of members should draw directly from the Dinkey Collaborative Charter.
- The exact project acreage is 154,000 acres, including private lands.
- Consider adding the Collaborative's project list and current activities to the talking points.
- On the fourth bullet of page two of the talking points, add "in support of the adaptive management."
- It was noted that the Dinkey Collaborative is a Resource Advisory Committee (RAC), but the current language regarding FACA should be retained because there are many types of RACs, not all of which are FACA committees.
- Revise the language on the FAQ to state "native species" and not use the term "biodiversity".
- In regards to the brochure, the group noted that the contact information was different from what is included on their contact sheet. Ms. Flick stated that there is a formatting issue with having enough space on the brochure; therefore, she suggested that the contact list be available online.
- Include Big Sandy Rancheria and the Sustainable Forest and Communities Collaborative as restoration partners in the brochure and other documents.
    - **ACTION ITEM: Pam Flick** to update communication materials.
- Offer brochures in the Forest Service offices. Mr. Charley volunteered to coordinate the Communication Work Group's efforts.
    - **ACTION ITEM: Dirk Charley** to follow up with providing brochures to the Forest Service.

Charge for Media Contacts

Ms. Flick asked members to review the Media Contact Memorandum provided. The group had comments on the media contact charge:

- Consider the reporter's integrity because they can skew the member's intended message to the media. The group discussed that there are issues associated with commenting "off the record", and it was advised to assume that you are always on the record, no matter what the reporter says. They noted that if there is a misstatement that you can write a letter to the editor.
- The members stated that having a variety of representations included in the contact list displays a diverse Collaborative membership. A member representing recreational interests should be added once a member has attended enough meetings and signed the charter.
- Send Ms. Flick media clips, links, or PDFs that would be beneficial to the Collaborative's website.

        - **ACTION ITEM: All members** to send Ms. Pam Flick any appropriate media clips and articles for inclusion in the media archive and website.
    - Mr. Dirk offered to debrief Ms. Rebecca Garcia on the communication progress.

Working Draft Communication Plan

- Ms. Flick discussed the communication strategies in the Communication Plan. She stated that the work group was concentrating on developing media archives, interested parties list, virtual media tours, links with environmental bloggers, standardized promotional materials, coordinating with other CFLRs, and utilizing key press and media outlets.
- Mr. Haze has contacted Mr. Tom Catchpole from the Mountain Press, and invited him to be a part of future field visits. The group noted that Mr. Catchpole has been historically involved with local restoration work and will not need to be brought up to speed with regard to technical issues.
- Members had comments on the Communication Plan:
    - Note that "regional tribal forum" should be "Sierra National Forest Tribal Forum".
    - Create a standard PowerPoint presentation for members to exhibit at other organizations.
    - Contact the SFCC for information about their mailing list. Ms. Elissa Brown offered to coordinate the efforts.
        - **ACTION ITEM: Elissa Brown** to provide information regarding the SFCC mailing list.
    - Create inclusive regional events for the public. The group stated that they could offer an open house at the Shaver Lake Museum for the public.
    - Note the success of the finance group's trip to Washington DC last year, and the potential to have a routine annual visit.
    - Include the San Joaquin Valley Air Pollution Control District in any released information. It was noted that the APCD likes to be updated about the Collaborative's plans, so they can contribute to the success of any fire prescriptions needed by the DLRP.
    - When possible, provide Ms. Flick with a draft press release before completion, to obtain any comments that help maintain Collaborative message consistency.

Volunteering for Implementation of Communication Strategies

1. Use the USFS Dinkey Collaborative website as the clearinghouse for all information and materials associated with the Collaborative meetings and the communication efforts.
    a. Sierra National Forest
    b. Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
2. Develop and maintain an interested parties email and address distribution list, including denotation of parties that express an interest in partnering.

   a. Center for Collaborative Policy, CSUS
3. Proactively develop and regularly utilize relationships with key press and media outlets for the purpose of sharing news and information.
   a. Stan Van Velsor
   b. Rich Bagley
   c. Steve Haze
4. Incorporate new technology and less-traditional media outlets (e.g., develop a virtual media tour; reach out to environmental/outdoor/recreation bloggers, journals) to increase the reach of our communication efforts.
   a. Stan Van Velsor
   b. John Stewart
   c. Pam Flick
   d. Craig Thomas
5. Develop a standardized series of general promotional materials (e.g., quarterly e-newsletter, PowerPoint template), as well as activity-specific and topic-specific materials as needed.
   a. Pam Flick
   b. Sierra National Forest
6. Enlist Collaborative members to periodically brief their constituent groups (e.g., twice a year).
   a. Mandy Vance
   b. John Stewart
   c. Rich Bagley
   d. John Mount
   e. Ray Laclergue
   f. Larry Duysen
   g. Steve Haze
   h. Stan Harger
   i. Joe Kaminski
7. Conduct an annual round of briefings for elected officials and agency executive officers.
   a. Steve Haze
   b. Kent Duysen
   c. Mandy Vance
   d. Pam Flick
   e. Craig Thomas
   f. Cindy Whelan
   g. John Stewart
8. Ensure Collaborative presence at all relevant regional, high-profile, large-scale public events.
   a. John Stewart
   b. Pam Flick
9. Conduct local informational events to promote the Collaborative (e.g., host a summer event at the museum at Camp Edison).
   a. John Mount
   b. Pam Flick
   c. Rich Bagley
   d. Mark Smith

    e. Sierra National Forest
10. Conduct field visit(s) that is open to members of the public, possibly in conjunction with informational event(s) referenced above.
    a. Sierra National Forest
    b. Elissa Brown
11. Conduct an annual visit to Washington, D.C., to promote the Collaborative.
    a. Kent Duysen
    b. Craig Thomas

6. Monitoring Work Group Activities

Mr. Van Velsor presented the group with updates of the work group's activities.

Socioeconomic Monitoring Proposal

- Mr. Van Velsor noted that Mr. Kusel's proposal meets legislative requirements for socioeconomic monitoring. He discussed that this proposal offers more benefits to the rural communities and an effective assessment of restoration work. The issues of cost were resolved by conducting the work in phases.
- It was noted that the science synthesis work will not be duplicated by the socioeconomic proposal, but will be supplemental.
- After conversation with Supervisor Armentrout, the Forest was comfortable with doing a cost-share agreement rather than an RFP.
- There will be an advisory group established for the socioeconomic proposal, which will be part of the larger Monitoring Work Group, and any member can participate in that sub-group.
- The group had comments on the socioeconomic proposal:
    - Ms. Brown stated that she thinks that the proposal should include more language suggesting the development of programmatic activities, and integrate other organizations to meet socioeconomic goals. She noted that the Collaborative should plan economic activities with the goal of benefiting the local community. It was noted that Ms. Brown and Mr. Van Velsor would discuss these concerns later.
    - Identifying the regional communities that affect the Dinkey Landscape. It was noted that members interested in this topic should participate in the work group. Mr. Haze and Mr. Stewart stated that they would like to work on the socioeconomic proposal sub-work group.
- **AGREEMENT**: The group, with the exception of Mr. Chad Hanson, agreed to recommend to the Forest to implement the socioeconomic assessment proposal from Sierra Institute.
    - Note that Mr. Chad Hanson, not in attendance, is not in support of Mr. Kusel's socioeconomic proposal. Mr. Hanson expressed concerns to the facilitator in advance of the meeting (and at the March 2012 Collaborative meeting) that he felt the attention given to socioeconomic issues takes away from more important ecological restoration activities. Furthermore, Mr. Hanson based on personal

experience had concerns about the impartiality of Mr. Kusel and his style of engaging rural communities.
    - Ms. Lisa Garcia, Big Sandy Rancheria, stood aside. This is still consistent with consensus, but signals that Big Sandy Rancheria does not specifically endorse the proposal, at the same time as it will not block the work from going forward.

Ecological Monitoring Question Prioritization

- Mr. Marc Meyer stated that he and Mr. Van Velsor would meet with Forest Service subject matter experts to prioritize the full list of questions, and bring a revised table of outputs and priority list back to the full Collaborative when ready. He noted that the Monitoring Work Group would schedule a webinar before the June meeting for any members who are interested in discussing the prioritization results before they are presented to the full Collaborative.
- **ACTION ITEM: Stan and Marc** to schedule a webinar on the monitoring work group's question prioritization.

7. SNF and Dinkey Budget Planning Overview

Ms. Cindy Whelan asked the group to review the budget handouts. She explained that the summaries attempt to address the Sierra National Forest (SNF) funding process. It was noted that the SNF budget is part of the total federal budget conversation. Ms. Whelan noted that the state's fiscal year does not correspond to the federal government's fiscal year, and the difference makes it hard to coordinate funds. It was noted that the SNF was facing cutbacks, but received more funds than anticipated.

It was asked whether funds that are allocated but not spent in a given year are lost. Ms. Whelan stated that they are carried over.

It was asked whether allocated funds are subject to federal budget sequestration cuts. Ms. Whelan was not sure. Mr. Porter assumed this would be the case.

Ms. Whelan reviewed the different funding categories for the SNF. It was noted that a large portion of funding goes towards fire suppression. The section listed for the Dinkey Project Funding has a set of requirements and should meet the Dinkey Collaborative's objectives. The group noted that almost all other categories link to the Dinkey Collaborative's objectives, and these categories often provide the matching funds that support the DLRP. Mr. Van Velsor stated that establishing a budget for the monitoring program would be valuable, and that he would work with Ms. Whelan on developing this further.

Ms. Whelan discussed the process for the Collaborative input in the DLRP budgeting process. She reviewed the distributed document. She stated that they are beginning the process of budgeting for 2013. In addition, the document did not show matching dollars to the Forest Service, such as what the PSW contributes. It was stated that twice a year, a budget presentation will be given for the Collaborative. Members had comments:

- In regards to the LiDAR project, the group wanted to know where that would fit in the budget categories. Ms. Whelan stated that it was part of the CFLR money grouped with the monitoring contract.
- Mr. Van Velsor wanted to participate in the 2013 budget planning for the Collaborative and represent the monitoring work group. It was stated that it would be possible to part of the general budget discussion. Ms. Whelan noted that within the next 30 days, the budget work plan would be reviewed. In addition, she stated that spending of 2013 funds begins on October 1, 2012.
- Consider including budget discussion during next monitoring group meeting. Ms. Whelan stated that she would talk with Mr. Van Velsor offline about monitoring budget possibilities.
    - **ACTION ITEM: Stan and Cindy** to further discuss monitoring as part of the overall 2013 CFLR budget once supporting materials are available.

8. Attendees

1. Rich Bagley
2. Carolyn Ballard, USFS
3. Jim Branham
4. Sue Britting
5. Elissa Brown
6. Dirk Charley, USFS
7. Narvell Connor
8. Kent Duysen
9. Larry Duysen
10. Pamela Flick
11. Dorian Fougères, CCP
12. Lisa Garcia
13. Gabriella Golik, CCP
14. Stan Harger
15. Steve Haze
16. Joe Kaminski
17. Ray Laclergue
18. Marc Meyer, USFS
19. John Mount
20. Ray Porter, USFS
21. Mark Smith
22. Kim Sorini-Wilson, USFS
23. John Stewart
24. Craig Thomas
25. Craig Thompson, USFS
26. Mandy Vance
27. Stan Van Velsor
28. Cindy Whelan, USFS