

**Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program
Outcomes & Indicators Workshop
June 7-8, 2011
Denver, Colorado
Red Lion Denver Central**

WORKSHOP OVERVIEW

Participants:

Ethan Aumack, Western Governors Association
Forest Health Advisory Committee
Gali Beh, Colorado Front Range
Anne Bradley, Southwest Jemez Mountains
Jenny Briggs, Colorado Front Range
Dana Carter, Uncompahgre Plateau
Phil Chang, Deschutes Forest Collaborative
Jennifer Cramer, Southwest Jemez Mountains
Cory Davis, Southwestern Crown of the
Continent
Joyce Dearstyne, Selway-Middle Fork
Clearwater
Karen DiBari, National Forest Foundation
Dennis Dwyer, 4 Forest Restoration Initiative &
Southwest Jemez
Krista Gebert, Region 1, Forest Service
Hal Gibbs, Colorado Front Range
Greg Hagan, Accelerating Longleaf Pine
Restoration
Rob Harper, Washington Office, Forest
Management (FS)
Dale Harris, Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater
Amber Kamps, Southwestern Crown of the
Continent
Jodi Leingang, Tapash Sustainable Forest
Collaborative
Paige Lewis, CFLR Advisory Panel
Reese Lolley, Tapash Sustainable Forest
Collaborative

Tom Mafera, Deschutes Forest Collaborative
Laura McCarthy, Small Group Participant
Marc Meyer, Dinkey Landscape Restoration
Project
Mary Mitsos, National Forest Foundation
Pam Motley, Uncompahgre Plateau
Collaborative
Bob Parmenter, Southwest Jemez Mountains
John Potyondy, Rocky Mountain Research
Station (morning only)
Megan Roessing, Washington Office, Forest
Management
Courtney Schultz, Observer
Gary Severson, CFLR Advisory Panel
John Shaw, Rocky Mountain Research Station
Ed Smith, 4 Forest Restoration Initiative
Jim Thinnes, Colorado Front Range and
Uncompahgre Plateau Collaborative
Micah Thorning, Accelerating Longleaf Pine
Restoration
Stan Van Velsor, Dinkey Landscape Restoration
Project
Ann Walker, Western Governors Association
Amy Waltz, small group participant
Mike Ward, Selway-Middle Fork Clearwater
Travis Warziniak, Rocky Mountain Research
Station
Matt Williamson, 4 Forest Restoration Initiative

Don't let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

--- *Voltaire*

Overview

Representatives from the 10 CFLR projects, the Washington Office of Forest Management, and others met June 7-8, 2011 in Denver to work toward creating a draft proposal for a national CFLR framework of outcomes and indicators. The workshop was coordinated and facilitated by the National Forest Foundation.

Process

An initial draft of a national framework was developed by a small group of invited individuals engaged in CFLR projects or offer a national perspective, and representing diversity across geography, Forest Service and partners. The small group consisted of:

Greg Aplet, Phil Chang, Rob Harper, Laura McCarthy, Micah Thorning, Meg Roessing, and Diane Vosick (with assistance from other individuals).

The draft proposal developed by the above group was used as the starting point for discussion at the workshop. The meeting attendees include at least two participants from all 10 projects (1 FS, 1 partner), representatives of the CFLR Advisory Panel committee, the Western Governors Association, and others.

The intent of the workshop was to further develop the national framework with the CFLR project representatives that:

- Works for the diversity of the ten current CFLR projects as well as landscapes selected in the future,
- Meets several basic criteria, including being simple and affordable,
- And will allow for the roll-up of data across the sites to assist in communicating the results of CFLR to Congress and national audiences.

Meeting objectives:

- To work towards identifying a small set of national-level outcomes and indicators that all CFLR projects will use. The data measured by the common indicators will be compiled to report to Congress and other audiences about the comprehensive impact of CFLR. The indicators will be:
 - Simple
 - Affordable
 - Responsive to the direction of the Act
 - Supported as much as possible by existing sources of data
 - Maximize individual project autonomy
 - Minimize additional reporting requirements
- To provide an opportunity for peer learning amongst the existing CFLR projects to share lessons, challenges, and individual project-level approaches to monitoring.

Purpose of national framework

What the national framework of outcomes and indicators ***is*** about:

- The ability to tell part of a national story about CFLR
- Measure outcomes and indicators consistently across projects so there is valid national data
- The regular collection and reporting of data to track work accomplished and results achieved
- A 30,000 foot level, coarse-scale picture of CFLR's impacts

What the national framework of outcomes and indicators ***is not*** about:

- Answering research questions
- Informing adaptive management
- The “be all and end all” of monitoring or reporting
- Telling the *entire* CFLR story
- Replacing individual CFLR site monitoring plans

The Draft Framework Structure

The small group used the following structure for developing the “strawman” outcomes and indicators.

Outcome:

Indicator:

Target:

Baseline:

“Test” for indicators

- **SIMPLICITY:** Is this indicator simple to understand, measure and report on?
- **AFFORDABLE:** Is it inexpensive in time and resources to collect the data for this indicator?
- **TIERS TO ACT:** Does this indicator respond to the purposes of the CFLR Act?
- **EXISTING SOURCES OF DATA:** Is this indicator supported by existing sources of data?
- **INDIVIDUAL PROJECT AUTONOMY:** Does this indicator interfere with the autonomy of individual project monitoring plans?

Process

- System used to get a sense of how the group was feeling about different indicators: “thumbs up” for support, “thumbs sideways” if able to live with it, “thumbs down” if can't live with it.

Agenda

(see attached)

Outcomes & Indicators

Detailed notes are provided in separate documents summarizing discussion about the following indicators:

- Ecological
- Economy/Jobs
- Fire costs
- Leveraged Funds
- Collaboration
- Biomass Utilization

Group Sensing at the Workshop

Question:

Do you feel the CFLR Program needs a set of national indicators that everyone measures in the same way?

Response of group – YES

Question:

Should this issue be measured by each CFLR project through a national indicator? (asked for each issue)

Response of group – YES, all of topics listed should be measured

- Ecological
- Fire Costs
- Jobs & Economy
- Biomass utilization
- Collaboration
- Leveraged and/or matched funds

Prioritization exercise – each person was given 2 dots to use in answering this question: Based on our discussions over the past 2 days, that we want to respond to the purposes of FLRA and meet the test of being simple, affordable, etc. Step out from the project level focus – what are the two most important indicators?

- Ecological - 19
- Fire costs – 16
- Jobs & Economy – 19
- Biomass utilization – 3
- Collaboration - 5
- Leveraged and/or matched funds – 0

Although there were very clear issues at the top of people's lists, in group discussion people expressed a desire to keep all of the issues on the table for consideration.

OUTCOME/INDICATOR NEXT STEPS

Ecological – next steps

- The “pizza and beer” group (Micah, Tom, Matt, Amy, Bob, Ethan, Stan) will get together via teleconference to take a stab at the sideboards
- A second call will be scheduled and anyone who’s interested will be invited to provide input.
- The new proposal with sideboards will be ready for presentation at the June 29th web conference.

Fire Costs – next steps

- General agreement that R-CAT might be the most appropriate tool for modeling fire costs as long as projects could be staggered through the process
- Get a status check on how long it takes to work through at the project level
- Tapash, Deschutes, Southwest Jemez, Uncompahgre, Southwest Crown all volunteered to take this back to their collaboratives and discuss working with Krista Gebert’s team
- NFF will provide contacts of the 5 projects to Krista Gebert
- Conference call to get more info: once Deschutes has gone through process, have a webinar w/Krista to walk through it – timeframe: by end of July

Jobs/Economy

- Sensing on which approach people prefer:
 - 2-3 hour call to more fully develop proposal – Use TREAT as a model as long as there is field verification/calibration – YES
 - Capture contracting value at county level – is further development of that approach a useful indicator of jobs/economy – NO SUPPORT

Next steps:

- Jennifer Cramer- CFRP has a new socioeconomic monitoring report and she will contact the author to determine when it will be released
- Pull together a small group to meet in a 2-3 hour call to:
 - Hear a presentation about the CFRP report and discuss whether there are key indicators to pull from it for the national roll-up (volunteers: Amber, Joyce, Jodi, Ethan, Jennifer, Jessica)
 - Include TREAT developers Keith Stockmann and Krista Gebert in those discussions
 - Discuss using TREAT as a model as long as there is field verification/calibration
 - Significant progress in counting jobs due to ARRA – research that

Collaboration

- Interest amongst group re: keeping collaboration in the mix and agreement that survey mechanism is a good approach
- Karen, Mary, Pam, Jessica, Gali will work to revise the survey

Leveraged Funds

- Minor elements of off-forest accounting that need revising
- Reese, Mike, Jodi, Paige, Joyce will work on revising the outcome/indicator

Biomass Utilization

- Group interest in letting projects measure at local level
- Might be useful to think about this in the same way as the ecological indicator – is cost dependent on slope, haul costs, etc.
- Use case study type stories to illustrate the importance of CFLR in advancing biomass utilization

Other ways to support telling the CFLR story: use the national indicators in conjunction with vignettes from the projects to illustrate.

Peer Learning

Detailed notes describing the peer learning discussions are provided in a separate document.

PEER LEARNING NEXT STEPS

Strategy: Establish a CFLR Network

Next step: Bob Parmenter to send poll to monitoring leads

Breakout group participants: Paige Lewis, Jenny Briggs, John Shaw, Marc Meyer, Cory Davis, Pam Motley, Kim Langmaid

Strategy: Tell the CFLR project stories effectively to continue support for the program

Next step: Develop a fact sheet for each landscape. Put a book of these fact sheets together for Congress. Need to decide who else this should go to.

Breakout group participants: Dana Carter, Ann Walker, Jodi Leingang, Mike Ward, and Anne Bradley

Strategy: Validate the TREAT model with actual project data

Next steps:

- If we are going to use this as a national roll-up:
 - Need a webinar training to increase understanding, ensure correct inputs of data (Who: Representatives from all 10 landscapes who will be responsible for running model).
 - Should use tools from ERI, EWP, and others to gather actual data/track money through to generate numbers for comparison to model numbers (Who: a sampling of projects).
- Give the developers a chance to guide CFLR projects through methods or do a local check with other technical experts.

Breakout group participants: Tom Mafera, Joyce Dearstyne, Stan Van Velsor, and Phil Chang

Strategy: Share information about setting HRV

Next steps: Dennis will send Gali HRV diagrams – distance between clumps

Breakout group participants: Dennis Dwyer, Gali Beh, and Hal Gibbs

Strategy: Apply adaptive management in projects

Next steps:

- There is a need to evaluate the info from monitoring to determine whether the projects are meeting restoration goals.
- Need to incorporate info into actions and evaluate protocols.
- If data shows that objectives are not being met there needs to be a process that allows trade-offs to be transparently deliberated and changes can be made to monitoring protocols and/or project implementation.
- Continue discussion – whoever is interested; maybe this could be a webinar.

Breakout group participants: Edward Smith, Megan Roessing, Jennifer Cramer, Reese Lolley, and Jessica Clement

Strategy: Measure landscape scale impacts

Next step:

- Follow-up discussion with interested parties (Matt will send e-mail to gauge whether there is interest in continuing the conversation).

Breakout group participants: Greg Hagan, Micah Thorning, Jim Thinnes, Amy Waltz, Courtney Schultz, Amber Kamps, and Matt Williamson

Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration
National Level Monitoring Indicator Workshop
AGENDA
June 7 – 8, 2011
Denver, CO

“Don’t let the perfect be the enemy of the good.”
~ *Voltaire*

Workshop objectives

- To work towards identifying a small set of national-level outcomes and indicators that all CFLR projects will use. The data measured by the common indicators will be used to report to Congress and other audiences about the comprehensive impact of CFLR. The indicators will be:
 - Simple
 - Affordable
 - Responsive to the direction of the Act
 - Supported as much as possible by existing sources of data
 - Created with the participation of representatives of the ten CFLR projects

The indicators are unlikely to reflect or respond to research questions. The national framework of indicators is not meant to replace individual CFLR site monitoring plans

- To provide an opportunity for peer learning amongst the existing CFLR projects to share lessons, challenges, and individual project-level approaches to monitoring.

A Note on the Agenda – We will be fluid with this agenda if necessary in order to be the most productive.

Draft Agenda

June 07, 2011

- 8:30 a.m. Welcome and agenda review
Rob Harper, US Forest Service
Mary Mitsos, National Forest Foundation
- 9:00 a.m. Introductions
- 9:30 a.m. Presentation from small group regarding the development of the draft framework
TBD
- 10:15 a.m. Ecological outcome and indicator discussion

12:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. Peer learning session
2:30 p.m. Break
3:00 p.m. Fire costs outcome and indicator discussion
4:30 p.m. Wrap-up for the day and review of tomorrow
5:00 p.m. Adjourn

June 08, 2011

8:00 a.m. Jobs and economy outcome and indicator
9:15 a.m. Biomass utilization outcome and indicator
10:30 a.m. Break
11:00 a.m. Collaboration outcome and indicator
12:00 p.m. Lunch
1:00 p.m. Peer learning session (break incorporated)
3:30 p.m. Wrap-up and next steps
4:30 p.m. Adjourn