



November 14-15, 2006

Scottsdale, AZ

Meeting 22

Follow-up Actions from SRR Scottsdale Meeting:

Overall SRR Projects:

- The paper about the conceptual model needs to be submitted and hopefully published by the end of the year. Two suggestions in journals were the *Journal for the Society of Natural Resources* or *Environmental Economics*.
- A Delphi needs to be sent out for the 'Ecosystem Services Report' on the meeting in Lyons, CO. Tom Bartlett needs to get this done as soon as possible.
- A publication needs to be created that can be handed out at the SRM meeting in February about the Ecosystem Services Workshop and our progress/ findings.
- There has been a push to "define the language" of our indicators. There is a need to go into each indicator and describe what we mean, what datasets, and what information would be required for each indicator. This is to be a QA/QC for the indicators and show their dynamic and evolving use. This needs to be completed ASAP, but should NOT be released until after the Monograph.
- Monograph to be published and released as soon as possible. John Mitchell is working on this.
- Advocacy and Promotion Goal Group need to look into the creation of a business plan. A Delphi to address this will need to be created.
- The Research Goal Group 3 is going to look into the creation of a book. They will refine and review Dan McCollum's proposal outline.

Goal Group 1 (Advocacy and Promotion) Projects:

- Set up a side meeting at SRM meeting in February with agencies. Kit will be in charge of developing some materials for this meeting.
- Paul Geissler will be in charge of updating the Forest Roundtable about SRR (summary) and the Pilot project.
- There needs to be a GAO Briefing but it is low on the priority list,
- There needs to be a Delphi by December (to have the results in by January) completed by Paul regarding :
 - What products can/ should SRR produce?
 - How we are viewed?
 - How 'they' could use the products that we produce?

- There needs to be a Congressional contact meeting, which will be of lesser focus than the Deputy contact. This should take place maybe late next summer to look at the Pilot project (depending on agency).
- There will be a Deputy contact meeting March to April 2007 where a PowerPoint, handout on ecosystem services, the Statement of Support, Model description (simple), and a descriptor of the framework needs to be created and presented. Contacts should be:
 - Henri Bisson BLM
 - Joel Holtrop USFS
 - Bob Doyle USGS
 - Dana York NRCS (Larry Clark &/or Bill Puckett)
 - CSREES? (Dan Kugler)
 - US FWS (John Walker)
 - NPS
 - DOD
 - ARS (Ev Byington & Mark Welch)
- Briefing the OMB needs to be on a future agenda. (Jason Weller, etc.)
- John Peterson will draft key messages to convey to Directors and Congress information about SRR and its projects and goals. This is to be completed by January 30, 2007. They should be brief, simple clear, and about 1pg.
- There needs to be a Legislative Program.
- Stan Hamilton will ask other agencies to prepare a version of Kit's matrix in next couple of weeks.
- Furnish Dick Loper additional information about Statement of Support.

Goal Group 2 (Assessment) Projects:

- Bob Breckenridge will develop a summary of Verification and Validation (V+V) process (using James's info as a starting place. There will be a draft to working group by Mid December 2006.
- A group review and respond to Bob with comments on the V+V process by the second week in January.
- Dennis Child is to discuss the option of employing a new grad student to help the SRR fill out the V+V process using all existing information on indicators from SRR files and answer to group by early December.
- Bob will meet with Dennis and grad student to kick off V+V process early January in Denver.
- The groups agree to V+V process and present it to Secretariat for planning and inclusion in the Spring meeting.
- The group will provide support to the Pilot Project through working on fragmentation.
- A special workgroup "attached" to the Integrated Rangeland Assessment Goal Group 2, will be a 'Tactic' added under 'Objective C' that promotes the continuous improvement of our indicators. The special workshop group should be made up of representatives from the original C/I work groups. There will be an initial product looking at fragmentation.

- *People that should be involved:* John Mitchell, Robert Washington Allen, Linda Allen, Dave Theobald, John Tanaka, Lou Swanson?, Jamison Ervin? Bill Kepner (EPA 702.798.2208), Dave Mowatt (541.754.4330 current?), Kurt Ritter -- There is a need to connect with the Heinz Center. Consider bringing in a grad student to bring together the information from the past so work is not duplicated or repeated.
- *Timeline:* Before the end of the year is preferable, but it needs to be done by the SRM meeting in February. The earlier the better because protocols are being created now. December for the fragmentation and for the rest should be done by February.

Goal Group 3 (Research) Projects:

- A group for W1192 will meet in January 2007 to begin writing funding proposals.
- CSREES, FS, BLM, ARS, ERS, NASS, USGS and other reps in DC form an informal rangeland sustainability research work group monthly to coordinate activities as well as communicate what they are doing.
- We will develop an outline for writing a book that focuses on the significant aspects of the SRR effort. Thoughts on book content include:
 - This will be a state of our knowledge book about rangeland sustainability and the integration of social, ecological, and economic aspects.
 - Book would be on existing information, rather than gathering new information.
 - It would be a more rigorous version of the *First Approximation Report* and include identification of data gaps and barriers for implementation.
 - It should include revision of wording and data relations for indicators.
 - It would identify research needs and be a precursor for developing the national assessment.
 - It will identify the research needed on how the outcomes of national programs (e.g., EQIP, CRP, GRP) can be predicted and shown by indicators such as the NRCS Conservation Effects Assessment Program (CEAP) effort.
- We will determine the best process for getting such a book written and published. In descending order, the models we considered were: (Needs a business plan)
 - Contract with the National Academy of Science to manage and publish the book. We expect this to cost a minimum of \$100,000, more like \$350,000 according to Jim D. We think that a firm business proposal be developed to accomplish this and be shopped around to agencies and private foundations for funding support.
 - Bring a group of authors together in a workshop setting and get them to write individual chapters. SRR would review and publish the book. Funds would be used to pay travel and workshop costs, potentially

publication costs. We expect this to be in the \$30-50,000 range and would require someone in SRR or one of its partners to manage the endeavor.

- Raise funds to pay a stipend to authors to write chapters. This would be similar to the second alternative except additional funds would need to be raised in order to pay the stipend. This alternative would have a higher potential to get the desired authors, but cost the most. Based on the current book outline, it may cost \$100-150,000.
- Conference and proceedings. This alternative would be to host a conference on rangeland sustainability, invite speakers, and ask them to either write up their work or hire someone to synthesize comments from multiple speakers. The resulting papers would be published in a symposium proceedings.
- We will provide the report(s)/book to the outreach committee to present to agency leadership and funding organizations.
- Identify research funding priorities with broad input from stakeholders (agencies would be participants, not the lead). Review research needs identified by SRR, including from the book activity in Objective C. Prepare a document on research priorities that will be supported by SRR participants. Define what is the desired future state that everyone buys in on (driving force for the book).
 - Use the identified research priorities to develop proposals and work with funding agencies and institutions to incorporate them into their funding priorities. Get into listening sessions for the agency, get on invitation lists, make personal visits, and other activities.
 - Promote a proper allocation of resource priorities among ecological, economic, and social indicators.
 - Identify specific funding sources for research.
 - Federal agencies – USFS, USGS-BRD, ARS, ERS, NASS, Rural Development, CSREES, Congressional appropriations, etc.
 - Private foundations
- Create a policy/resolution statement that can be promoted by organizations for funding.
- Create a mechanism to ensure that both indicators and research needs are periodically reviewed for relevancy and need for updating. Priorities for research should be based on its utility for advancing the conceptual framework.
- SRR will facilitate periodic national forums to review C&I research and develop a rangeland sustainability research community, promoting cross-disciplinary interactions. These sessions may be linked to or held in association with the data status forums identified by Goal Group 2.
 - Each forum will highlight on-going and completed research. Ensure that forums include social, economic, and ecological aspects.

- These reviews will prioritize indicators with the highest research needs and potential usefulness to assess rangeland sustainability. Conduct at different levels and interests – scientists, managers, policy makers, etc.
- Meeting among interested parties at SRM meeting in Reno, 2007.

Goal Group 4 (Coordination and Communication) Projects:

- By early December, there will be a 1st quarterly update to the main SRR participants with updates including:
 - Outreach efforts from Kristie Mazcko
 - Statement of Support progress from Doug Powell
 - Update on the monograph from John Mitchell
 - Update on W1192 from John Tanaka
 - Update on CINE and KNII from Ted Heintz
 - Request for really Cool Rangeland Factoids and WOW statistics
 - Highlights of meeting – bullets
 - Conceptual modeling – link to 1 page update on website
 - Ecosystem services – link to 1 page update on website (write up by Tanaka and Heinz)
 - CSREES rangeland program
 - Book
 - Pilot project
 - Recommitment to goal groups
 - New participants – Jim from CSREES, Dave from Rocky Mtn Elk
- Liz will get the Scottsdale Meeting Minutes out by November 23, and they will be posted on the web no later than Wednesday of the following week.
- Timetable for next 3 – 6 months
 - Meeting minutes by November 23, 2006.
 - Quarterly Update (see above) by Dec 8th.
 - Assessment of the status of list.
 - Update the stakeholder list by Jan 1st, develop strategy to use, and how will contact each stakeholder (how to parse and in conjunction with group 1.)
 - Testing of Delphi questionnaire (sent out by Paul)
 - Revision
 - Send out to full group in December
 - Pilot Study
 - Get white paper and communication plan from BLM USFS and NRCS in February
 - Develop our own complimentary items to help with
 - Recovery to internal products
 - Inventory of all notes, products, etc
 - Annual Report
 - January
 - No more than 5 pages long
 - Link to stuff on website
 - Website Review
 - Facility of use and content

- Is everything there? Can it be easily found?
 - Move list of “products” to front (to create its own button).
 - Create a statement of support page with those who have signed the statement as well as the logo of their affiliation.
- WOW Statistics
 - Request folks to provide really cool (but verifiable) rangeland factoids and WOW statistics
- Request monthly update on status of statement of support – from Doug, Liz and Dennis
- Review old outreach plan to see if still valid - January
 - Send out to working group and have them provide comments
- Quarterly update in April
- Outreach efforts – SRM
 - Update on pilot study
 - Etc
- Identify people by January or February to reactivate and invite to the next SRR meeting (Albuquerque in March). We are bringing them in for verification and validation of indicator process via assessment group. The Vallas caldera group using the indicators should also present an update (if possible) with a field trip?
- Find out who has used our indicators
- Inventory of products developed and review to see what is still useful and what needs to be updated.
- Recover historic documents/ developments and do a website review

Ecosystem Services Follow Up:

- During the Ecosystem services meeting in Lyons, CO, it was established that SRR will need to link the indicators to the ecosystem services.
- Tom Bartlett needs to create a Delphi for the report written about the workshop (the summary) to assess its validity. It doesn’t have to be a Delphi, but an open comment arrangement.
- There is a need to inform the workshop participants that their work has advance the model, and that the model has been changed because of their input. The SRM symposium would be a good place to show updates and progress on ecosystem services to participants.
- The list of services that was created needs to be taken to the SRM symposium along with the Delphi and report, by Goal Group 1. From there, phase 2 for ecosystem services can be assessed (another meeting or Delphi or something else?).

Possible Up Coming Meetings:

- All Organizations
 - Fragmentation Meeting (invite representation of this group) in Ft Collins (soon)
 - National Grazing Lands Conference in December
 - AFB in January
 - NCBA in January/February
 - NACD in February
 - SRM in February

- RMEF in February
- GLCI in March
- NAWNR in March

- SRR Meetings
 - May/ June Albuquerque with a fieldtrip (possibly).

** Text highlighted below in red will provide greater detail to those tasks addressed above, as well as details about other items.*

SRR Scottsdale Meeting Overview – Day 1 Summary

November 14, 2006

1) Updates- *Kristie Mazcko, Doug Powell, John Mitchell, John Tanaka, Ted Heintz, Dennis Child*

- a) Outreach
 - i) Past: SWCS, ESA, Land Trust Rally, Managing Grazing Lands
 - ii) Up coming: 3NCGL, AFB, SRM, NCBA, RMEF, NAWNR
- b) Statement of Support (Charter)
 - i) Need some information for Dick Loper to help tie SRR to “on the ground users” and make a strong connection.
 - ii) Have been mailed out in early October and responses are trickling back.
- c) Monograph: Currently putting all the papers together as one and going through the editing process. As soon as possible it will be submitted to be published
- d) W1192: Regional Research Project (met last fall in AL) to look at land fragmentation and the impact on wildfire and invasive species. Meeting in January in the Arizona to find funding and write grant proposals. Want to get federal researchers involved. The area hasn’t been specified.
- e) CINE Collaboration of Indicators on the Nations Environment: Creation of indicators for a broad range of natural resources and the statistical needs. It is about forming the ability for the agencies and collaboration with data providers and data users. They want to gets things pushed through by the next year to make budget timelines.
- f) KNII Key National Indicators Initiative: Coming from the Government Accountability office and focuses on economic and social indicators. Focused right now on talking to foundations to become endowed. Working on a website that will have the data to make it available to the broad public.
- g) Timeline: (*See Excel File From Dennis Child*)
 - i) We want a refinement of the goal group tactics and objectives so that a clear and updated timeline.
 - ii) Need to develop a list of products that will be need by the different constituencies.
 - iii) Need to set solid dates and products for this meeting.
 - iv) Need to start a combination of outreach, listing and advocacy. The goal groups are going to need to be in contact with each other and work together on occasion

2) Strategic Plan and the Goal Groups: *Dennis Child*

- a) Goal Group 1: Advocacy and Promotion
 - i) *Leaders*: Stan Hamilton and John Peterson
 - ii) *Group Members*: Paul Geisler, Kit Muller, Dennis Child, Dick Loper, Niels Hanson
- b) Goal Group 2: Integrated Rangeland Assessment
 - i) *Leaders*: Bob Breckenridge and Cliff Duke
 - ii) *Group Members*: Rooter Brite, John Mitchell, Gene Fults, Doug Powell, and Ted Heintz
- c) Goal Group 3: Integrated Rangeland Research
 - i) *Leaders*: John Tanaka and Bill Fox
 - ii) *Group Members*: Urs Kreuter, Jim Dobrowalski, Dan McCollum
- d) Goal Group 4: Communication and Coordination

- i) *Leaders*: Lori Hiding and James Bernard
- ii) *Group Members*: Rob Roudabush, Dave Torell, Paul Tueller
- e) There was a meeting in August with several of the agency heads where suggestions were made to the Strategic Plan. The tasks and objectives were prioritized, combined, and organized. They are just suggestions but need to be considered.

3) **Conceptual Model Group**: *Bill Fox*

- a) The paper is written (handout at today's meeting). There are proposals to submit it to the *Journal for the Society of Natural Resources* and possibly the *Environmental Economics Journal*.
- b) There was a meeting Monday afternoon, and *there was consensus to get this paper about the model published by the end of the year*. There is a want to get people to use it and to get feedback on it so that this model can progress, mature and be useful. It should get people to look it to is further.
- c) There is a need to create these types of articles for "grayer" publications which are not so scientifically based, but may reach a broader group of people. (We need a non-scientific article.) This would be how other groups could use the model and apply it. Almost as a "How to Use this" type article about the model. Use a modular to walk through the model and show how it works. { *Work for Goal Group 4 to setup needed publications and communications.* }
- d) Suggested Model Name by URS: ISEE Integrated Social Economic Ecological Framework for Sustainable Rangelands Indicators

4) **Ecosystem Services Workshop Outcomes**: *Kristie Maczko, John Tanaka and Dan McCollim*

- a) Overall Status:
 - i) First Objective Achieved
 - ii) Second Objective (Delphi): John Tanaka and Robin O'Malley have written a summary (passed out as a handout at today's meeting).
 - iii) Didn't cover prioritization of services.
 - iv) Didn't get into the representation of the services to the link with the indicators.
 - v) Good presentations of incentives programs, but a lot of information needs to be developed.
- b) The Millennium Assessment groupings of the categories for the ecosystem services was looked at, but it was decided that they weren't appropriate for our work. Instead the ecosystem services were categorized by Tangible Goods (Extracted goods), Tangible goods (in situ goods), and Intangible goods (in situ). This is more consistent with the SRR framework
- c) *The report will go out in a Delphi to be assessed by Tom Bartlett as soon as possible.*
- d) *There needs to be a product by the February SRM meeting so there can be publications and information available at the meeting.*
- e) We should think about who we want to get this information to could include Ed Warner because he could be beneficial.
- f) Does there need to be a special working group for the ecosystem services or should it be just placed in one of the current goal groups? Suggestions:
 - i) Integrated Assessment Goal Group – subgroup

- ii) Integrated Research Goal Group – subgroup
- iii) Currently in Advocacy and Promotion
- iv) Needs to be multi-group
- v) Make it its own goal group. A smaller group might help things move forward a little faster. Need to get the group moving to have things ready for the SRM meeting. (Should be held off until a later time when the other four groups are functioning and everything is working well.)

5) **Indicator Language:** *James Bernard* (see word document)

- a) There is no continual development and adjustment of our indicators and they need to be dynamic and up kept. Right now we have been static since 2003. We need to keep going through and reviewing the information and changing to fit the data available.
- b) Six Steps to Taking Indicators from Words to Measures
 - i) Verify/ reconcile/ refine indicator language:
 - (1) Look to where the data might be found and what data set
 - (2) Creating the model to use.
 - (3) What does the indicator mean? Where would that data come from? What kind of data?
 - (4) *Product:* Annotated list of Indicators that can answer these questions
 - ii) ID potentially supporting data sets and responsible parties that underlie the indicators
 - (1) *Product:* List of data sets and agencies associated contact person
 - (2) What data supports the indicators?
 - (3) Who holds and manages the data?
 - iii) Develop/ modify a data screening tool
 - (1) What are the key data characteristics needed to building indicators
 - (2) How much information about the data is needed for the operationalizing that indicators?
 - (3) *Product:* Data screening tool questionnaire.
 - iv) Implement the data screening tool
 - (1) *Product:* Compilation of the responses in the form of the data catalogue
 - v) Review the data sets with indicators, id gaps, and developing strategies to improve the data
 - (1) What are the similarities and differences between the data sets available? Are they comparable?
 - (2) What are the gaps?
 - (3) *Product:* Similarities, differences, data gaps strategy report
 - vi) Select a data repository (We will not do this—we are relying on other people to do this.)
- c) ***Need to develop a QAQC for the indicators as soon as possible:***
 - i) There is a need to develop the “deeper meaning” and “interpret” the language of the indicators to get a clear wording that everyone understands and start/ understanding of the metadata sets that will be needed. SRR should use and compile other groups work (EPA, Heinz Center, USFS) on the indicators to use to help us check off our own work and use graduate students to compile the work and write these up. There is a need to select target indicators (linked to RPA or Pilot project—the highest

priority ones to implement) to bite off a smaller piece that can be done very well and get them out.

- ii) **The first step of those mentioned above, needs to be done by SRR for ALL of the indicators, but only 8-10 indicators taken through the whole 6 step process. This is essentially the first step of writing a report.**
 - iii) There is need for a report, but nobody has asked for it yet. There needs to be things done to get people asking for a report. Part of this will be creating/ designing/ selecting methods of measurements for the indicators that a price can be assessed. This way, it can be presented and shown to people and agencies with number attached.
 - iv) *All of this needs to wait until after the Monograph to come out so that there is no confusion.*
 - v) *Dennis will appoint a special workgroup “attached” to the Integrated Rangeland Assessment Goal Group (goal Group 2). Their assignment would be a ‘Tactic’ added under ‘Objective C’ that promotes the continuous improvement of our indicators. The special workshop group should be made up of representatives from the original C/I work groups. They could get a lot done in a 2 day special workshop.*
- 6) **CSREES Rangeland Program:** *Jim Dobrowolski* (See PowerPoint of the presentation entitled ‘JimDpresentation.’)
- 7) **Potential for a book publication:** *Kristie Mazcko*
- a) Possible outline from Dan McCollum

Goal Group Decisions/Products - Scottsdale Meeting Day 1:

1) Goal Group 1 (Advocacy and Promotion)

- a) Talk not to agency directors, (DOI, DOD,) but with the deputies by *March* of this coming year. Talk with them about how we can help them on banking and reporting their performance through the framework that we have developed. The group is to meet in as a large group.
- b) Want to look at the business plan a lot closer and start working with this.
- c) Need to talk to communications group and coordinate to get more people on board at the national scope—but this will need to be addressed further
- d) There is a need to do a Delphi on the “so what” part of this group—this needs to be done soon and should be associated with the “communications and cooperation” group.
- e) There should be a meeting with the Assessment group and talk about the Pilot project.
- f) There is going to be a need to get into senators and congress.
- g) There is a need for more information on the Farm Bill 2007.

2) Goal Group 2 (Integrated Rangeland Assessment)

- a) Objective A has stayed the same.
- b) No longer is the development and adjustment of the conceptual model part of this group. The group feels like it has been taken care of and now should just be part of the research group if it needs to be tweaked or changed.
- c) There is a need to build up the indicators and their definitions as James Bernard talked about (see 5. Indicator Language, above).
- d) Need to have a discussion in the spring meeting to go through the indicators to see if they can be considered for ‘prime time’ or usable. This will be about the relative ability to implement the indicators—not necessarily the importance. This will need to include the original people who started work on the indicators.

3) Goal Group 3 (Research)

- a) W1192 research consortium had been completed (Objective A).
- b) There have already been meeting with the agencies (Objective B), thus it has been completed or is in the process of being completed.
- c) The book should be on the on discovered information/ existing information instead of the idea of information needed. The book will need a review of the indicators (as mentioned in Goal Group 2 and by James earlier).
- d) The priorities (for research needs, analysis, and interpretation) need to be developed, get a broad range of support and be able to take it to the agencies. This would include preparation of a document on research priorities that will be supported by SRR. These priorities need to be based of the conceptual framework.
- e) Use the national forums to engage in research capabilities.
- f) *Where will the Ecosystem services fit within this group?*

4) Goal Group 4 (Communication and Coordination)

- a) Updating the Rangeland stakeholder list (January). Advocates, Blockers need to be identified. We need to link the audiences with the indicators.

- b) The statement of support continual updates on the progress (who has signed, and received).
- c) Reactivate the “dormant” SRR participants (by spring). Have the secretariat create a quarterly report on what is happen. Get a Delphi going to see how we can get them back involved.
- d) Get ‘wow’ statistics up on the website.
- e) Annual report (short) activities, accomplishments.
- f) Outreach portfolio: short stories about what is going on happening.
- g) In reach: let people know who is going where and what is happening and recovery of historic work products, systematic reminder of decisions (quarterly). (evaluation of datasets that would support indicators)

SRR Scottsdale Meeting Overview – Day 2 Summary

November 15, 2006

- 1) **Update on the Multi-Agency Pilot project:** *Kit Muller*
 - a) PowerPoint presentation
 - b) The needed help from SRR includes:
 - i) Informing people about the Pilot. **There could be some publications that need to be done ASAP that SRR should help with creating.**
 - ii) Evaluating the Pilot
 - iii) Expanding the assessment

- 2) **Agency Proposal for SRR Involvement for use of Indicators for regional and Local Planning:** *Kit Muller*
 - a) See the handout “Monitoring and Evaluating Team Report” and Excel file ‘**BLM Management Processes 11_14_06.**’
 - b) **The agencies and NGO’s need to start incorporating the framework and the indicators form SRR into their work/ planning/ strategizing. If the agencies can’t do this we need to find and display other organizations that are willing to use the framework and indicators. This should be put into Advocacy and Promotion Goal Group. The group should be used a way to pick and search for pilot projects/ targets of opportunity.**
 - c) If we can get people/ agencies to buy into the framework, then we can bring it up from watershed to larger scales, like state and national. Sherm would be a good person to talk about because he was involved in a plan like this. There needs to be a ‘buy in’ in both local and national and have some ownership in the process. The way to do this is to involved these groups from the onset, not just at the end when everything is already set up.
 - d) Monitoring and Locator Protocol Library websites:
 - i) http://biology.usgs.gov/status_trends/nrmp/monitoringpartnership.htm

- 3) **Book Conversation about the Outline created by Dan McCollum:**
Lou Romero
 - a) There is a group consensus that the book needs to be written.
 - b) We need to consider our audience and what audience that we are going to try to reach with a book. There have been discussions in the past that we are trying to connect with younger generations that don’t use books, they use electronic files.
 - c) **This will be left in the hands of the Research Goal Group to define and refine.**
 - d) There needs to be a business plan to figure out where money is coming from and such.
 - e) Should the Pilot be part of this book?

- 4) **Assignment:** **Dennis will appoint a special workgroup “attached” to the Integrated Rangeland Assessment Goal Group 2. Their assignment would be a ‘Tactic’ added under ‘Objective C’ that promotes the continuous improvement of our indicators. The special**

workshop group should be made up of representatives from the original C/I work groups. There will be an initial product looking at fragmentation.

- a) *People that should be involved:* John Mitchell, Robert Washington Allen, Linda Allen, Dave Theobald, John Tanaka, Lou Swanson?, Jameson Irving? Bill Kepner (EPA 702.798.2208), Dave Mowatt (541.754.4330 current?), Curt Ritter -- There is a need to connect with the Heinz Center. Consider bringing in a grad student to bring together the information from the past so work is not duplicated or repeated.
- b) *Timeline:* Before the end of the year is preferable, but it needs to be done by the SRM meeting in February. The earlier the better because protocols are being created now. December for the fragmentation and for the rest should be done by February.

5) **Business Plan** (for the whole SRR, not just individual Goal Groups)

- a) A business plan identifies a client and the goods and services that can be created by the business. SRR is not really limited by what we can produce, but there need to be prorates so that energy is not lost and squandered.
- b) Suggestion that there is a plan created and then a Delphi be used to evaluate.
- c) Delphi to figure out the markets, products, uses of SRR and our products. Questions that will need to be assessed can include:
 - i) How are you going to use?
 - ii) Who is the user?
 - iii) How important is this to the user?
 - iv) Are there similar products (completive products)?
- d) Needs to be done by the **Advocacy Goal Group 1**

Lou Romero thought that it would be a good idea if we all just briefly reviewed our Vision, Mission, and Guiding Principles to remind us what we are doing.

Vision: *Rangelands in the United States (1) provide a desired mix of economic, ecological, and social benefits to current and future generations; and (2) Criteria and indicators for monitoring and assessing the economic, social, and ecological sustainability of rangelands are widely accepted and used.*

Mission Statement: *The SRR will promote social, ecological, and economic sustainability of rangelands through the development and widespread use of the criteria and indicators for rangeland assessments, and by providing a forum for dialogue on sustainability of rangelands.*

SRR Guiding Principles:

1. *Collectively, indicators should guide monitoring efforts to measure rangeland sustainability in the U.S. at the national scale. Where possible, indicators should guide monitoring efforts to measure rangeland sustainability at multiple scales.*
2. *Ensure that the indicators employ the appropriate temporal and spatial scales for assessing the criteria.*
3. *Collectively, criteria and indicators will address social, ecological, and economic aspects of sustainability.*
4. *Use a criteria and indicator framework as a common language and operational framework for defining and assessing sustainability. Begin by considering the criteria and indicator framework of the RSF.*
5. *Review and consider, as appropriate, other indicator initiatives.*
6. *There are numerous policy questions related to rangelands. We will focus on the vision-mission agreed to by the SRR.*
7. *The Roundtable process will feature outreach to stakeholders, open dialogue, and respect for differing opinions.*
8. *The SRR will be supportive of and compatible with improved on-the-ground management of rangelands.*

Attended By:

- Gene Fults (Replacing Dennis Thompson)- NRCS
- Bob Breckenridge
- Dave Torell (Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation)
- Kit Muller (BLM)
- Paul Geissler (USGS)
- John Tanaka (Oregon State University and SRM)
- Jim Dobrowolski
- John Mitchell (Rocky Mountain Research Station, Forest Service)
- Paul Tueller (University of Nevada)
- Stan Hamilton
- Urs Kreuter (Texas A&M)
- Dan McCollum (Rocky Mountain Research Station)
- James Bernard (Mendocino Land Trust)
- Lori Hidinger, Consortium for Science, Policy, and Outcomes
- Bill Fox (TX Water Resources Institute)
- Doug Powell (BLM)
- Rob Roudabush, BLM
- Rooter Brite
- Ted Heintz (CEQ)
- Dennis Child
- Kristi Maczko
- Lou Romero
- Liz With