

## **MEETING SUMMARY | Dinkey Collaborative Full Group**

**March 20, 2014**

**Dinkey Landscape Restoration Project, Sierra National Forest**

### **Meeting Synopsis**

The Dinkey Collaborative met on March 20, and spent the morning discussing the ongoing preparation for planning the Exchequer project. Following a brief member presentation, the group discussed a series of draft project objectives developed in January and refined in February. Building on this, another member presented on the effort to develop a cumulative effects analysis process for Pacific fisher and California spotted owl, which the group also discussed. Two more member presenters reviewed work to identify where the boundary could be expanded to better accommodate the use of prescribed fire, also followed by discussion. Another member presented on the parallel work to plan for cultural burning in the Exchequer project and at the landscape scale. In terms of process, the group also reviewed and recommended a project planning timeline, with the caveat that dates might shift depending on evolving Forest and member obligations, which would have to be discussed with the full group if necessary. Lastly, the group reviewed a draft proposal for an Interdisciplinary (ID) Team liaison, clarifying how this person would serve as a data conduit and necessary qualifications. Before lunch the Forest Supervisor presented a new series of public communication mylar overlays, which should be available for future public events. The Monitoring Work Group Co-Lead briefed the group after lunch on new funding provided to the Sierra Institute to support coordination and information exchange between the three California CFLRs, and the expected date for a revised socioeconomic assessment report (spring or early summer 2014). Immediately thereafter, the group had a videoconference with the Deputy Regional Forester for Resources and regional budget director, to review the budget status for the Collaborative, how to better communicate about budgeting in the future, and regional support for prescribed fire funding and crews. A series of three presenters then spoke about new modeling results showing the limits of mechanical treatments on the national forests in the Sierra Nevada, practical fire management activities on private lands, and how to define resource benefits as related to high severity fire; one presenter was from the Pacific Southwest Research Station, another was a Collaborative member, and the third from the Regional Office. Next, a presenter from the Region's Remote Sensing Lab reviewed new products from LiDAR (light detection and ranging) flights in 2011 and 2012, which provide a wealth of data but challenges for analysis, given the newness of the technology. The group discussed how this could aid measurement of concepts like heterogeneity as well as help characterize wildlife relationships with habitat. Finally, the Communication Work Group Co-Lead presented on recent communication activities, and obtained feedback about upcoming public events. The group postponed its budget item to April 17, at which time it will cover this item, continue Exchequer pre-planning, revisit the ID team liaison position, recommend the Collaborative Adaptive Management process, and revive its Finance and Budgeting Work Group.

## Contents

Meeting Synopsis: .....	1
Action Items .....	2
1. Welcome and Introductions.....	3
2. Interested Party Comment Period .....	3
3. Landscape Planning Update on Exchequer Boundary.....	3
A. Member Presentations on Exchequer Priorities, Cumulative Effects, and Cultural Burning on the Dinkey Landscape .....	4
B. Proposed Exchequer Planning Timeline .....	5
C. Interdisciplinary Team (ID) Liaison Charge .....	5
4. Announcement and Brief Presentation from Dean Gould .....	6
5. Dinkey CFLRP Expenditures and Accomplishments .....	6
6. General Updates .....	7
A. Sierra Cascade All Lands Enhancement (SCALE) Program .....	7
B. Socioeconomic Monitoring Project .....	7
7. Videoconference with the Deputy Regional Forester for Resources .....	7
8. Fire and Vegetative Treatment Accessibility Modeling.....	9
1. The Opportunity for Mechanical Fuels Reduction in the Sierra Nevada National Forests .....	9
2. Grand Bluff Forest: Fire Practices on Private Forest Land .....	10
3. Defining Resource Benefits of Wildland Fires in the Southern Sierra Nevada .....	10
9. Dinkey Landscape LiDAR Presentation .....	11
10. Communication Activities .....	12
11. Attendees .....	13

*This meeting summary paraphrases individual comments and suggestions from Dinkey Collaborative members. Statements do not indicate consensus of the group unless they are preceded by the words, "AGREEMENT:".*

*All materials are available to members on [DataBasin.org](http://DataBasin.org), and general information is available on the Dinkey Collaborative website, [www.fs.usda.gov/goto/sierra/dinkeycollaborative](http://www.fs.usda.gov/goto/sierra/dinkeycollaborative) For questions please contact the facilitator, Mr. Dorian Fougères, at [dfougeres@ccp.csus.edu](mailto:dfougeres@ccp.csus.edu) or (916) 531-3835.*

## Action Items

- 1. Mr. Cielnicky to Mr. Thompson** to work on lining up proposed Exchequer boundary in advance of April 18<sup>th</sup> joint work group meeting.
- 2. Mr. Smith** to look at the options for travel reimbursement for outreach and liaison volunteers.
- 3. CCP** to contact Mr. Bagley regarding IDT Liaison position.

4. **CCP** to solicit member applicants for IDT Liaison position by COB Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup>.
5. **Members** to review the draft letters on managed wildfire and on fuels management funding and Mr. Gould's Maps, and provide final comments by COB, March 28<sup>th</sup>.
6. **Mr. Smith** to reach out to Mr. Sherlock, Ms. Elliot and Mr. Taylor or Mr. Bowden regarding their coordination with the Regional Office for budgeting for the collaborative.
7. **CCP** to resend CFLR letter to Mr. Gyant and note Collaborative's desire for future video conferencing.
8. **Communication Work Group** to invite Regional Office executives to May 14 Elected officials field visit.
9. **Mr. Meyer** to distribute climate change assessment to the members of the Collaborative.
10. **CCP** to connect Mr. Ramirez with Landscaping Planning Work Group regarding the application of LiDAR to fisher data and send Mr. Ramirez Mr. Thompson's 2013 fisher connectivity analysis.
11. **Work Groups** to provide additional communication messages as available.
12. **CCP** to distribute march 20<sup>th</sup> presentation slides, as well as Mr. Gould's maps.

## 1. Welcome and Introductions

Mr. Gus Smith, newly appointed High Sierra Deputy District Ranger, welcomed members to the full Collaborative meeting. Dorian Fougères, Center for Collaborative Policy (CCP) Facilitator, reviewed the agenda items, meeting ground rules, and conducted member introductions.

## 2. Interested Party Comment Period

Mr. Steve Haze announced to the group that the California Department of Water Resources was convening a symposium on May 2<sup>nd</sup> regarding fire ecology and water yield. He also noted that in May there will be a bioenergy pre-feasibility session hosted by the Sierra Nevada Conservancy in Auberry, CA.

## 3. Landscape Planning Update on Exchequer Boundary

The facilitator explained the planning process of the Collaborative, noting that there are two major work groups:

- 1) The Landscape Planning Work Group, which focuses on owl and fisher and the Cumulative Effects of treatments on the landscape.
- 2) The Prescribed Fire Work Group, which focuses on cultural burning and prescribed fire on the landscape.

The work of both of these work groups is leading into the overall Exchequer planning process, as well as, the landscape scale planning for fire and cumulative effects for 2014-2015.

## A. Member Presentations on Exchequer Priorities, Cumulative Effects, and Cultural Burning on the Dinkey Landscape

Mr. Mark Smith reviewed the areas of Exchequer that required the most restoration based on the 2013 landscape assessment, and noted that this information lent itself to determining project objectives (handout). He reviewed the handout of objectives and highlighted the primary, secondary and tertiary priorities.

Ms. Sue Britting reviewed the objectives associated with designing a project for the Exchequer area that can anticipate the adverse impacts to California Spotted Owl (CSO) and fisher, and incorporate design elements in a way that can avoid or minimize such impacts. She reiterated that the Cumulative Effects (CE) analysis would be conducted on three scales: landscape, home range, and stand. Filling in for Mr. Thompson, USFS, she reviewed a presentation he had prepared that outlines the areas of highest concern for fisher denning and high-activity areas, including areas that overlap with CSO habitat. She displayed the home range habitat quality, reproductive success, and owl occupancy map of PACs within the current Exchequer MUG. She added that Exchequer was one of the most productive owl areas as far as reproduction is concerned.

The third presentation was given by Mr. Craig Thomas and Mr. John Cielnicky, USFS, regarding the development and expansion of proposed prescribed fire expansion boundaries. Mr. Cielnicky explained that the areas were primarily based on natural barriers that aid in controlling burns. He highlighted the areas of expansion to the northeast, southwest, and into McKinley grove. Ms. Carolyn Ballard, USFS, pointed out that most of these areas are outside the current NEPA documentation, and although some may be managed under the forest plan amendment for non-significant fires, the majority will require NEPA documentation and will be at least a few years before they are burned.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Cielnicky to Mr. Thompson to work on lining up proposed Exchequer boundary in advance of April 18<sup>th</sup> joint work group meeting.

The final presentation of the morning was presented by the Honorable Ron Goode and Ms. Connor Bohna, North Fork Mono Tribe. They discussed the conversations held at the Cultural Burn sub-group meeting and highlighted the ideas of incorporating cultural burning, sustainable harvesting, improving partnering and communication between agencies and looking at alternative burn practices. Mr. Goode explained the importance of identifying the areas of concern ahead of time and building up relationships with the Forest Staff and other tribal community members so that the key resources may be restored and protected early on in the process. They added that Big Sandy Rancheria has created a fire crew that can partner with the Forest Service whenever necessary. They also provided a document to the members that described the state of meadows and the lack of water in the surrounding areas. Members agreed that increasing communication and partnerships between tribes and other agencies would be beneficial to all parties. Not only would it increase the amount of traditional knowledge, it would aid in restoring valuable resources such as wildlife and cultural necessities.

They added that this process would also aim to be more inclusive to other tribes such as Cold Springs Rancheria, which has expressed interest but not consistent participation.

## B. Proposed Exchequer Planning Timeline

Mr. Porter explained that the planning process would start out general and become more issue specific over time. He added that in the process of doing NEPA work, the Forest wanted to make an effort to keep the Collaborative updated on the progress. He explained that this was a weakness in the Bald Mountain project. The facilitator reviewed the timeline, provided on the handout.

### Discussion followed:

Members expressed concern with the timeline because it was based exclusively on Forest Service timelines, whereas organizations around the table might have other constraints, including partly responding to various other Forest Service efforts like the NEPA process for the Rim Fire on the Stanislaus National Forest. They noted that they could agree to the process steps but felt that the timeline itself was too ambitious in terms of deadlines. Mr. Porter noted that on the draft and final proposed actions, members will have opportunities to comment suggest improvements. He added that the primary concern of the Forest staff is to ensure participation along the way, he explained that it was okay that not everyone can comply with the deadline but that they would try to be as inclusive as possible.

- The facilitator suggested the addition of language similar to, “dates may need to be adjusted based on Collaborative Discussion of Forest and member obligations.”
- **AGREEMENT:** The members agreed that with the addition of language on dates, they could live with the Exchequer timeline.

## C. Interdisciplinary Team (ID) Liaison Charge

The facilitator explained the purpose of having an ID team liaison. Mr. Porter hoped that having a person in this position, would help to make the process more transparent because the representative could represent both the interests of the Collaborative and the ID team. They explained that the task could be undertaken by one person who would attend 4-8 all-day technical meetings. Their role is not to negotiate for the Collaborative, but rather to be a source of information exchange.

- Members asked about the level of technical knowledge that would be required of the liaison. Mr. Porter replied noting that the representative would be expected to be well versed in the forest plan, standard guidelines, biological knowledge and so on. He added that they should be aware of the concepts of silviculture, wildlife biology and many others, and that the more knowledgeable they are, the better.
- Members also asked about the costs incurred while on the meetings and the significant amount of time that the person would have to commit to.
- **ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Smith to look at the options for travel reimbursement for outreach and liaison volunteers.  
**AGREEMENT:** members agreed to the draft charge with the additions made to the language about required background knowledge.

The facilitator asked members if there were any willing volunteers to take on the position. Members were hesitant and noted that there were very few people that might actually meet those qualifications. The facilitator suggested three people that would be suitable, he listed Mr. Rich Bagley, Mr. Smith, and Ms. Britting.

- **ACTION ITEM:** CCP to contact Mr. Bagley regarding IDT Liaison position.
- Many members raised concerns that the level of commitment and participation that is required of the person was too much and wondered why a member of the Forest staff couldn't fill the position since they do much of the same work. The facilitator explained that this situation had been attempted before but was unsuccessful. The purpose of the liaison was specifically to address a problem that the Collaborative had experienced with its old approach to information exchange.
- The facilitator noted that an application would be available for those members who wished to apply. It would require a written statement of commitment for others to review. He added that the applications would be due in April 4<sup>th</sup> when a representative would be chosen soon after.
- **ACTION ITEM:** CCP to solicit member applicants for IDT Liaison position by COB Friday, April 4<sup>th</sup>.

#### 4. Announcement and Brief Presentation from Dean Gould

The facilitator announced that an agenda Item had been added due to recent accomplishments from the Forest supervisor. Mr. Dean Gould, Forest Supervisor, noted that when he took the position, he asked three things of his staff to consider when working in the forest: Safety, teamwork, and to be the "Go-to Forest." In achieving these goals, he made an effort to create a map that had never been created on this forest; an overview of the historical treatments to the forest over the past 100 years. This map will serve as a strong public education tool, aid in decision making, and will strive to be as user friendly as possible. He displayed the map and discussed its seven primary overlays:

- 1) A base map of roadways, water bodies, Internal and external fire assets, etc. (a basic recreational map)
- 2) The primary public concentration areas (WUIs)
- 3) Other infrastructure of concern (repeaters, dams, power lines, etc.)
- 4) Wildlife: fisher dens, California Spotted Owl, Northern Goshawk
- 5) The fire history on the Sierra National Forest for the past 100 years (size, location, name and how it was started)
- 6) Past ten years worth of treatments, completed and ongoing (size, location, and name)
- 7) All of the primary fire breaks

This information will assist in mitigating the risk of catastrophic fires in the future. It provides the historical data needed to compare to current conditions.

#### 5. Dinkey CFLRP Expenditures and Accomplishments

The facilitator explained that for the sake of saving time, the budget discussion item of the agenda would be postponed until the next full Collaborative meeting in April. He asked the members to review the budget materials, draft letters in blue and yellow, and Mr. Gould's maps, and send any comments to himself or Mr. Smith by COB March 28<sup>th</sup>.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Members to review the draft letters on managed wildfire and on fuels management funding and Mr. Gould's Maps, and provide final comments by COB, March 28<sup>th</sup>.

## 6. General Updates

### A. Sierra Cascade All Lands Enhancement (SCALE) Program

Mr. Van Velsor provided the project updates on the SCALE program. The Collaborative has identified the individuals who will represent the SCALE process. There will be three different CFLRs involved from California. The intent of this effort was for the Collaboratives to act as an administrative body to oversee the efforts to develop a regional working group around the CFLRs. However, due to time, resource and funding limitations, it has been unsuccessful until now. The Collaboratives were able to receive grants with matching funds to enable them to be successful. At this point, a steering committee has been created to provide guidance to the Sierra Institute as they perform administrative work. The steering committee members from the Dinkey Collaborative, will be selected from the five members who initially expressed interest.

### B. Socioeconomic Monitoring Project

Mr. Van Velsor also provided an update on the Socioeconomic Monitoring project with the Sierra Institute which continues to gather data on indicators and measures that were identified in phase one of the project. Data collection is nearing completion on the Forest Service contracting, Sierra Forest Products work, and other organizations. He noted that at the last meeting there were questions regarding whether the indicators addressed the issues that the Collaborative would like to have addressed. As a result, the advisory body has identified an additional indicator identifying the public perception on fire and community safety changes over time as treatments are applied to the landscape. While this addition will cost more money to address, the advisory body agreed that it was worthwhile to pursue. One member added that in terms of long term support for national CFLRs, the 2015 Forest Service Budget justification has just been increased from \$40 million to \$60 million, to create more CFLR programs across the nation. Mr. Van Velsor noted that the expected date for a revised socioeconomic assessment report would be this spring or early summer.

## 7. Videoconference with the Deputy Regional Forester for Resources

The facilitator welcomed both Mr. Barnie Gyant, Deputy Director for Resources, and Ms. Sherri Elliot, Budget Director, from the USFS Regional Office, and introduced each member of the Collaborative.

**Discussion followed:**

One of the primary areas of interest for the Collaborative was how to understand and be more involved in early communication with the Regional Office throughout the funding process. Members noted that their primary points of concern were money, staff, and research commitment.

- Mr. Gyant responded by recognizing that all of the Collaboratives are trying to identify their needs, and that he is striving to support those needs. He added that if the Dinkey CFLR could provide a revised business plan by early fall, the Regional Office staff would do their best to fund them.

An additional area of concern was that the Collaborative had previously sent a request asking for greater participation from the Regional Office staff including Mr. Sherlock and Mr. Gyant. Members noted that they would like to see quarterly participation in the Collaborative and wondered if there was any update on this involvement.

- Mr. Gyant noted that this support should be possible. He highlighted the importance of working as a team and partnering together (the Forest, the Collaborative, and the Regional Office). He added that as the Forest and Collaboratives send in their budget needs, the Collaboratives would be a priority. He emphasized the significance of the business plan and explained that the more detailed the plans were, the more likely funding would be.

In relation to the business plan, members brought up the idea that costs may increase every year as a result of adding more monitoring projects and wondered how these costs were to be accounted for in the business plans at the beginning of each financial year.

- Mr. Gyant noted that when the Collaboratives first started, the budget for them was only \$40 million, but as the needs change, the figures change as well and this year the budget is around \$54 million. He reiterated the importance of updating the business plans and noted that in his personal opinion, communication between the Forest and the Collaborative is crucial. He added that partnerships are key and ensure that the funding is there for the work to be done.

The final topic of concern was the question of Regional Office support of using prescribed fire on the landscape.

- Mr. Gyant noted that the burning piece is challenging, but they are making efforts to find opportunities where using prescribed fire makes sense. He added that fire is a tool that he feels is underused, and offered his personal commitment to supporting prescribed fire in the region. He noted that he came from a region that burns 100,000 acres per year and has seen the ecological benefits that arise from such treatments. The facilitator asked if there were single NEPA prescribed fire documents as large as Dinkey. Mr. Gyant noted that there were none that compared to the scale of this Collaborative, he added that most are only at a scale of roughly 10,000 acres, making Dinkey one of a kind. He summarized by congratulating the members on their efforts, documentations, activities, involvement, and ability to tackle challenging issues. He added that these achievements are displayed in the hard work of the members, and that the Dinkey Collaborative is the model to be looked at.

Before ending the videoconference, Mr. Gyant noted that there are three priorities in the Sierra National Forest: the Collaborative, Forest Plan Revision, and ecological restoration. He added that if there are key vacancies in these areas, he will try to ensure that they are filled. Members thanked him for his support and expressed their appreciation for the best technical advice and connections. Mr. Gyant likewise thanked the members again and emphasized that a member of the Collaborative reach out to Mr. Sherlock, Ms. Elliot and Mr. Taylor regarding their participation with the Collaborative.

- **ACTION ITEM: Mr. Smith** to reach out to Mr. Sherlock, Ms. Elliot and Mr. Taylor or Mr. Bowden regarding their coordination with the Regional Office for budgeting for the collaborative.

#### **Videoconferencing feedback:**

The facilitator asked the members if it was helpful to be able to speak directly to the Regional Office staff via videoconferencing. Members agreed that the information that he was able to provide was helpful and noted that it would be beneficial to have these kinds of conferences on a quarterly basis. Some members expressed concerns that the Regional Forester did not receive the invitation for participation and agreed it should be resent.

- **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to resend CFLR letter to Mr. Gyant and note Collaborative's desire for future video conferencing.

The facilitator also suggested the communication work group send invitations to the staff of the Regional Office for the Terra Bella Mill visit.

- **ACTION ITEM: Communication Work Group** to invite Regional Office executives to May 14 Elected officials field visit.

In addition, members expressed that the notion of updating the business plan could be a valuable Collaborative activity, they noted that if there is room for discussion, it would provide ample opportunity to explain what the Collaborative does in detail.

## **8. Fire and Vegetative Treatment Accessibility Modeling**

A series of three presenters then spoke about new modeling results showing the limits of mechanical treatments on the national forests in the Sierra Nevada, practical fire management activities on private lands, and how to define resource benefits as related to high severity fire; the first presenter was from the USFS Pacific Southwest Research Station (PSW), the second was a Collaborative member, and the third from the Regional Office.

### **1. The Opportunity for Mechanical Fuels Reduction in the Sierra Nevada National Forests**

Mr. Brandon Collins, PSW, presented on limits of mechanical treatments on national forests. He drew comparisons on historical vs. contemporary fire patterns, the contemporary treatment rates, and the opportunity to scale up mechanical treatments on the landscape and the implications that may arise. He also provided visual representations of the proportion of area burned annually and the levels of severity that exists. According to the article, there is a severe lack of fire, particularly low severity fire, which in turn provides more opportunity for fires to

extend and expand rapidly under high severity conditions. He also presented the contemporary treatment rates including the annual treatments, the historical treatments, and the “backlog” or untreated category, all of which supported the need to increase pace and scale of prescribed fire. When asked if it was safe to say that the fire danger is actually increasing under the current framework, Mr. Collins agreed that it may be possible that the data may support that suggestion because the backlog is getting larger than the actual treatments that are being conducted. Mr. Collins also presented data on the types of constraints to mechanical treatments including biological, legal, operational, and administrative. He compared the percentage of mechanically treatable land after each of the constraint levels. Finally, he emphasized that current forests are substantially altered from historical conditions at the stand and landscape scales, that contemporary fire patterns are far outside historical range of variability, and that integrated landscape scale restoration strategies are needed.

#### **Discussion followed:**

Members recognized that after a mechanical treatment there is generally additional debris on the forest floor, and asked Mr. Collins if there is ever burning done post-treatment.

- Mr. Collins noted that while only 10-15 percent of the cases involve post-treatment burning, the majority of the time, the follow-up burn is not ever conducted.

Members also asked about the level of intensity upon ignition within the treatable land. Mr. Collins noted that the ignition contours and ignition densities may be used for prioritization. Ms. Ballard added that the ignition sources can be used to look at areas for managing wildfires and identify those areas that may have higher risk of ignition.

## **2. Grand Bluff Forest: Fire Practices on Private Forest Land**

Mr. Ray Laclergue, a private landowner within the Dinkey landscape and Collaborative member, presented examples of the practical use of managed fire on the landscape. He demonstrated examples of mastication, excavation, and oak regeneration. He also added images of insect infestation, planting in charcoaled areas, fuels reduction and various examples of environmental conditions limiting tree planting.

- One member asked Mr. Laclergue to briefly explain how prescribed fire was applied in tree plantations.
- Mr. Laclergue explained that that in the beginning, there were planting trees in masticated material which caused the trees to burn as a result of the increasing fire intensity. In order to prevent this from happening, they started piling material from the forest floor. He added that even with this method one must be very careful, as the trees are still vulnerable to burning in lower intensity fires.

## **3. Defining Resource Benefits of Wildland Fires in the Southern Sierra Nevada**

Mr. Meyer began his presentation noting that he had climate change data information that he could distribute to the group.

- **ACTION ITEM:** Mr. Meyer to distribute climate change assessment to the members of the Collaborative.

He highlighted the definition of resource benefits, and explained that fire can help to reduce fuel loading, enhance structural heterogeneity, promote biodiversity, and facilitate the

regeneration of shade-intolerant tree species. He also discussed the Natural Range of Variation (NRV) Concept which seeks to incorporate diverse information sources and use them in a variety of management applications. To summarize, he presented the findings of the Region 5 ecology program study. The findings concluded that managed wildfires in the ecoregion were within the natural range of variability in terms of fire severity proportion and high-severity patch size. In contrast, he found that suppression wildfires were outside of the NRV, which supports the expanded use of managed wildfire programs on the landscape.

#### **Discussion followed:**

Members asked for clarity in the data sources for the mean and max patch size, and about the average elevation that fires were studied.

- Mr. Meyer noted that it was difficult to determine, but the best information came from contemporary reference sites from Mr. Collins, and work done in Baja, CA. He added that the elevation tended to be around 5,000-8,000 feet, though some were even higher.

Members were also curious about the criteria of a “managed fire” and the ranges of “high severity” and asked for clarity in both definitions.

- Ms. Ballard explained that managed fire can be as simple as just monitoring as opposed to actually managing the fires. Mr. Meyer added that the fires were classified by remote sensing imagery and in composite burns, typically 95% of the trees died. He noted that the program has been collaborating with U.C. Davis and has found that almost all of the major fires producing small high severity patch sizes, with significant seed regeneration. As the patches get significantly larger, the seed regeneration decreased.

The final question was from a member asking about the use of contemporary reference sites as opposed to historical ones.

- Mr. Meyer noted that there were many advantages to burning under the desired conditions, they are ideal in terms of looking at NRV. One major advantage of using the contemporary reference sites is having the changing climate trends because they are happening now, all of this data points to warmer weather patterns and longer fire seasons.

## **9. Dinkey Landscape LiDAR Presentation**

The final presentation of the day was presented by Mr. Carlos Ramirez, from the Region’s Remote Sensing Laboratory (RSL). He reviewed the preliminary results of the Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) flights in 2011 and 2012. This new technology provided information on the structural make-up of the forest at high resolution. He provided examples of the pre- and post-treatment data as well as information of the heterogeneity of the forest. He noted that this type of technology has multiple future applications that include metrics, model development for fire/fuels, comparisons against reference conditions, connectivity of habitat for key species, and developing tools for forest resilience and restoration on multiple scales. The facilitator

noted that it would be beneficial for Mr. Ramirez to be in contact with Mr. Thompson (fisher expert) to further discuss how LiDAR can be applied to fisher and other key species.

- **ACTION ITEM: CCP** to connect Mr. Ramirez with Landscaping Planning Work Group regarding the application of LiDAR to fisher data and send Mr. Ramirez Mr. Thompson's 2013 fisher connectivity analysis.

#### **Discussion followed:**

Members asked about how LiDAR and its findings could be applied in the future. There was conversation about including the costs of this technology into the revised business plan, and how it could be applied to current issues such as heterogeneity.

- Members suggested attaching the data to reference conditions to see how it increases heterogeneity.
- They also discussed its transition from GTR 220, and practical application to fire, by analyzing whether the structural signatures from fires in different vegetation types, stands, and complexity, and desire to determine whether these treatments are mimicking fires in other forests or the parks. However, this technology is so new that applying it to current classifications such as California Wildlife Habitat Relationships (CWHR) may not be using it to its full potential. Rather, CWHR is a very broad scale classification, whereas LiDAR is based on very fine scale level of detail. Instead, this resource could be a potentially better use of data when applied to defining habitat changes.
- Members agreed that being able to analyze data before and after treatments could lead to more efficient treatment methods. They also agreed that this technology was not only groundbreaking but one of a kind. It has the potential to redefine an entirely new system reflecting more data driven clarity for how forests actually appear as opposed to how they are observed. Nonetheless, it was noted that CWHR has a history of being used and refined and is the foundation for many analyses, so although LiDAR analyses would improve over time, CWHR should not be abandoned.

## **10. Communication Activities**

The facilitator asked members needed to complete the briefing priority list by the end of the meeting, review the outreach letters and provide comments, and if the work groups had any additions to the communication messages, to submit them in a timely manner.

- **ACTION ITEM: Work Groups** to provide additional communication messages as available.

He also added that the outreach and communication budget was being recommended to the Forest and asked for member agreement on adopting the budget revision.

- **AGREEMENT:** Members agreed to adopt the budget revision to include travel costs for briefings.

As he closed the meeting the facilitator reviewed the items from the agenda that would be postponed until the April meeting. He also added that CCP would provide the presentation slides from the meeting.

- **ACTION ITEM:** CCP to distribute march 20<sup>th</sup> presentation slides, as well as Mr. Gould's maps.

## 11. Attendees

1. Emily Adams, CCP
2. Jared Aldern
3. Chip Ashley
4. Justin Augustine
5. Carolyn Ballard, USFS
6. Miles Baty
7. Sue Britting
8. Dirk Charley, USFS
9. Brian Coddling
10. Brandon Collins, USFS
11. Lois Connor Bohna
12. Narvell Connor
13. Kent Duysen
14. Larry Duysen
15. Dan Fidler
16. Pamela Flick,
17. Dorian Fougères, CCP
18. Marcia Freedman
19. Hon. Ron Goode
20. Dean Gould, USFS
21. Rebecca Green, USFS
22. Sean Greene
23. Stan Harger
24. Steve Haze
25. Andy Hosford, USFS
26. Joe Kaminski
27. Ray Laclergue
28. Marc Meyer, USFS
29. John Mount
30. Jody Nickerson, USFS
31. Ray Porter, USFS
32. Carlos Ramirez, USFS
33. Justine Reynolds
34. Susan Roberts
35. Ramiro Rojas, USFS
36. Greg Schroer, USFS
37. Gus Smith, USFS
38. Mark Smith
39. Kim Sorini-Wilson, USFS
40. Ryan Stewart
41. John Stewart
42. Craig Thomas
43. Stan Van Velsor