

2/14/18 ACCG Monitoring Meeting

Attendees: Gwen Starrett, Reuben Childress, Robin Wall, Jill, Becky Estes, Shana Gross

Collaboration survey – update and potential summary of results

- Reuben called and left messages, at least one or 2 people did surveys
- Summarize results – Becky sent
- Participation decreasing – need recruitment for planning to have a strong collaborative
- Some people took surveys, but didn't participate – different levels of participation on the projects
- Discuss results 3/14 – try to make a connection with strategic planning as threads/opportunities
- Feed results back to Sierra Institute to demonstrate how we have been at receiving surveys results
- Present at full group meeting 3/21 maybe 20 minutes?

Social-economic monitoring

- Robin working with Kyle Sierra Institute – challenge cost share agreement – submitted to grants and agreements: within a month we hope to have this finalized
- Ten people signed up – Jill has the list: will provide list to Robin, Shana
- What is the commitment from the Sierra Institute's perspective
- Steps: development, review, template, learning fill out template
- Monitoring group will pull together social-economic group and get them moving
 - History of what has happened: contractor survey (Shana), questions – monitoring matrix (Becky)
 - New contract and what is going to happen: go over details of template and agreement (Scope of work –Robin)
 - Identify leadership role – organizing meetings, making sure things happen on time – intro to sub committee
 - 1.5 hours – Shana send email to group to invite (end of the meeting)
- Design so ability for succession

Symposium information relevant to project design

- Farm Bill CE Calaveras – 2/28 field visit (hazard tree abatement)
- Draft pre-project planning letter for one of projects using new management recommendations share recently learned
- Use CWD to identify thinning – but not relevant since focused on hazard trees
- Could be applicable to larger Scottiago project (beyond hazard tree, thinning project)
- Synthesis of recommendations provided by group for larger scottiago project good and timely
- These strategies synthesized from these planning efforts are considered (and broader science)
- Brainstorm what put in letter – these are useful tools for planning a project such as Scottiago
 - Recommendation came from previous efforts – available as part of planning study
 - CWD targeting thinning locations
 - Use GTR 220 “end game”/236
 - Time of year of operations and percentage of shrub cover retained – based off of these studies

- Spotted owl – North (height paper – send link)
 - LiDar – covered under Scottiago
 - Ecological framework as a tool
 - Topographic assessment
- One grid with tools/studies alongside over top applies to this type of project (management action) then check boxes
 - Share this with districts
 - Also will make it easier for writing paper
- Letter planning letter can work on later
- **To summarize:**
 - Monitoring group will focus on developing matrix based on monitoring results (ACCG specific – symposium, power fire, ongoing) and key publications that group is familiar with – Gwen will start
 - Draft letter for Scottiago – Reuben (planning group can make it more prescriptive)

Incorporate other collaborative ecological monitoring

- SCALE – Jonathan Kusel (Sierra Institute)
- We are trying to synthesize ACCG ecological project work so far and studies that are relevant and trying to design a recommendation matrix so the information is incorporated into projects. We would like to increase this information from other collaborative ecological monitoring (Sierra Focused).
- If Sierra isn't doing this we can reach out to individual collaborative

Identify monitoring needs for 2018 field season

- Opportunities to learn and do additional monitoring
- What type of monitoring can be done by volunteers
- Attached to project, report to ACCG general
- Letter of completion, certificate
- Panther: month allocated for CSE (let Reuben, Gwen, Jill know when starting, ask CESSR – John Buckley)
- Thompson follow-up: 2019,
- Cole Creek Bear River – if we get NFWF grant, planning, assessment, low impact work
 - Fall of this year pre-project monitoring
 - Conifer encroachment meadow protocol
 - 3 meadows – might help allocate our crew to help with monitoring
 - Shana/Becky will help with selecting transect locations
- Power Fire Reforestation monitoring planning
 - Have final units from Marc
 - Are another studies from other regions looking at cluster versus even spacing: Moonlight (blocked study)
 - Does it make sense to do pre-treatment monitoring as a baseline condition
 - Alissa and Helen already funded to do monitoring in Power Fire in units we have identified

- Looking at different planting arrangements
- Reuben thinks baseline is important – comparing different treatments, with different treatments in different projects
 - Are we starting in same conditions?
 - Can we incorporate things like CWD to control and test?
- Size of plots:
 - Units identified split down middle for 2 planting arrangements
 - White thorn unit: 10 acres
 - Low 80-160 alt 3; projected survival 40-80
 - High 140-200 mod alt 3; project survival 70-100
 - High severity
 - Bear clover unit: 30 acres
 - Low 80-160 alt 3;
 - High 140-200 mod alt 3;
 - Ridge dominate
 - Moderate to high severity
 - Live to mature trees existing – existing regen (and if these are retained)
 - Deer brush: 30 acres
 - Low 40-80 alt 3;
 - High 140-200 mod alt 3;
 - Mid-slope, SW facing >30%
 - High severity
 - Units seem similar at face value across individual unit
- Going to start site prep – hold off on units to capture data: units set aside
- Need site visit to get understanding – and establish photo points
- Baseline, immediate (site prep/planting), radial herbicide (3 or 5 years after) – need to identify time frame so we can lay out when we are going to monitor
- Questions:
 - will remove natural regen in site prep
 - species being planted
 - time frame for implementation occurring
 - when site prep going to happen
 - get on schedule
- Could pair bird surveys for post treatment 2019 when point blue is going to treat
- Tracking:
 - Survival and growth
 - Shrub composition (how changes over time)
 - Spatial component – location of planting seedlings
 - Site characteristics
- Event bright – volunteers
- Follow up with Robin/Becky if need funding for our crew
- Nested plots to decide what size plots after planting to stick with

Monitoring/work days – liability in order to do this

- Trying to get foothill conservancy to do small projects remove small conifers – organizations may have constituent bases

- Becky to follow-up understand volunteer agreement
- Robert's et al paper: discussion of paper (attached); Shana and Becky to provide background on WHR veg types and to see if Chuck available to join our discussion