SLAWG November/December 2020 E-workshop Series Action Items & Participant Feedback Summaries

Megan Layhee, meganl.chips@gmail.com

1/15/2021

E-workshop Action Items for Megan Layhee & SLAWG:

Action Item	Owner
Handbook revisions: • Additional clarifying language about refreshing server connections • Add troubleshooting section – including source data server connections issues during server maintenance	Megan
Discussion to acquire in-planning phase fuels reduction project spatial data from entities (that aren't in the FACTS, CalMAPPER, etc.) • Possible solution – project shapefile submission form on ACCG SLAWG webpage • Possible solution – regularly make cold calls to check for any new conceptual or in-planning project shapefiles	Megan SLAWG
Clarification to what Megan said during Dec. 11th video, and update to CalMAPPER project inventory workflow –add step in workflow to join CalMAPPER Activity table to CalMAPPER shapefile prior to other preprocessing workflow steps	Megan
Develop SLAWG webpage on ACCG website. Potential content: general info, map, link to google drive (contain handbook, handbook supplemental materials, ArcGIS files), project submission form	Megan
Remove "pruning" activity type from database.	Megan
Discuss whether all of the activity types included in the database should be assigned a treatment outcome and maintenance status.	SLAWG
Discuss changing Treatment Outcome terms. Candidates - "Surface/ladder fuel removal" and "Surface/ladder fuel remain".	SLAWG
Develop a one-pager on the automation process for the Maintenance Status attribute, to help pitch this concept to local entities and CAL FIRE CalMAPPER. Share with SFL and others to help pitch this idea of an automated method for coming up with maintenance intervals for project data.	Megan
Reach out to USFS FACTS Team and inquire about FACTS maintenance schedule and Stage field availability with the Common Attribute Feature Service layer.	Megan
Clarify modifications to RF scores for future presentations	Megan

General list and discuss further steps for model validation. Some initial suggestions - lidar, working with land agencies/folks with on-the-ground knowledge, and field visits to "priority areas"	Megan SLAWG
ArcGIS Pro ModelBuilder workflow compatibility with ArcMap	Megan
Consider having ArcGIS Pro workflows for cNVC and eNVC calculations, and have steps outlined in handbook to this process in ArcFuels in ArcMap	Megan
Discuss potential next steps for tools	SLAWG

E-workshop Series Topic & Participant Feedback Summaries

ACCG E-workshop Part I 11/19/2020

Hosts: Megan Layhee, Michael Pickard, Stephanie Horii

Attendees: Sue Holper, John Heissenbuttal, Steve Ogburn, Steve Brink, Rich Farrington, Shane Dante, Regine Miller, George Dondero, Gwen Starrett, Sara Husby, Caitlyn Rich, Sandy Anderson, Robin Wall

- Clarification on why the activity "pruning" would be assigned a treatment outcome type of "Stand Structure Alteration".
    - recommendation that we change the names of the Treatment Outcome types.
    - this is a topic that warrants further discussion in the SLAWG.
- For project in need of maintenance, which projects are ready for prescribed burn?
    - will require on the ground knowledge to verify potential projects that are in need of maintenance.
- Recommendation to stay with defining Activity types as the FS FACTS database does and to be consistent and close to the FACTS database.
- When the products go public, there could be controversy over prioritization, and what is priority areas and what are priority projects.
- Topic of on-the-ground expertise and knowledge is really important for validation and refining of these products.
- Timber Resources HVRA including timber species as low as 6" dbh. Also brought up sub-HVRA RIs, relative extent, and that the analysis seems to be valuing small trees
    - Someone referenced the FIA about the 6" dbh
- Question about how column K (sub-HVRA RI scores) were determined
- Question about what is the meaning, what are you trying to find with this data? Is the value and overall health of watershed, and putting all of them in one basket in order to protect.
    - triple bottom line was factored into this analysis, and that communities and infrastructure were prioritized in this tool.
    - the collaborative's triple bottom line makes this HVRA characterization and analysis process complex, but it's important.

- Suggestion that this tool will be very useful for the ACCG to have a tool for the Planning WG
- potential project locations guidelines, incorporate priority management tool (thinning? Prescribed fire additionally?) required to treat those areas? in context of Malcom North and incorporating strategic anchors and pyrosivicluture.
  - eNVC outputs can see areas that need to protect from future wildfire, but also displays areas that would benefit from low intensity fire
- Topic of helpful supplemental layers to showcase with priority areas slope, HUC subwatersheds
- Importance of validation
- Some of the purple priority areas like around Arnold and Avery, have fuels reduction projects that are about to start, Mule Deer project was referenced. Positive validation of the priority area identified in analysis. Areas that aren't in the FS 5-year plan, they could do a rapid assessment of these products.
- Two complemental directions of inquiry, 1) defending against threat of wildfire and 2) working with potential of landscape to be self-protecting. Products are a grounding of the collaborative's means of working together to support each other.

ACCG E-workshop Part I 12/3/2020

Hosts: Megan Layhee, Michael Pickard, Stephanie Horii

Attendees: Sid Beckman, Rick Hopson, Sue Britting, Greg Suba, Shane Dante, Regine Miller, Thurman Roberts, Becky Estes, Brendan Palmieri, Karen Quidachay, Jim Bearden

- Develop a one-pager on the automation process for the Maintenance status attribute, this could help pitch this concept to local entities and CAL FIRE CalMAPPER. Share with SFL and others to help pitch this idea of an automated method for coming up with maintenance intervals for project data.
- 1) Are we running parallel with CAL FIRE's project tracking system or are we an example for them? 2) Is there something that the state can do to help local group efforts maybe store, house or showcase local project inventory databases?
- other collaboratives are doing something very similar (Butte, Yuba, Burning Hat, Battle Creek, Pit RCD/Modoc NF)
- good to keep in mind that our process also identified areas that may benefit from predicted low intensity wildfire
- 1) importance of looking at that supplemental landscape info to guide the identification of project areas process (slopes, PACs, etc.); 2) sixth step in the project identification workflow about having field trips to field validate these areas; 3) asked about being able to upload these products to Avenza (referenced that we could probably have a georeferenced pdf come right out of the webappbuilder online map); interested to see how these tools will inform and be used in the project development process especially since there is sometimes

a disconnect between the projects that the FS are prioritizing and what the ACCG is prioritizing

- LIDAR products could help inform the prioritization outputs in terms of what the current conditions are on the ground, in addition to what Rick mentioned about doing field trips, as well
- LIDAR and field trips as next steps to help inform the prioritization tool products; asked about whether an ArcGIS Pro Package would be feasible for ArcMap users (short answer – no) I brought up looking in to using a Map Server framework for folks
- Megan's notes based on discussion: look into housing the map as a map service versus just providing an ArcGIS Pro Project Package, for those still only using ArcMap (FS for instance)

ACCG E-workshop Part II 12/11/2020

Hosts: Megan Layhee, Michael Pickard, Stephanie Horii

Attendees: Becky Estes, Greg Suba, Caitlyn Rich, Thurman Roberts, Tim Bearden, Sandy Anderson

- Need to reach out to FACTS contacts and get a better understanding of database maintenance schedule; Becky may have contact
- Further consideration about order of individual Activity polygon representation in the mapper when they are overlapping polygons – different activities for the same project polygon
  - o Users need to understand that there may be multiple activities overlapping
  - o Suggestion to default to any of the activities that are in need of maintenance
  - o Another suggestion is that we only assign *Maintenance Status* to the "main" treatment, if the prescribed fire was done subsequently that also needs to be assigned a *Maintenance Status*
- Need to be clear about what exact modifications were made to Response Functions (RF)
- Consider converting HVRA layers into polygon vs. raster format before sub-HVRA cNVC calculations step
- Consider both ArcGIS Pro workflows and using ArcFuels in ArcMap to run cNVC and eNVC calculations
- Consider a strategy to automate the calculation of the relative extent of each sub-HVRA in the workflow – maybe ArcGIS bridge with R.
- Need to see where the STF PODs analysis goes – to help in deciding where our process might head next
- Add FS Handbook Soil Erosion Hazard reference to handbook reference list
- ACCG Monitoring WG – Can we integrate the Mapping Tool to house not only fuels reduction related project data, but also any and all data from the MWG