**SBEADMR Adaptive Management Group Meeting Notes**

**May 10, 2018**

The SBEADMR Adaptive Management Group (AMG) met at 10:00 AM on Thursday, May 10, 2018 in the Pioneer Room at Friendship Hall in Montrose. Present and representing the various “seats” on the AMG were:

*Meeting Note Disclaimer: Unfortunately the recording of the meeting did not start at the very beginning so the introduction of attendees was not recorded. Attendees names were picked up by voice recognition on the tape so if you attendance or absence is incorrect please make note for correction!*

**Designated Seat**  **Regular Member** **Alternate Member**

Delta County Robbie LeValley?? Mark Roeber??

Gunnison County Jonathan Houck?? TBD

Hinsdale County Cindy Dozier absent

Montrose County John Waschbusch absent

Ouray County Ben Tisdel absent

San Miguel County Hilary Cooper Lynn Padgett

Environmental/Conservation Chris Jauhola Enno Heuscher

Environmental/Conservation Lexi Tuddenham absent

Forestry Processor Norm Birtcher absent

Forestry Logger Mike Ganroth absent

Community at Large

East Zone absent TBD

North Zone Mary Chapman TBD

West Zone Nancy Fishering Andy Goldman

Water Resources Lynn Padgett absent

Recreational User Groups Ralph Files?? TBD

Wildlife and Fish Craig Grother absent

Education TBD TBD

**Resource/Staff Present**: Clay Speas, Kim Phillips and Carlyn Perovich, GMUG Nat’l Forest; Sam Pankratz and Scott Johnson, Colorado State Forest Service; Tony Cheng, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI); Chris Miller, PLP Coordinator and Susan Hansen, Facilitator

**Guest**: Hogan Peterson, Senator Gardner’s office

**Approval of 01/04/2018 AMG Meeting Notes**: The draft notes of the 1/04/2018 were approved as submitted.

**Item No. 1: Debrief of Mid-Winter Forest Service SBEADMR Meeting**

The group debriefed the annual GMUG mid-winter SBEADMR meeting from the perspectives of the GMUG staff, AMG and Science Team. The key points that were noted and discussed were:

* **Clarify who is the intended audience for the annual mid-winter meeting** – the SBEADMR stakeholders (list of 160 people who have either been actively engaged or kept informed since the inception of SBEADMR) or the public in general? Given the content of the mid-winter meeting and emphasis on research and monitoring, it was recommended that the mid-winter meeting focus on the SBEADMR stakeholder group who have followed the program and are more informed about SBEADMR.

There was agreement an effort to increase public awareness of the SBEADMR projects was important now that projects are being implemented. Factors noted to consider in planning public meetings are:

* + Meetings for public should be held in the evening and ideally in different locations
  + Content should be general in nature aimed at appropriate level of detail and information to raise awareness not make decisions
  + PLP might host such public meetings as part of its outreach efforts to inform interested public and newcomers to the area; similar format to the community SBEADMR meetings PLP hosted in the past
  + Avoid confusing/overwhelming the public with SBEADMR meetings at the same time the GMUG is launching Forest Plan Revision meetings
* **Meeting drew fewer attendees than last year**; this is typical of past experience with other multi-year projects where public participation tends to whittle down to interested stakeholders over time
* **Forest Service specialists would like more time to spend with the Science Team**: Carlyn Perovich, GMUG Forest Ecologist, reported on the internal debriefing that FS staff had and proposed a different meeting design to address the concerns. After considering the proposed change in design, the consensus of the group was the following:
* Plan for a full day meeting with separate morning and afternoon sessions. The morning session would be designed to provide more detailed and technical presentations from the Science Team for those individuals interested in that level of detail; the afternoon session would be designed to focus on the key points of the monitoring and findings related to SBEADMR as well as the annual update on the SBEADMR program in general.
* Modify the afternoon breakout sessions to be interactive “poster stations” to present the out-year (2019-2021) proposed program of work for each timber zone. Arrange for separate rooms for each “poster station”.
* **Need to address how to better deliver the various levels of information that attendees want or need from the Science Team**. Tony Cheng, CFRI, described a continuum model where content is staged to align with what level of information is needed to raise awareness to understanding to knowledge integration to what level of information is needed to make decisions, i.e. to provide recommendations to the Forest Leadership Team. He suggested looking at different delivery mechanisms such as area colleges/universities to develop short videos or 5 minute podcasts summarizing recent research/findings. Another suggestion was to explore the Rocky Mountain Research Station’s science delivery format – “science you can use in 5 minutes” versus a longer 8 page bulletin. Consider contracting with a qualified writer to translate the technical information to the lay person.

**Item No. 2: Brief Update on Scheduled Treatments/Activities for 2018 Season**

* Scheduled Commercial Timber Treatments/Activities: Clay Speas, GMUG Renewable Resource Staff Officer, distributed a matrix of GMUG Commercial Timber Treatment Status for both SBEADMR and other NEPA timber projects (attached). He focused on the 3rd quarter sales explaining the bidding process and highlighted those projects that were on track and projected bid opening dates.

Clay also advised that the salvage timber program will be accelerated in 2019-2020 in order to maximize the value of the dead timber which has a certain amount of lifetime in it. The target for those years will be 85,000 ccf or slightly over. After 2020 the focus will shift to green timber. The GMUG is already looking at the Spring Creek/Taylor Creek area in Gunnison County. The plan for that area is to replicate much of the SBEADMR Adaptive Management approach for lodgepole pine stands, i.e. identifying priority treatment areas, incorporating the Science Team, having an AMG assist the GMUG in implementation and monitoring, etc. That decision will be a separate NEPA decision from SBEADMR using the Farm Bill Environmental Assessment.

* Temporary Road Construction/Closing Tracking: In response to the section of the above referenced matrix “ Temporary Road Construction Tracking” several points were noted:
  + Track “temporary roads closed” as part of report – are we exceeding the “not to exceed” projection?
  + GMUG is working on adding necessary preventions to help curtail the public from using temporary roads, i.e. signage or installation of temporary gates.
  + Add in county roads used to access haul routes to the report. Sale administrators have been asked to advise GMUG on what will be closed, when, etc. so that information can be updated on the GMUG website.

Clay explained the process for determining what and where roads may be closed, the process for determining where temporary roads will be constructed, performance bonds required for construction and closing and the responsibility for decommissioning the road once a sale is completed. He noted that as part of SBEADMR some existing temporary roads have been identified that will be obliterated along with the newly constructed temporary roads.

* Wildfire Concerns: Given the unusual dry season and high risk of wildfires, questions were posed regarding what the Forest and sale purchasers are doing to prevent a wildfire. Comprehensive wildfire prevention measures are incorporated in all timber sale contracts and companies have to submit fire plans to each forest they work on. Measures apply to equipment as well. Contractors’ heavy equipment may provide rapid response in times of emergency.
* Timeframe for Resiliency Treatments: Although the primary focus for 2018-2020 is salvage sales and uncertainty of where the beetles may move to, the plan is to move to more of the resiliency treatments in 2021 and 2022.

**Item No. 3: 2018 Summer Field trips**

Two field trips are proposed for the summer of 2018:

* Cathedral Salvage Sale (Gunnison County) – a Best Management Practice (BMP) site visit. This trip would represent the first project level review for SBEADMR in that the sale is in progress. The GMUG ID team would do the initial site review focusing on 5-6 of the design features to assess whether they are doing the work prescribed and if it is working. Then about a week later members of the AMG would be invited to go on a field trip to review the findings of the internal team and have a discussion on site of what is working/what’s not working. This field trip will be scheduled for July.
* Rainbow/Red Creek (southeast Gunnison County) -a salvage sale proposed in the 2020 program of work. Field trip would look at proposed treatments. Science Team will participate. Trip will be scheduled for early August just before the informal 30 public comment period begins.

In response to AMG’s concern for capturing what is learned on field trips, the GMUG will provide a notetaker to take notes. The AMG Monitoring Committee was tasked with developing a questionnaire for field trip attendees to complete upon completion of the tour. The questions will tie back to the goals and objectives of SBEADMR adaptive management process. Tony Cheng provided a questionnaire used by the Front Range Bark Beetle group as a starting point.

**Item No. 4: Review of AMG Matrix for Tracking Collaborative Research, Monitoring and Adaptive Management Projects**

Although copies of the draft matrix were not available as a handout for attendees, Tony Cheng and Susan Hansen provided an overview of the tool and its purpose. The matrix was developed by members of the AMG Monitoring Committee as a tool to track over the life of SBEADMR the implementation and monitoring efforts in four major areas consistent with the goals and objectives of SBEADMR, namely:

* Research studies and monitoring efforts
* Socio-economic data and impacts
* Community understanding and engagement, and
* Collaborative adaptive management process and outcomes

The tool was designed not only to provide a record over time but also to illustrate how the adaptive management process will move from findings to recommendations to adaptations and the relationship between the Science Team, the AMG and the GMUG. The tool is intended as an internal document for the AMG and is considered a “living document” as it will be updated annually with new information, findings and recommendations. Given the early stages of implementation the adaptations to date have been administrative rather than design or treatment based. The timeframe/opportunities for interaction between and with the GMUG staff, Science Team and AMG was also reviewed as outlined in the draft Communication Plan.

**Item No. 5: Final Draft of SBEADMR Communication Plan**

Kim Phillips, GMUG Public Affairs Officer, distributed copies of the revised draft of the SBEADMR Communication Plan and asked AMG members to please review and submit any comments/edits/changes to her directly via email. She specifically pointed out sections #2 and #6 for input. Other comments noted were:

* GMUG has not done much with social media but will begin to use Facebook to get information out.
* GMUG can prepare news releases for any SBEADMR related public meetings.
* Monitoring Committee discussed developing a process to address FAQ of the GMUG or Science Team regarding SBEADMR – how to identify and make public the FAQ and answers and where to post appropriate contact information.
* Communication plan should describe a process for letting people who commented on a project know how their comment(s) were addressed or handled.

**Items No. 6: Public Comments** – There were no public comments

**Item No. 7: Non-Agenda Items** – There were no non-agenda items

There being no further business before the AMG, the meeting was adjourned at 12:00 PM

Notes prepared by Susan Hansen, Meeting Facilitator