#### SUSTAINABLE RANGELANDS ROUNDTABLE

#### **Indicator Implementation Workshop**

Developing a roadmap for standardized rangeland monitoring and reporting in the United States

#### Hosted by the Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation - Ardmore, OK

See Workshop Agenda in Appendix A

#### MAY 24, 2005

Participant Introductions & Welcome -- Dennis Child

**Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation Welcome** -- *Mike Cawley, President of The Noble Foundation* 

#### PLENARY PANEL I

#### **Grazing Lands Conservation Initiative --** Bob Drake

- 40% of the nation's lands are rangeland
- Need to compromise to work together
- The information & tasks that SRR determines need to be simplified so we can help
- We will help you sell it, as long as you bring it to us in terms we, and the people we represent, will understand

#### Society of Range Management – John Tanaka

*PP presentation – see website* 

#### National Cattlemen's Beef Association – Jeff Eisenberg

- People that work the land love the land. We consider these groups as the first environmentalists.
- How is the work of SRR going to be integrated into the framework of the other monitoring frameworks? (NRI, FIA) In order to sustain the industry we need the information.
- Can we get Congress to adopt these findings & conclusions?
- In times of tight budgets, what is the case that can be made so that the product can be integrated into agency decision-making? People are going to need to know how this is going to help them...
- Need a seamless, transparent & uniform set of indicators that could perhaps be divided up between the agencies need to present a cohesive picture...

#### National Assoc. of Conservation Districts – Tim Reich

- Concerned focused on the application of rangeland inventories. Practicality is so important to the 3000 conservation districts locally elected, local focus
- Little confused about the vision statement of SRR First part has nothing to do with SRR... the rangelands already do that. The second part is more applicable for the NACD
- Seeing a lot more non-resident landowners acting as managers. They are more likely to invest in long-term sustainability due to economic differences with these people. Resident owners look at resource management much more short-term
- NACD focus on western issues. Try to influence Washington on rangeland issues.
- Looking at indicators, going beyond Congress & selling it but how are they applied? Applications need to be economically smart, environmentally sound
- Need to recognize our limitations

#### Oklahoma Farm Bureau - Steve Copeland

- Strong supporter of all conservation issues
- Lobbying in Washington DC & local
- Farm Bill about to expire needs to be rewritten
- Can't assume that people (esp. consuming public removed from farm community) will understand the need for this work

#### Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) – Rick Knight

- SCB is an international organization of conservation scientists. Biodiversity of conservation is main concern less focused on topics like invasive species. Increasing awareness of the relationship between biodiversity and how that is a reflection of healthy landscapes
- Shift away from single-species focus, to more of a broad ecological processes view. Monitoring is essential Need to be able to communicate that rangelands are improving in health. Previous reports on rangeland monitoring were so haphazard that we couldn't even monitor the health properly.
- The American public is increasingly interested in buying local food, from healthy local rangelands.
- Can cut through value-laden topics with the monitoring data

#### **The Nature Conservancy** – Jamie Ervin

- Criteria & Indicators not new, standards are common
- Chief executive of The Nature Conservancy said 'measures are the top priority for the Nature Conservancy for the next 3 years'
- In terms of this mission we can't currently assess whether are meeting the mission. Stuck with measuring the old way (bucks & acres).
- Working with others, want to conserve at least 10% of every habitat type

- Ecoregions: 6 indicators biodiversity (2), threats (2), area of conserved lands/water (2). Single dataset, but when combined becomes ecological intelligence
- Indicators can help us develop sound strategies & inform us on how to allocate scarce resources

#### Tribal Advisory Council - P.J. Workman

- Mission of Tribal Advisory Council is to promote the preservation of sovereign rights of Native Americans. Much of the rangeland in America is owned by Native Americans (Alaska, Navajo)
- Some of the other states don't have a good cadre of people addressing agriculture. Need to support and promote those people that have a good feel for our needs

#### PLENARY PANEL I - DISCUSSION

- Awareness of other sustainability programs is not there and the "driver" is not there
- The bottom-up solution is the answer but also need to get the work going Have some of both going on: Top – down, coordinating activities among agencies, Key National Indicators Initiative; Bottom – up efforts, different roundtables
- Farm bill how could issues like this be introduced into the farm bill
- Lobbying trade will have big impact
- Need to have a unified voice & know what we want
- Do you think we need new funding focused mainly on the core indicators
- Accountability to the public especially conservation dollars that came through to agriculture as a "pass-through" and by-pass to WTO but there will be a "day of accounting" where the public will ask if they got their money's worth

#### PLENARY PANEL II

#### Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) – Dennis Thompson

- Works primarily with the private lands provide assistance through the Farm Bill Change in 2002 increase in cost-share programs
- Increased the budget in conservation (\$2.2 billion). There is an increased interest in grazing & rangeland resources, and in conservation of private rangelands...
- Needed to go back to 1992 data... didn't have the data. How do you implement programs when you don't know what's going on?
- We need to properly direct our resources... what type of expertise do we need? Continuous NRI process 3 year process
- Need to be accountable to Congress
- Can't separate private & public lands

- Many agencies have the objective to manage for wildlife rangelands are the home for this.
- We're creating the comprehensive plan in a piecemeal way right now.
- Will build a common denominator so we know exactly what we're assessing

#### **Bureau of Land Management - Ron Dunter**

- The man in the middle hopefully will be a connecter & not be bypassed
- BLM has always used monitoring & indicators as measurement tool. Monitoring has always been used to monitor changes, more in specific problems & in specific areas (this data is not as useful regionally or nationally) BLM has not in the past collected data to report on rangeland health.
- Rangeland inventory is out-of-date (+20 years old) and does not reflect current conditions. Need to continue to monitor at the local level where we make management decisions -- we also see the need for national monitoring.
- BLM sees the need for us to prioritize tasks.
- If we have no systematic monitoring systems, it leaves us vulnerable to criticism and unable to respond to gross exaggerations. Also we can't communicate to other groups about the reality of situations. Inter-agency conflicts and inconsistencies confuse the work and the general public. BLM supports an inter-departmental steering group on rangelands. BLM sees collaborative effort as a boon and leaving everyone less vulnerable to attack. Also helps coordination & helps assure that the results will be accepted.
- Need better national & regional information dictated to us by OMB.
- Some indicators may be better at certain scales vs. others. Many of the indicators of SRR are seen as better than BLM's indicators

#### **USDA Forest Service** – Janette Kaiser

- Invasive species, SARS Effects of global markets
- US Population greatest growth through immigration, different value systems, natural resources, will change how we look at these things
- 5 major urban zones everything else rural, projected even larger disconnect between connection of people to the landscape
- Current movement away from subsidies, increasingly valuing restoration & services, people in the cities paying people in the country to maintain healthy lands
- Migration in the interior West is the greatest since the wagons... ranchettes, small-acreage lots, what is the effect of all that development?
- Forest Service moving dialogue from old issues (Clear-cutting, overgrazing)...
- -- Invasive species
- -- Unmanaged recreation
- -- Loss of open space development
- Articulating a clear set of National indicators new issues, can change the questions. Recent events not one size fits all. Need a better articulation of what we're talking

about. Can't do site-specific & national monitoring in one event.

• It would be helpful to craft the language that addresses this.

#### Agricultural Research Service (ARS) – Rod Heitschmidt

- Close links with research
- Not as much into the land monitoring as developing the technologies to implement the indicators
- If I was a congressman, how decide what \$\$ to shift out of where & into SRR... Until all the agencies come forward with a standard set of indicators they aren't going to want to talk to you... Even if the indicators aren't perfect, need to move forward.
- The process is not science driven, it's agency & socially-driven
- Is there new technology out there that we're not utilizing?
- How are we going to get people to get on board & understand the need
- ARS will try to work with other agencies

#### **US Geological Survey (USGS)** – Paul Geissler

- USGS doesn't manage land or wield regulatory authority. Does a lot of methods development similar to ARS. Focused on integrated science, biology, water, geography, geology
- To coordinate efforts involves changing things, which is very difficult especially if we're changing objectives. At the technical & field level the agencies work well together.
- Integrated monitoring (EMAP) has happened in the past. Didn't have the stakeholder buy-in that has happened in the roundtables
- Better data --> better dialogue --> better decisions We have an excellent group to move forward...

#### PLENARY PANEL II - DISCUSSION

- Any possibility for changing "Healthy Forest Initiative" --> "Healthy Forest & Rangeland Initiative"... already includes this
- How to pass the baton of the work to the next generation? Where is the leadership coming from? Numbers of people that are retiring in the next few years are incredible... successional management.
- There is a trend that rangeland people & services are decreasing people are doing monitoring themselves NRI (National Resources Inventory). Don't have the resources to do all the work & effort to build the partnership with private industry... Need to define the quality of the information that is contracted out. Need to set the standard high enough to get the quality we're paying for.
- Real problem is how to do more monitoring with less resources one way is to use highly skilled, qualified trained volunteers. Involving volunteers into the process, get buy-in, rancher monitoring program they have range science degrees.

- More monitoring may be a misnomer... What are the right questions to ask? We need to collect useful, non-minutia data. Need to keep in mind collection of data vs. compilation & statistical analysis of the data
- Need to make a connection with people in the urban centers
- Value issues –people in agencies are not feeling the same values, especially the younger employees. Have not embraced change use language that is more ecologically-bent.
- First steps towards learning how to work together each need to know what the other are doing & how much money & what resources are being devoted towards rangelands

#### **INDICATOR INTRODUCTION** – James Bernard

See Powerpoint on website

Get info on the changes / problems with the indicator language...

#### **CONCEPTUAL MODEL OVERVIEW** – Bill Fox

- SRR Conceptual model is not predictive nor a mathematical model. We are mainly looking at validity & how the indicators integrate.
- It is difficult to visually/graphically depict this
- We drew upon knowledge of range scientist / managers, economists & sociologists -- contributed expertise from each field
- Conceptual hierarchy from more to less integration & distillation
- Basic model: State (current status) & Processes (Ecological & Natural resource processes Social & economic processes interaction socio-economic & biophysical processes)....
- All looking at the evaluation of sustainability over time More complex model step through using the Invasive Species Illustration  $T_0-T_1-T_2$
- SRR is testing the set of indicators by identifying elements of the framework to which each indicator applies. Using the framework to develop "stories" regarding specific issues associated with rangelands and how they interact between sub-systems. We think we have a good set of indicators that are acting in the manner they were envisioned for assessing sustainability on rangelands.
- Working with the integration & synthesis group

#### DATA STATUS OF CORE INDICATORS – John Tanaka

- Led group through all the core indicators & their associated data availability. Step through each indicator that doesn't have data or missing data or data gaps. Some of the data is available, but not on national scale or may not use aggregate methods
- Selection of core indicators: importance and practicality, availability and ease of collection, feasibility of monitoring over large land areas

- Need to identify rangeland-dependent counties... stratify further into Metro, Micro, & Rural... Rangeland-dependent depends on the definition of rangelands. Many of the Social and Economic indicators are predicated on finding "rangeland-dependent" counties
- Develop the set of C & I's for rangelands. The conceptual framework gives us a context for evaluating the indicators to tell the sustainability story
- All 64 indicators are important -The core set is just he beginning of the long-term process.
- Identify the data we need to complete a first report

#### AFTERNOON SESSIONS I - DISCUSSION

- Leading through the conceptual model was helpful to start as simple as possible then increase the complexity. Suggestion made to remove all boxes that aren't currently being shown as you step through the model in the presentation.
- Conceptual model helps show how some indicators have been taken out, refined When we pushed all 64 C & I through the conceptual framework it led us to want to refine the framework
- Not a flat-screen model different time sequences & rates between boxes
- Why are we going back to try to fit old datasets into the indicators? Need to get very knowledgeable about the relevant datasets – do a complete data catalogue – before we ask someone to change their protocol and/or re-do datasets. May need to just re-look at the current data, can perhaps just re-data mine.
- For some of the indicators, there will have to be standards for comparison. Are we getting better or worse?, compared to what?, so what?
- We need a sustainability definition. Sustainability at what time scale, for how long and for whom? Sustainability is going to change through generations... it's a moving target. Indicators provide flexibility tried to remove the value judgments from the indicators. We may interpret the data differently we're not measuring sustainability, we're measuring change and trends... then you can <u>interpret</u> sustainability from the measurements
- Indicators need to be value-free, desired condition is a reference point for determining progress. The indicators are generic value-free system they just inform society and then over time we see trends... and look at the desired condition and make changes in operations to try to reach those conditions.

- We need to be able to tell the story without the boxes and arrows show human beings and daily lives... we don't have charismatic macro- & micro-fauna. Base the stories on a consistent set of facts.
- What percent of the ultimate product do the conceptual models represent how far are we from done? We still haven't seen a marketable product. What is it going to be and what will it look like? Only one in a range of products for a comprehensive system. We can say we're showing "samples" but not full product line. Product is a paradigm shift in the way we look at rangelands

# Challenges to a National Strategic Inventory/Monitoring of Anything... the FIA Experience – Michael Wilson See Powerpoint slides

**Mechanics of Implementing Interagency Ecological Monitoring** – *Jeff Goebel* See PowerPoint slides

## USDA National Agricultural Statistic Service (NASS) – *Linda Hutton* www.usda.gov/nass

- NASS releases over 450 reports/year
- Has questions and concerns about how they are counting the AUM rental... To determine land that is producing agricultural products:

Land owned + Land Rented in -Land Rented out

• Need for more discussion on this

#### **Mechanics of Implementing Interagency Socio-economic monitoring** – *Ted Heintz*

- Quite a lot of the indicators are social/economic (SE) focused.
- Income is not being generated by the landscape they are bringing their income to the landscape.
- Scale question illustrated by SE data...

Census – can be looked at a very fine scale. Other data are confined to National, perhaps regional use (National Income & Product accounts – GDP)... can not be brought down to the county level, not geographically very specific

- We can allocate higher-level aggregates to the county level but it's not a direct measurement. If can make a bridge between national --> county-level data, then data that is brought down from a national level (allocated) is not going to be as trusted as much as data actually collected at a finer level.
- Sonoran Institute has national data available for local users, but assumes reliable data is available at the county level.

- We can interpolate between sample points similar to allocating from National data down to the county level not as trusted or valid. Don't design the system to allow local users to access it at the beginning. Let the market drive what we provide. Hope that we would move into a demonstrated market for local information that is consistent with national information. It will be hard to justify the budget beyond those needed for national statistics without a clear indication of the demand.
- The sample structure built into the socio-econ data reflects a demand that is already there. A lot of data is at the county level because of the demand a lot of decisions are made at the county level because they have lobbied for that data. Is the county level the level to be focused on? This is the most local scale which, across the board, we have data available... (census tract level is available in some locations).
- Some social indicators don't have an identified dataset to match them yet. So that means a new social monitoring system. What is the measurement that needs to be made? The sociologists were creative in their set of parameters that would identify the demands that the community was making on the resource.

#### AFTERNOON SESSIONS II - DISCUSSION

- Indian lands have not been included before... So will see a jump in the lands. Need to recognize their sovereignty. There is an opportunity here get baseline data (climax) 100 million acres of Indian lands won't fit in current model
- Core indicators list is very ag-focused, concerned may not be addressing all the other uses of the Rangelands...
- Any possibility of the SRR indicators integrating with NRI could work well scientifically... politically more difficult.
- Who are the primary supporters of the FIA & NRI... key customers have been states, national forest systems, universities, industries (value-less inventory). Reaction to an expansion to include the SRR indicators already do address many of these indicators (forest)...
- Property costs on ranchers losing battle livestock grazing is least subsidized use of land. They keep school coffers in the black.
- Statistical designs compatibility between the groups... seen as not being too difficult.

#### MAY 25, 2005

Review Day 1 & charge for Day 2 – Lou Romero & Dennis Child

#### IMPLEMENTATION BREAKOUT SESSION I

<u>Four groups:</u> University, Agencies, Legislative, Funding (Split up into groups in different rooms)

#### BREAKOUT GROUPS - REPORT OUT & DISCUSSION

#### **UNIVERSITY** (see powerpoint)

#### How to institutionalize the C & I's into the University setting

- Agencies have to embrace C & I first & fund it
- Time to get moving
- May have reached the limit of the roundtable & volunteers at this point
- Universities may get upset without significant scientific products
- Need to get buy-in
- <u>Develop a university consortium modeled after others</u>
- Lead university with full-time person
- Other universities with part-time people
- Contract with other universities

Economic, Ecological & Social departments

- Need to get these faculty involved
- Products / Activities (land grant model teaching, research & extension)

#### Teaching:

- Incorporate concepts into existing classes (no/ low-cost)
- Develop distance education classes (up front cost --> then revenue-producing)
- RSEC (group made up of all university range department heads)
  - Avenue to get concepts incorporated into their curriculum

#### Research:

Develop studies on specific indicators

- Data warehouse, Data analysis, Basic research

Consortium could control which projects done, setting priorities, funding, finding people

#### Extension/ Outreach:

e-extension – online

Develop adult education courses

Agency training courses

Get widespread buy-in from different groups

Universities (land grant & others), Tribes, Producers, Public

- Aware of Sustainable Forest consortium? Use as a model...
- Any place to get groups to converge...? Use of Ag Demo Days goods/bads, lessons learned, tied into SRM meetings, Cattlemen producer meetings...
- Rangelands West libraries, websites...
- Purpose of a consortium help with the 2010 report?
- Asked about Tribal colleges --> now considered Land Grant colleges

#### **AGENCIES** (see OneGoal.doc file)

One goal – develop national handbook - require use across all agencies

#### • How to accomplish:

One rangeland agency
One agency for private / one for public rangelands

- Next Steps:
- 1. Look at core indicators
- 2. Identify potential options
- 3. Conduct an assessment of ongoing pilots & learn from them
- 4. Look at where we want to be and options to get us there

Where is the data housed?

Can we, when, do we expand beyond the core 27?

- 5. Who responsible for preparing the report / assessment?
- Programmatic changes for agencies:

Incorporate a national assessment

Require the document to the extent we can

Incorporated into the budget

Institutionalize the requirement for monitoring and reporting

Use this information to drive and inform research

All agencies need to determine that programmatic changes need to be made to implement This will require a road map of who will provide what, when, where and how.

- Need to get programmatic acceptance of the C& I <u>outside</u> the Range people need to get it approved by the Fish & Wildlife & Recreation, etc.... same with Forestry.
- Need to have a clear message start staff by staff or starting with the agency head?

Seems to already have an affinity for C & I out there

• We started thinking within our own program's needs – then stepped back and a broader array of options & considered a different model – like a single agency to handle this

#### LEGISLATIVE

Bottomline – could be better defined as administrative changes...

- Need a MOU (draft forms). An expired MOU --> good model to work from
- At what level should that MOU should be handled? Secretarial level? --> perhaps asst / undersecretary level instead
- MOU would be non-binding document, an attempt to establish a common ground from which to work from. Executive Order – once MOU in place, expand possibilities for financing & buy-in outreach
- Buy-in is key—

Private landowners, don't thus far have the outreach to these groups NGOs. In departments, agency heads on board before take to the secretary level

- In the event we decide a legislative fix is necessary then the Farm Bill is most obvious vehicle for that.
- Need a firm proposal to go to the departments they should be 1<sup>st</sup> attempt for support 2<sup>nd</sup> attempt – Executive Order 3<sup>rd</sup> attempt – Legislative action / Farm Bill
- President has cooperative conservation Executive Order
- Conservation Summit in St. Louis, August meeting If we have something cohesive, Chip willing to bring it & represent
- Going to cabinet level economics/sociology, some agencies restricted from doing it. Hoping to include our CEQ representative as well

- MOU discussion focused on long-run implementation or 2010 report? 2010 report. We have the model of the MOU for sustainable forests and that one didn't say anything about the long-run... complexity of MOU makes it easier to go short-term
- Because of the breadth of the agencies and Interior vs. Agriculture either have multiple asst. secretaries --> so need to go up one level (Dept. Secretary – nominee is very supportive). Or better to keep it at the bureau level...
- We have considerable buy-in work to be done at the Dept. of Interior Unless there is considerable political clout moving this forward... concerned about success

- Process needs to start soon very complex
- MOU two different conversations: Focused on 2010 report vs. Future monitoring
- Economics & Sociology parts --> we will need other agencies to cover these topics
- Executive Order we don't want any more unfunded mandates... The administration needs a better environmental image – so this would be a good time to take advantage of it.

#### **FUNDING** (funding pp & word doc)

- Capture plan Focused on getting 27 C & I in
- Development and funding C & I this is the information that will go into the 2010 report
- "Killer Matrix" graphically show who working on what, roles & responsibilities defined. Matrix needs a fulltime staff person working on it
- In order to be useful, needs to be geo-spatially referenced Needs to be part of a larger national effort National Environmental Reporting Act New congressional Act with appropriations

- Any talk about homeland security act instead of Farm Bill?
- Important to get each step done along the way. Don't ask Congress to write legislation when we don't know what needs to be in it!
- GLCI formed with lots of organizations involved. Money may be authorized but may never be appropriated. That money was taken from other locations a shift, not a new appropriation, no new funding to the agencies
- With legislation, looking at a 6-10 year time frame to be enacted/ appropriated. Until the agencies action happens first, everything else on hold. Start with a deliverable set to the agencies then grow to 27. Write the manual in sequence as we get stuff produced.

- We're going to need to cross-pollinate between the roundtables (forestry, watershed, etc). Begin with just the vegetation type, keep it to just the agencies that we have and wait to do the socio-econ later.
- We need a hook to grab their attention. SRR is proposing "A new way to characterize accountability and progress on federal lands" (for example). Propose a pilot amongst the groups
- Agencies need to sit down and figure out how to do this Need to talk to the higher-ups, If that doesn't happen it won't happen
- Ted Heintz willing to convene a meeting moving the MOU along, address idea of starting the matrix, getting leaders together...

#### Overview of Progress Report, Charge for this afternoon

• Rangeland Ecology & Management journal supplemental article overview & update

#### **THURSDAY MAY 26, 2005**

#### **Review Day 2 progress**

#### Report out from groups

#### AGENCY group (see Agency Grou1.doc)

• Meeting next week with Ted Heintz.

Intention is to bring agency people here with other people with similar roles to discuss how to move through this issue

- -- Strategy to cooperate on a national strategy
- -- Address rangelands info at the broadest scale
- -- Describe relationship with SRR and agencies
- -- Develop a strategy for how to get us there
- Selling Points:

Provide cohesive national assessment

#### **UNIVERSITY** group

Time is running out & things need to happen

- Four alternatives for action:
- 1. Implement the 2010 report under the current concept of agency participation and retasking agencies for \$ and personnel to state monitoring what they identify as feasible... any mandate??
- 2. Form consortiums and regional research committees (agencies & universities) and seek outside funding to do the indicators would require grant writing
- 3. Implement some sort of a program through agencies request to NAS/NRC like the Rangeland Health book (1994)... agencies would fund the program
- 4. Disband

Preferred alternative – Option #1 Feel that there is momentum but it's not coalescing yet

#### LEGISLATIVE group

- Recognized that the work had not been finalized on the Rangeland's Charter Work to get the charter circulated and signed & as a tool to get buy-in to move forward
- This is a task for the advisory board
- This group will submit a draft cover letter
- 4 pg document shared key pieces of this
- Decided to start at the three agency level and work out from there Plan to circulate this document & should be out in the next couple of weeks

- Seeking buy-in from previous participants and would give consideration to strong objections/changes

"Here's the National scope and this is how it will benefit you and your organization"

- Still haven't made a good linkage between SRR & individual landowners
- -- What is it we need to say to make this message clearer?
- We can do some on-going things to make message better
- -- Sending charter out to better communicate with them
- Why do they care? --> this is not being well-communicated
- -- This should be in the text of the cover letter
- The agency coordination is going on at the same time as NGO communication
- Still want to approach departments to solicit overall support for SRR efforts There needs to be direct communication from the SRR leadership & key members
- -- They may need to add a personal note to supplement & personalize
- If can't get National organizations to sign, have the option of going to the state level
- If can't get some organizations/agencies/universities/NGOs on the first try, after accumulate some signatures may wan to re-visit those original groups
- Discussed social, economics We need real & real-time numbers to help counter-act some of the attacks/charges against rangeland issues/ local producers
- Provides real value
- Helps with our ability to respond
- People are an important component of Rangelands
- After can show some support from the NGOs, then solicit additional support for the implementation of the SRR indicators at the department level

Page 3 of the Charter A - D and 3 points under the Federal agencies section...

#### **FUNDING** group

- Did timeline until 2010. Many of the activities need to be done within the next year To help identify activities in the next couple of years—otherwise the 2010 report isn't going to happen. Try to capture year-end funds
- Needs to be a person or couple to work on/be lead to work on each of these Who going to be overall manager on the Report
- Overall task of long-term management of the monitoring not looked at

#### MATRIX:

MOU

- -- Agency Meeting Indicators / Report
- -- ID overall manager
- -- Lead
- -- Write
- -- Analyze
- -- Combine Data

Pilot Study

- -- ID who do it & where
- Along top -- the 27 indicators & along side -- all the people responsible
- Will show what indicators we really have the ability to report out on in the 2010 report. Similar to the Forestry roundtable "killer matrix" Paul Geissler helped with that
- -- The Forestry matrix was the output of 3 workshops
- Funding strategy for the long-term would come out of that
- Indicators that we can collect data on, with no current data, would need new funding
- What information available, data gaps, institutional gaps
- Pilots Should review what has already been done need to glean all the information we can from the current/past pilots. Need to integrate & learn from them
- 5 year census of agriculture is 2007 so 2006 will be a critical year If there needs to be data from NASS, then need to have this done ASAP...
- How going to link back to the NGOs & Universities— Matrix will include everyone, not just the agencies
- FACA & Agency Involvement brought up

#### CRITICAL UPCOMING WINDOWS

- Ag Census 2007 match up
- Need a letter from SRR leadership with signatures from NGO, Agencies, Universities...
- The pilot & the matrix and a body that is dedicated to doing that
- need year long funds to do that
- August is the drop-dead time / July need info in place otherwise too late Needs to be a planning & budget person to help write an across-department budget proposal

- Conservation Summit in St. Louis August invites already out
- get info to people going there to present SRR info to the summit
- one reason to work on the charter
- Can try to sneak something in, beyond the 18 case studies?
- There may be other alternatives. Get charter out to NGOs --
- Are the universities going to implement the consortium concept?
- Producer groups are waiting to see whether the agencies can produce Even a qualified "we want to support this" would be preferred Want to hear that the producer groups really support this...
- Pilots isn't the first C & I release going to be a pilot? In the 2010 report... new information. Look at the past pilots, learn what we can & move forward. If we need to prototype something then we can.
- Formalize the matrix of time deadlines

#### • Kit... BLM

Monitoring work has been looked at carefully by management, auditors & OMB Went to management and said we wanted to look at our data collection & monitoring Started looking at the indicators (SRR & Forestry) and asked them to ID twelve... then down to 10. Start thinking about how to implement the 10 indicators – When meeting with agencies, thought that we would work on these 10, a limited number... then expand in the future. Need to look at all the details. And look at what the other groups are doing. Agencies meeting next week – BLM would like to explore a way to work on & implement these 10 indicators with everyone (Universities, NGOs, Producers). Figure out how to report for the 2010 – focusing on a limited number, get success under our belt, then we can expand. BLM would like to be a part of this group rather than off by itself.

- How to add in groups that haven't been involved to date (Tribal lands BIA key organization), Military lands, Outreach to congress?
- Restructuring the roundtable have to keep people engaged A lot of new people here, take it one bite at a time, get organized & structured, and stick to timeline, don't be overwhelmed by whole task
- Committed to the vision, need to make sure we don't ignore the socio-economic side of the C& I, re-structure & organize

- Circulate results from the Agency meeting to all interested parties a Newsletter??
- $\bullet$  At the Portland meeting 2010 is a National Level report... so not ALL the indicators from SRR may be included, there may be some others in there as well
- Write back to Noble Foundation to thank them for their amazing hospitality... *Address here:*

Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation c/o Mike Cawley 2510 Sam Noble Pky. Ardmore, OK 73401

#### Appendix A

## Sustainable Rangelands Roundtable



### INDICATOR IMPLEMENTATION WORKSHOP

Developing a Roadmap for Standardized Rangeland Monitoring and Reporting in the United States

Monday, May 23 - Thursday, May 26, 2005

Hosted by

The Samuel Roberts Noble Foundation

#### SRR VISION, WORKSHOP GOALS & OBJECTIVES

#### **SRR Vision:**

We envision a future in which U.S. rangelands provide a desired mix of social, economic, and ecological benefits to current and future generations; and criteria and indicators for monitoring and assessing the economic, social, and ecological sustainability of rangelands are widely accepted and used.

#### Implementation Workshop Goals:

Outline a realistic, concrete plan, including timeline and budget, for implementation of comprehensive, indicator-based monitoring and reporting of rangeland sustainability in the United States. Final product will be the skeleton of a marketable plan to be fleshed out for presentation to Congressional, Department, Agency, and NGO leadership.

#### Implementation Workshop Objectives:

- 1. Familiarize participants with SRR's framework for standardized monitoring and reporting on the sustainability of US rangelands; convey that indicators are ready for implementation in a comprehensive monitoring and reporting system.
  - Introduce SRR's 27 core indicators and review indicator datasets, sources, and limitations
  - Present SRR's conceptual model of indicator interactions
  - Overview existing national monitoring efforts and lessons learned FIA, NRI, and socio-economic information
- 2. Participants explore strategies to implement comprehensive, indicator-based national monitoring and reporting on sustainability of US rangelands.
  - Outline suggested programmatic changes within universities, agencies, and NGO organizations to facilitate implementation of monitoring/reporting on 27 core indicators.
  - Identify potential legislative actions/changes needed to facilitate implementation of indicator-based monitoring and reporting on rangeland sustainability.
  - Identify funding challenges and opportunities.
- 3. Participants provide focused tactics to develop an implementation plan for a system of monitoring and reporting on sustainability of US rangelands.
  - Address institutional changes needed within agencies, universities and NGOs.
  - Address funding challenges and opportunities.
  - Address operational changes needed agencies, universities and NGOs.
  - Identify a timeline and necessary base budget item allocations for implementation of monitoring/reporting on 27 core indicators.

## Monday, 23 May 2005

5:30 – 6:30pm Welcome Reception and Introductions -

SRR Overview and Desired Products from Workshop; Briefing on SRR progress toward national and international implementation *Dennis Child and Lou Romero* (1 hour)

6:30 - 9:00pm Opening Banquet

## Tuesday, 24 May 2005

| 8:00 am  | Introductory Remarks (10 min) - Dennis Child and Lou Romero   |
|----------|---|
| 8:10 am  | Noble Foundation Welcome (10 min) – Mike Cawley, President  |
| 8:20 am  | Opening Plenary Panel (10 min slots) NGO Perspectives on Indicator-based Monitoring. Organizations include: GrazingLands Conservation Initiative — Bob Drake, Chairman Society for Range Management — John Tanaka, Vice-President National Cattlemen's Beef Assoc. — Jeff Eisenberg, Director, Fed. Lands National Assoc. of Conservation Districts — Tim Reich, Vice-President Oklahoma Farm Bureau — Steve Copeland, President Society for Conservation Biology — Rick Knight, Professor CSU The Nature Conservancy — Jamie Ervin, Ecoregional Measures Mgr. Tribal Advisory Council — P.J. Workman, Special Projects Mgr Discussion — 20 min |
| 10:00 am | Break (15 min)  |
| 10:15 am | Opening Plenary Panel II (10 minutes slots)  Agency Perspectives on Indicator-based Monitoring. Agencies include:  Natural Resources Conservation Service – Dennis Thompson, National Range and Grazing Land Ecologist  Bureau of Land Management – Ed Shepard, Asst Director, Renewable Resources and Planning  USDA Forest Service – Janette Kaiser, Director, Rangeland Mgmt.  Agricultural Research Service – Rod Heitschmidt, Research Leader  US Geological Survey – Paul Geissler, Coordinator, National Park Monitoring Project  Discussion 20 minutes  |
| 11:25 am | <b>Indicator Introduction</b> - emphasis on 27 Core Indicators (35 min)<br><i>James Bernard, Executive Director, Mendocino Land Trust</i>   |
| 12:00 pm | Buffet Lunch Onsite (1.5 hours)   |
| 1:15 pm  | <b>Conceptual Model Overview</b> : How the Indicators Fit Together (30 min) <i>Bill Fox, Senior Research Scientist, Texas Water Resources Institute</i>   |

- 1:45 pm **Data Status for the Core Indicators** (45 min):
  - a. What Data has been identified?
  - b. What do we know about data availability and quality? *John Tanaka, Assoc. Professor, Oregon State University*
- 2:30 pm Discussion on Core Indicators, Conceptual Model and Data Issues
  (30 minutes) Moderated by Lou Romero with James Bernard, Bill
  Fox, & John Tanaka
- 3:00 pm **Break** (15 min)
- 3:15 pm What are the Mechanics of Implementing Interagency Ecological Monitoring? (30 min) Sampling and data collection issues, analysis issues, interpretation concerns, and issues associated with integration with socio-economic information? Mike Wilson, USDA Forest Service Forest Inventory and Analysis Program (FIA) and Jeff Goebel, USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service National Resources Inventory (NRI)
- 3:45 pm What are the Mechanics of Implementing Interagency Socio-Economic Monitoring? (30 min) Sampling and data collection issues, analysis issues, interpretation concerns, and issues associated with integration with ecological information? Linda Hutton, USDA National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS) and H. Theodore Heintz, Presidents's Council on Environmental Quailty
- 4:15 pm Questions and Discussion (45 min)
- **5:00 pm** Adjourn Day 1
- 5:30 pm Social Hour
- 6:30 pm Italian Buffet Dinner (onsite)

## Wednesday, 25 May 2005

| 8:00 am  | Recap Day 1 and Overview Day 2 – Dennis Child and Lou Romero   |
|----------|--|
| 8:15 am  | <ul> <li>Implementation Breakout Sessions I: What will it take to get SRR indicators on the ground to ensure wide acceptance, adoption and use? (2.5 hours)</li> <li>a. What Legislative Actions are needed?</li> <li>b. What are Potential Funding Sources and Opportunities? How could they be leveraged?</li> <li>c. What Programmatic Changes are needed to institutionalize indicator-based monitoring in the agencies?</li> <li>d. What Programmatic Changes are needed to institutionalize indicator-based monitoring in the universities?</li> <li>Group on each topic (4); no more than 10 people per group.</li> </ul> |
| 10:45 am | Break (15 min)   |
| 11:00 am | Implementation Breakout Sessions I (cont'd for 1 hour) Prepare to report out to whole group for discussion   |
| 12:00 pm | Buffet Lunch Onsite (1.5 hours)  |
| 1:15 pm  | Breakout Reports and Discussion (1 hour)   |
| 2:15 pm  | Break (15 min)   |
| 2:30 pm  | Implementation Breakout Sessions II (3 hrs) What are the tactical considerations for national, on-the-ground implementation of indicator-based monitoring?  a. Timeline b. Budget c. Pilot studies d. Partnerships/Agreements e. TBD f. TBD (Product should be marketable to Congress, Agency, and NGO Leadership. Consider funding at \$8, \$12, \$16 and \$20 million.)  |
| 5:30 pm  | Adjourn Day 2  |
| 6:00 pm  | Depart for Chuckwagon dinner at the Coffey Ranch   |

## Thursday, 26 May 2005

| 8:00 am  | Recap day 2 and continued small group work (10 min)  Dennis Child and Lou Romero  |
|----------|---|
| 8:10 am  | Implementation Breakout Sessions II (2 hrs) What are the tactical considerations for national, on-the-ground implementation of indicator-based monitoring?  a. Timeline b. Budget c. Pilot studies d. Partnerships/Agreements e. TBD f. TBD (Product should be marketable to Congress, Agency, and NGO Leadership. Consider funding at \$8, \$12, \$16 and \$20 million.) |
| 10:10 am | <b>Break</b> (15 min)   |
| 10:25 am | <b>Discussion and small group report out on implementation of indicator-based monitoring</b> (1 hour) – <i>led by Lou Romero and Dennis Child</i>   |
| 11:25 am | Overview of Implementation Planning Accomplishments, Take Home Messages for SRR, and Next Steps based on output (35 min) – led by Lou Romero with Dennis Child and SRR Steering Committee   |
| 12:00 pm | Overview of Noble Foundation Rangeland Research Activities (45 min) – Shan Ingram, Noble Foundation   |

### Optional Noble Foundation Field Tour (1:30 pm-5:30 pm)

Bag Lunches on Bus/Van for Field Tour

Participants may leave at noon or later; earlier departures are discouraged.

Thanks for your time and effort!