SE Monitoring question	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project				
	AZ – Four Forest Restoration Initiative	NM - Southwest Jemez	NM - Zuni Mountain	CO – Colorado Front Range	CO – Uncompahgre Plateau
1. *Who is doing the Jobs/ Socio-economic monitoring?*	The 4FRI Landscape Assessment and Monitoring (LAM) working group, primarily Anne Mottek Lucas	Forest Guild, working closely with the Santa Fe NF; primarily Eytan Krasilovsky	Forest Guild; primarily Eytan Krasilovsky	FRR Social-Economic Working Group (CO Forest Restoration Institute); primarily Kathie Mattor and Torsten Snee	Colorado Forest Restoration Institute); primarily Kathie Mattor and Torsten Snee
2. *What is being measured? How?*	Economic: A contractor reporting form will be used and refined as needed (with the new contractor). It will: 1) Collect detailed employment information for both milling and logging operations; 2) Calculate logging and milling operational costs; and 3) Identify the milling products produced (i.e. type, amount, value).

Social: 1) Phase I monitoring assessed general public perceptions using two focus groups in two communities in each of the forests in the 1st 4FRI Analysis area and six personal interviews with forest managers (3 in each forest) to obtain opinions and attitudes towards the 4FRI project before implementation. | Economic: 1) Track restoration costs over time through communication with USFS and VCNP staff annually; 2) Identify direct and indirect benefits to local economies through discussions with project partners, wood utilizers, and USFS and VCNP staff; 3) Identify the effects of the project on recreation use through annual check-in conversations with recreation user groups and USFS and VCNP recreation staff.

Wood utilization: Assess wood utilization through interviews of the businesses involved.

Social: 1) Track changes in the diversity and activity of stakeholders, and collaborative process | Economic: 1) Determine the effects of CFLRP on businesses through interviews; 2) Calculate wildfire repression costs using RCAT; 3) Identify the benefits of restoration to ranching community and economy through interviews; 4) Assess the capacity-building benefits of CFLRP (i.e. quantify benefits of project to business) through interviews and comparable metrics; and 5) measure job sustainability through interviews and other existing metrics.

Wood utilization: 1) Track the amount and types of product sold; and 2) Identify where material is processed and sold through interviews with the contractors. | Economic impacts – 1) Estimate the economic benefits to local counties of CFLR funding using "Colorado model;" 2) Estimate the number of part- and full-time jobs created by CFLRP stewardship contract using the "Colorado model;" and 3) Develop an economic narrative of additional funding through interviews and analysis of the USFS CFLRP annual report.

Wood utilization – 1) Track the amount and types of product sold; and 2) Identify where material is processed and sold (through worksheet contractors filled out)

Social – 1) public perception and outreach mechanisms through | Economic impacts – 1) Estimate the economic benefits to local counties of CFLR funding using "Colorado model;" 2) Estimate the number of part- and full-time jobs created by CFLRP stewardship contract using the "Colorado model;" and 3) Develop an economic narrative of additional funding through interviews and analysis of the USFS CFLRP annual report.

Wood utilization – 1) Track the amount and types of product sold; and 2) Identify where material is processed and sold (through worksheet contractors filled out) |

SE Monitoring question	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project				
	AZ – Four Forest Restoration Initiative	NM - Southwest Jemez	NM - Zuni Mountain	CO – Colorado Front Range	CO – Uncompahgre Plateau
(Continued)	2) Phase II monitoring will build on this initial analysis using a broader sampling methodology (i.e. telephone survey with residents in study area) to develop an expanded understanding of public opinion and attitudes toward the4FRI project(s)	(annual check-in with core collaborative members); 2) Document training and education efforts through annual check-in conversations with partners and USFS and VCNP staff.	Social – 1) Determine the effects of CFLRP on businesses through interviews; 2) Identify the benefits of restoration to ranching community and economy through interviews; 3) Calculate the number of training and outreach opportunities associated with CFLRP through document review and interviews.	literature review and focus groups of outreach experts, 2) levels of collaboration – based on case study conducted previously by CFRI	
3. *Does the jobs/ socio-economic monitoring being done differ from what was described in the accepted CFLRP proposal?*	Yes. The 4FRI CFLRP proposal broadly describes the social and economic monitoring	Yes. Forest Guild is working to implement what was described in the proposal.	Yes - The proposal described documenting actual jobs by type and extent annually to compliment TREAT outputs.	Yes – this monitoring was 'to be determined' in the proposal. It has been developed by the FRR through the CFLRP landscape restoration working group	n/a – not described in proposal
4. *What are the annual expenditures for the jobs/ socio-economic monitoring for this CFLPRP?*	Approximately $20,000 (For the development of the SE monitoring protocol and implementation of the first phase)	Approximately $7,000 annually.	Approximately $5,000 annually.	Approximately $25,000 annually.	Approximately $5,000 annually.

SE Monitoring question	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project				
	AZ – Four Forest Restoration Initiative	NM - Southwest Jemez	NM - Zuni Mountain	CO – Colorado Front Range	CO – Uncompahgre Plateau
5. *What are the top three challenges to conducting the jobs/ socio-economic monitoring*	1) Funding – the 4FRI collaborative has not received funding for monitoring other than the NFF SE project. 2) Change in contractor 3) Lack of capacity and possibly interest in SE monitoring	1) Getting started. Prior to receiving funding a large amount of time has been devoted to keeping the collaborative moving forward. 2) Communication with all parties involved 3) Securing data from all parties and converting it into common metrics	1) Communicating with all the parties: harvesters, log haulers, wood processors, wood processing management, wood product truckers, road graders, CSE plot contractors, cultural survey archaeologists, volunteer monitors, youth conservation corps volunteers, USFS staff, NGO staff. 2) Securing data from all parties and converting it into common metrics 3) Keeping the collaborative moving forward	1) Obtaining information from the contractors - time intensive process; highly dependent on the contractors' willingness 2) "Colorado Model"– costly data to obtain and can be a challenge to identify experts able to conduct analysis 3) The social and economic monitoring gets less attention in the CFLRP-related working group than the ecological monitoring, although many understand its importance.	1) Obtaining information from the contractors - time intensive process; highly dependent on the contractors' willingness 2) "Colorado Model"– costly data to obtain and can be a challenge to identify experts able to conduct analysis 3) Funding is a challenge as SE monitoring gets less attention than the ecological monitoring
6. *Interesting initial results?*	Public participants: Participants' emphasized the need for further public education for improving forest ecosystem health, the necessity of Rx fires, etc. There is a sense of urgency to treat the forest from communities. USFS: "To get the work done on the ground, social	Unfortunately, it is too early to discuss.	This is the end of the first year of data collection and it is still in progress. Some interesting results so far: The harvesters have actually started renting a house locally, and are investing in new equipment. There is labor that is	Restoration activities contributed approximately $1.8 million in labor income and $1.6 million in GDP to the local economy; 38 full- and part-time jobs were calculated; All company employees reside within Colorado and are able to commute	Economic analysis is in progress – too early No social analysis being conducted at this time

SE Monitoring question	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project				
	AZ – Four Forest Restoration Initiative	NM - Southwest Jemez	NM - Zuni Mountain	CO – Colorado Front Range	CO – Uncompahgre Plateau
(Continued)	concerns need to be considered and we need to focus just as much on communication, education and outreach as we do on the mechanisms of removing timber from the forest. There's no plan to integrate the information at this point. Hopeful the stakeholder group will play a role in this."		unaccounted for through people restoring acres through secondary removal of fuelwood from treated sites (i.e. locals picking up the small stuff). They are removing an additional 1-3 cords per acre, which has an in-kind value, but also, some of the fuelwooders are doing this commercially off-the-books which are jobs nonetheless.	to work. All value-added materials purchased by Colorado businesses	
7. *Have outside academics/ researchers done any research on your CFLRP?*	Courtney Schultz, CSU; Erik Nielsen, NAU and Tony Cheng, CSU; Marci DuPraw, Nova Southeastern University; Will Butler Florida State University, Sarah McCaffrey USFS Northern Research Station, Ashley Monroe FSU; Melanie Colavito UA; Lauren Urgenson UW.	Courtney Schultz, CSU; Marci DuPraw, Nova Southeastern University; Will Butler Florida State University, Sarah McCaffrey USFS Northern Research Station, Ashley Monroe FSU; Melanie Colavito UA. Also: University of Michigan; Lauren Urgenson UW.	University of Arizona, University of Michigan, Virginia Tech.	Courtney Schultz, CSU; Marci DuPraw, Nova Southeastern University; Will Butler Florida State University, Sarah McCaffrey USFS Northern Research Station, Ashley Monroe FSU; Melanie Colavito UA..	Courtney Schultz, CSU; Marci DuPraw, Nova Southeastern University; Will Butler Florida State University, Sarah McCaffrey USFS Northern Research Station, Ashley Monroe FSU; Melanie Colavito UA. Also Biomass workgroup

SE Monitoring question	Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project				
	AZ – Four Forest Restoration Initiative	NM - Southwest Jemez	NM - Zuni Mountain	CO – Colorado Front Range	CO – Uncompahgre Plateau
8. *What is being done with the data collected?*	The Socioeconomic Monitoring Report is posted on the website A depository for the data and reporting has not been finalized.	It is very early in the socioeconomic effort of the SW Jemez CFLR. It is anticipated the Forest Guild will store the data and share the analysis annually for agency reporting (December) and at the spring "All-Hands" monitoring meeting with partners.	Forest Guild is storing the data. Data are being summarized and shared at the annual "All-Hands" Monitoring meetings.	CFRI stores the data; CFRI and FRR provide website links to related final reports	CFRI stores the data & provides website links to related final reports
9. *Who is the constituency for this information?*	The USFS, the stakeholder group and is being used by the Flagstaff Watershed Protection Project (FWPP).		Data are being used for reporting, sharing with the collaborative group. It is used to determine if implementation is on the right track compared to the proposal goals (and any targets that were part of the proposal).	This information is for The Front Range Roundtable, the National Forests, local and state government – to inform them of the baseline information and changes over time	the UP partnership, the GMUG NF, local and state government
10. *How can the information being collected and analyzed be used more effectively?*	Establishing baseline information and gauging public perceptions and economic impacts throughout the life of the project.		If a project is only using TREAT outputs there is value in communicating the details of the project by talking with people involved and affected by it. It is important to ask additional jobs questions since there is so much valuable ancillary information.	Press releases and publications of social-economic impacts of CFLRP projects, importance of SE information Have the SE monitoring reports from all CFLRPs posted at one website (USFS, NFF)	Develop a national SE monitoring report outlining the findings from all CFLRPs Continue R2/R3 workshops for groups to share their methods and findings