**SBEADMR Adaptive Management Meeting Notes**

October 1, 2020

The SBEADMR Adaptive Management Group (AMG) convened as a socially distanced meeting at the Montrose County Event Center, with conference call attendance, at 9 AM on Thursday October 1, 2020. Present and representing the various “seats” on the AMG were:

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

Delta County absent absent

Gunnison County absent TBD

Hinsdale County absent TBD

Montrose County Justin Musser absent

Ouray County Ben Tisdel (phone) absent

San Miguel County Hilary Cooper (phone) absent

Environmental/Conservation Chris Jauhola Enno Heushner (phone)

Environmental/Conservation Lexi Tuddenham (phone) Robin Nicholoff (phone)

Forestry Processor Tim Kyllo Mike Orndorff

Forestry Logger absent TBD

Community at Large

 East Zone TBD TBD

 North Zone Mary Chapman TBD

 West Zone Nancy Fishering Andy Goldman

Water Resources absent absent

Recreational User Groups absent TBD

Wildlife and Fish Craig Grother absent

Education TBD TBD

**Resource/Staff Present**: Clay Speas, Carlyn Perovich and Stewart Robertson -Fuels Planner, GMUG Nat’l Forest; Jason Sibold (phone), Mike Battaglio (phone) and Tony Cheng (phone), SBEADMR Science Team; Scott Johnson, Colorado State Forest Service.

**Approval of May 13, 2020 AMG Meeting Notes**: M/S/P Tim Kyllo moved and Chris Jauhola seconded the motion to approve the meeting notes of the 5/13/2020 AMG virtual meeting as submitted.

Ben Katz new to conservation groups but an invited guest did not attend. Robin suggested that he be added to the AMG. Nancy advised that the upcoming Operating Manual has a process to maintain balance among stakeholders and that would need to be followed to ADD a person to the AMG, but guests were always welcome to all field trips and to all meetings.

**Item No 1: Brief Recap of SBEADMR Summer Activities –**

Clay and Carlyn gave a summary of the pre-treatments prepping for the Bald Timber Sale area. Jason discussed SBEADMR treatment and monitoring. He cited review of 59 plots and temperature sensors started in 2019. The 2019 snow and late snow anomaly and COVID regulations for field crews presented challenges. One student devoted time to lab work and modeling on climate scenarios focusing on after-treatments and the likelihood of regen for spruce and a more dynamic management style. Jason also mentioned the participation of NASA with added resources. NASA will not be a full-blown partner since they were not present from the beginning of the project. We will benefit from good collaboration and expertise from their jet propulsion lab experts, but don’t expect investment dollars. Due to the importance of early detection, we can benefit from their ‘air surveys’ to guide some adaptive management. These are less helpful for drawing specific polygons for treatment. Post spruce beetle attacks the needles changed colors a year later and remote sensing at 15 months is before the change of colors.

Denser Horizontal Cover (DHC) analysis assistance (important data for Lynx management) is time consuming for the USFS but can be helped by NASA assistance. There were questions raised on the DHC changes due to changes in climate. There may be highly dynamic effects from climate change over the next 20 years.

**Item No. 3: Update on Bald Timber Sale Planning/Prescriptions – Carlyn Perovich**

Item 3 was covered next which was a further update on the Bald Timber Sale Planning.

Scott Johnson CSFS reviewed his findings applicable to the Bald Timber Sale. Prior treatments were dated between 1957 and 1988. He found generally good, advanced regeneration, and found less regen where clearcutting was the treatment from the 70’s. He noted old roads could be used for the new timber management and noted the need to avoid damaging the advanced regen. The clearcutting from the 70’s was not silviculturally correct and was replanted at the time to Lodgepole. Replanting to spruce is planned for later this fall. This review was conducted before planning prescriptions and Carlyn asked for input from the field trip attendees as to questions and reactions to the stands that will be treated in 2021. This was an effort to elicit input prior to finalizing prescriptions.

Mike Battaglia described moving to ‘mini-adaptive silviculture prescriptions. He uses the field work above described by Scott and plans to consider slopes (south facing) and regen and other topographical features which will inform the ‘mini-prescriptions.’ He plans to have them done by Feb 2021 and field prep will follow next spring. The AMG group expressed support for this adaptive approach.

**Item No. 2: Review Revised AMG Monitoring Matrix/Approve AMG Recommendations for Adaptations – Tony Cheng, Clay Speas, AMG Monitoring Committee Members**

Tony outlined the new format.

First pages 1-15 followed the ROD and FEIS.

The final column will be renamed as ‘Adaptive Actions’

Pages 16-17 were noted as AMG generated topics. Tony noted that data collection for this section is TBD or To Be Determined.

Tony noted that the matrix has been in development for a year, and that it was introduced in Jan 2020. The USFS staff filled out their findings and this completed matrix is being reviewed in this meeting. He needs to send out updated checklist which has some changes which is one of the outcomes.

Robin wanted to have dates of various management changes added to the matrix, but it was explained that this is an annual report which would only list new adaptations occurring in the year of the report. This report will updated every May or June. Listing a historic record of dates would make this document longer and more unwieldy.

Clay noted the adaptations often pertain to 2021 or 2022 since the existing projects are under legal contracts that cannot be changed, and treatments are in process. New contracts would contain the adaptations. Clay’s example was a change in requirements on closing temp roads. The old standard was ripping to a 12” depth which is too disturbing to the soil layers and future standards will be less deep but adequate for reseeding a cover crop. Another example of management change was to leave some slash piles for hare habitat per an AMG suggestion.

Mary asked when data would be available for the final questions. Tony responded that individual projects/ sales need to be completed before certain data can be collected. He also noted that non-governmental data is more difficult to collect and asked what action the AMG would be taking from that effort. Mary responded a basic need to understand who is benefiting from the contracts. Questions such as 1) Where or sale location (county), 2) Who or contract purchaser, 3) Company adding value are easy data.

Clay reminded the group that the Action section was reviewed by the AMG at the June meeting. Each action recommendation as voted on and approved by the AMG. He noted that all SBEADMR objectives are being met. He continues to track lynx habitat conditions and tracks the % of habitat that moves into the unsuitable category. Single story stands are unsuitable due to standing dead and when timber is salvaged the area becomes more ‘unsuitable’, but no change in % of lynx habitat.

Craig had a concern that local folks often raise issues/ complaints after the project begins implementation and he gave Lone Cone as an example. **The adaptation suggested is that local ranger districts needed additional outreach as each new project is firmed up with specific silviculture, design, and timelines. The Matrix could track the number of field trips, articles or other project level outreach efforts made by RD’s.**  County reps could also track projects to keep County Commissioners up to date on new project initiation.

Chris J mentioned that annual meetings are focused on future projects which are hard for the public to relate to and perhaps adding information on current year projects would increase attendance at the annual public meeting. **T**

NF asked for a formal motion to approve this as the new template and formal 2020 report, Justin Musser moved, and Mary Chapman and Robin Nicholoff seconded. The motion passed unanimously.

**A last editorial suggestion was to add the header titles to every page.**

**Item No. 4: Overview of Purpose/Responsibility/Timeline of SBEADMR Reports**

**Item b-** The summer fieldwork summary was a succinct one-page document.

**Item c and d -** Carlyn felt that this template could easily be updated each year and Heather Sacket did a good, cost-effective job completing it for 2020. As Carlyn reviewed the timeline, **it was suggested to add a monitoring subcommittee meeting prior to presentation to the full AMG in March or April.**

Items ‘c (AMG Annual Review and Monitoring Matrix) & d’ (Annual Management Review for FS leadership team) will now be incorporated into the AMG Annual Review and Monitoring Matrix and is found in the column Management Review Conclusions.

**Item e - To add clarity a suggestion was made to call item ‘e’ – 2020 SBEADMR Community Report.** This should help denote a layman version of SBEADMR activities.

Final take-away: the efforts in 2020 did a good job in streamlining into 4 documents.

**Item No. 5: SBEADMR Road Related Costs Spreadsheet Follow-Up – Clay Speas**

Clay briefed the group on his analysis of costs related to projects with a specific focus costs spent on USFS roads. He reported that effective October 1, of this year the FS budget system was changing the process of itemizing expenditures. In order to determine expenses per project, he developed an internal GMUG spreadsheet and interview each relevant GMUG employee (support staff, accountants, specialists, road engineers, etc.) about the % of their time spent on any task related to the SBEADMR project. From that analysis he determined that the cost of the science team equated to $1.70 per ccf and will determine the other costs per ccf. He committed to sharing the spreadsheet with the AMG when complete. After questions, he said that he did not include the **savings** achieved by using one NEPA doc vs a typical 10 to 12 NEPA doc’s using the traditional approach. An average EA costs $325,000.

**Justin asked that the effort continue by *adding* a quantification of the benefits of the SBEADMR treatments and the expedited process. This part was assigned to Tony.**

**Item No. 6: AMG Housekeeping Issues**

a. Proposed revisions to the AMG Operations Manual were presented and discussed. Primarily the document was updated to reflect the change in status of the PLP. Chris J noted that under Item 6 on page 6 that we should list the new CFRI/SBEADMR website. M/S/P Kyllo/Justin. Motion to approve the updated Operations Manual as presented effective October 1, 2020.

b. Status of CFRI SBEADMR Website: Susan Hansen and Nancy are working on this in conjunction with Marin and Hannah who work at CFRI.

c: Public Outreach/Communication Efforts – updating the template will facilitate this in 2021. Reaching out to Heather Sacket is feasible under existing budget if needed.

**Opportunity for Public Comment: None**

**Non-Agenda Items**

**Closing and Adjourn**

Meeting adjourned at 11:50