

Sustainable Rangelands Roundtable-Meeting 22 (Phase 3)

-Self Introductions:

- Name
- Position
- Organization
- Location

-Given what I currently know about SRRs strategic direction and tactical activities, I am most pleased about

- Funding for meeting periodic basis to continue discussing
- Attitude toward SRR
- Reception of the concepts dealing with
- Progress with agencies, pilot project
- Caliber of people and ideas involved
- How far we've come (model and framework for the indicators)
- The three legged stool
- New looks and consistent information getting out to people
- Progress and materials
- Leadership and energy
- Exploration of indicators
- Spreading of the effort involved

-Unclear about SRR:

- How agencies are going to be affective toward the paradigm change
- Where are we going from here?
- Personal duties to SRR
- The second goal- can we get together to work on it
- How are we going to do all this?
- How are we going to scale this?
- When and how is this going to be put down on land?
- Do we have the right mix of players?
- How are we connected with the field activities?
- How do we keep these activities moving forward?
- How to build the indicators and how to log the data?
- How are we going to allocate (science vs. politics)?
- Agency roles- who and how to allocate work?

SRR-Update (Power point): Dennis Child, Kristi, Lou

Meeting on March 30

- What is phase 3
- Expand from the 4 indicators to 10
- Calibrate with agencies to monitor
- Why we were there?
 - cooperative conservation with national assessment
 - common protocols

- incorporation on social and economic indicators
- Continued support of SRR
- SRR Update review (handout passed out at meeting)
- The meeting came about because of encouragement from this group- shows the continuation of the spread of information
- Refer to draft agenda handout
- enthusiastic attitude
- 8 agencies represented at meeting
- Take Home messages:
 - Endorsement of SRR vision, Mission, activities/ products
 - Need deeper, broader, stronger internal agency ownership and leadership SOON
 - Need effective, targeted external outreach and involvement for understanding, acceptance and support
 - need for concise message or products for approaching congress reps
 - Timing is good- several things lined up (except funding) critical window (1-1.5 years)
- don't want project to get too big so that it doesn't progress and move forward
- different agency involvement
- Outreach Efforts:
 - Society of Range Management (trade show and session)
 - Grazing Lands Conservation
 - NA Wildlife and Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation (see how they are moving forward and the kinds of people who had interest)
 - Third National Conference on Grazing Lands (trade show and session)
 - 3 events still in the future
 - There needs to be a core (a tree trunk) and that there are agencies and researchers that are willing to be the "branches" if a true core is created (right now they are more of a support function)

-SRR Progress Report (John)

- Booklet handout
- 27 core indicators described along with their usefulness and data available (collectable, measurable, recorded, ...)
- Qualifiers for core indicators- measurable, collectable?
- Booklet on website and hard copies will be to major stakeholders
- Personal note- high quality of publication, good to get information out

-Charter and Cover Letter (Doug)

- Renamed to "Statement of Support"
- Ready to get it signed (especially with SRM as a major support)
- Miss-spelling (document will be fixed and signed in this meeting)
- Cover letter created as an introduction for introduction to statement of support. The letter will be personalized, but please maintain a look, the

paper is a standard Kinko's paper. If a support group would like to add information, which would be acceptable.

CINE and KNII (Ted)

- Collaboration of Indicators for Nations Environment
 - Focal point not what indicators should be but what management set and frame work will be needed- meant to deal with monitoring shortages
 - What new agencies what only have data collection as their primary organization (ONLY collect statistics)
 - Over come problem of susceptibility of monitoring systems (due to lack of funding) and to decrease fragmentation of monitoring systems
 - Tasks include a scoping system, recognition of functions and desirability of these institutions, and find out in a detailed way which agencies are capable of what so that we have options
 - Reflect a broad community of interest in the information possible
 - About to take this to administration
 - No budgets created as of yet, due to lack of comparable institutions
- Key National Indicators Initiatives
 - National Research Council
 - environmental, economic, and social
 - environmental not the main point, but gaining steam
 - Handout given
 - Move out of academies to a nonprofit group
 - Website and indicators will be created
 - Work on environmental side are based on SRR indicators- movement in same direction
 - Economic indicators: now skill on how to select indicators
 - Social: tons of statistics and information, but hard to limit to specific indicators
 - Environmental: good grasp on how to select indicators (measurable, feasible,...)

Pilot Project Update (Larry and Jeff)

- Key agencies indicated 4 indicators
 - Invasive species
 - Bare ground
 - Fragmentation
 - Change in use of rangeland
- NRCS NRI and USFS FIA are two great tools
- Do testing in Oregon and do social/economic with environmental
- Still in mediation of looking at all three indicators
- Problem: What is fragmentation and how do we measure (land ownership? plant cover? subdivision?) Bring this to SRR to have a discussion so that there is a

- common conscience. [Progress report booklet- page 18 and 36] Also need to define and discuss invasive species (did we mean weeds, or just invasives?) with SRR.
- The three agencies are looking to work with existing infrastructure.
 - 13 county area in Oregon with BLM, private, State, and USFS land, which will help us have a uniform system regardless of ownership
 - Started to come up with detailed questions, or data elements so we know what report will need to look like
 - Other states have been considered (UT and NM) but there were large gaps in missing soils data so OR was settled on
 - True scientific survey problems-
 - What is rangeland? Make it so each agency can define it themselves.
 - Common approach to private and federal lands
 - Need to form a core set of indicators (like NRI – with sets of measurements taken)- revisit sites to look for changes
 - Have to have a good grasp on baseline data (why OR was chosen)
 - Important to realize how things are changing (amounts of range, types of lands, ownership—there are a lot of dynamics and changes)
 - Land type vs. Land use
 - FIA and NRI have different purposes, but need to have a commonality (need to create a national data set- not fragmented with a bunch of different owners)
 - We understand this will not be cheap, so SRR needs to really start perusing funding
 - Are new agencies going to be needed after the pilot program? Is there a need for new infrastructure? (These questions will be addressed in the future. Possible proposal by May 23.)
 - Can we tie this together with the Forestry Roundtable? Right now the plate is pretty full, but it is possible for the future. There is potential for the water indicators to be tied together (especially with BLM).
 - Integration with NASA projects in remote sensing? NRCS has a remote sensing group, but NASA hasn't been really incorporated. There is potential for the future however. There are several programs for remote sensing for fragmentation. NRCS programs exist, but NASA information would be great for supplementation.
 - **What can SRR do to help?**
 - Timelines/ Milestones
 - We want to start real work next year, so we will need to start this year to figure out protocols, so that this fall we can start testing protocols

Overview of NRCS CEAP (Dennis Thompson, Jeff and Dennis Child)

- **Power Point presentation**
- No economics of invasive species because there was previously no spending

John Mitchell Discussion –Heinz Center(Handout**- December 2004)**

- Formation of indicators from the Heinz Center


- Two rangeland indicators
 - Development/ fragmentation
 - Grassland/ shrubland conductivity (page 11): what they mean between “connection” is unclear
- There are no range backgrounds in this task group- they have pulled away from SRR. We need to pull them back in so that the efforts can be recombined.
- Final report was due in 2005, but not yet published
- Draft report available, comment would be appropriate from this group
- How do we re-engage the Heinz Center with SRR? Contact John with ideas.

Break for Lunch

Discussion of organizational Structure and Strategic Plan Review

Goals (As of April 18, 2006):

1. Promote paradigms and practices for sustainable rangeland assessment and management
2. Facilitate the development of a multi-agency assessment of the status and trend of the ecological, social and economic aspects of rangeland sustainability
3. Promote integrated ecological, economic and social research for rangeland sustainability
4. Effectively communicate and coordinate with stakeholders and others interested and involved in sustainable rangeland management



Organizational Frame-work (Created in Denver July, Modified in Phoenix)

- Power Point give by Dennis Child

- New framework for phase 3
- SRR best at coordinating, cooperating, and investigating
- Positions
 - Secretary
 - Facilitator
- Function is to further goals pobjectives and tactics
- Meet two to three times per year and sharing projects
- Financial support is okay

Organization of SRR:

Vision:

Broad intent of SRR in long run

Mission:

Disscribe the purpose for SRR

4 Goals:

Focused intent

Objective:

Commitment

Tactics:

Implementation

- We have clear goals created, but we need more consideration for objectives and tactics.

Assignment

1. Draft a charter for goals group.
2. Draft a workplace with a timeline and cost estimate (if any) to accomplish these activities/tactics.
3. Anticipate “overlaps” and how to deal with them.
4. Nominate leaders and members .
5. Prepare a report-out and give your product to Liz.

SRR Meeting (April 19, 2006)

Status of the 2007 Farm Bill (Stacy- National Cattlemen’s Beef Association)

- Timeline- Currently, there are listening sessions and a publication was created with several common threads. Hearings will continue throughout the coming year and pen will hit paper 2007.
- The budget is a huge driver in 2007. There will probably be less money dedicated to the bill.
- WTO, 2006 and 2008 elections, Globalization, budget deficit, perception of subsidies, and political will are also going to change the formation of the Farm Bill.
- NGOs, nutritional groups, health groups are all looking for benefit from the bill.

- Energy interests may/may not play a role in allocations of resources within the bill.
- Where will rangelands stand in the Farm Bill?
 - o CRP
 - o EQUIP
- “There will be more players at the table with less money.”
- There is a need to promote the ‘three-legged stool.’
- What are some windows in which SRR should really show themselves?
 - o Talk to groups with like-minded goals.
 - o Things need to happen before the end of the year.

Conceptual Model (John- Power Point presentation)

- There is a need to get a peer-reviewed article out about the model.
- Is there a need to protect the model (copywrite) so that our group gets credit for its creation?
- Conclusions
 - o There needs to a paper that is consistent with the SRR discussions that is then sent to Lorie. Lorie should then take it to the group (maybe a small revision group) to make sure there is a clear consensus that this is what the group wants to say.
 - o More indicators should be thought through the model so there can be a greater appeal to more stakeholders- this does not need to be done right away, but a sometime in the future.
 - o This model should be used to build a political basis for the need for the data.
 - o Get this done by the next meeting. (next 6 months? By fall?)

Indicator Language Revisions:

There needs to be a way to make language more understandable so there is an easy and common understanding.

- Is it short term or continued process?
- How much time and effort should be applied?
- Should we triage the indicators?
- Should we concentrate on the 4 indicators for the pilot?
- Remember there is more information for each of the indicators than the simple short hand terms that we’ve been using.
- Have goal 4 look at how we are getting information out to see if it can be done more effectively—recommendations?
- What is the metric for these things?
- Done by SRR to facilitate the multi-agency report, or is it an agency problem to deal with?
- Is this a project for the goal 2 group or for the fourth group- who should be responsible?

- So much time and effort has already been put in, the reconsideration of these definitions might distance people.
- Need for a consistency in presenting the indicators? Establish criteria for a good indicator.
- Internal inconsistencies- need for a technical editor, or a group
- Not reinvention, just modification and building upon what we already have.
- This needs to get done.
- Two levels, one is to get the information out and the other is to really explore what they stand for.
- Monograph to go forward without changes?

Conclusions:

Dennis will form a small task force to undertake these revisions, keeping in mind that there is a desire to keep the original intention of when the indicators were created. The language will also be reviewed by a technical editor if possible.

Organization of SRR:

Vision: Broad intent of SRR in long run

Mission: Describe the purpose for SRR

4 Goals: Focused intent

Objective: Commitment

Tactics: Implementation

- ☞ We have clear goals created, but we need more consideration for objectives and tactics.

Goals (As of April 18, 2006):

1. Promote paradigms and practices for sustainable rangeland assessment and management
2. Facilitate the development of a multi-agency assessment of the status and trend of the ecological, social and economic aspects of rangeland sustainability
3. Promote integrated ecological, economic and social research for rangeland sustainability
4. Effectively communicate and coordinate with stakeholders and others interested and involved in sustainable rangeland management

Assignment

6. Draft a charter for goals group.
7. Draft a workplan with a timeline and cost estimate (if any) to accomplish these activities/tactics.
8. Anticipate “overlaps” and how to deal with them.
9. Nominate leaders and members.
10. Prepare a report-out.

Goal Group 1:

~ Promote paradigms and practices for sustainable rangeland assessment and management.

~ We are the new paradigm of agency realignment, integration of current inventory programs requires collaboration, accountability, redefining the role of existing legislation change would be ordering the budget process

~Practices:

Utilizing existing data at the local-level to the integration with small-scale high resolution/space data defining whatever usable spectral bands can be related to existing plot data. (i.e. Landfire)

Connect to social science data at the county level

Whatever the inventory/monitoring system, a complete cycle is accomplished over a decade and that for a 100 year period you have ten decennial points in time.

Develop a flexible data collection system that can quickly respond to technological (data storage) changes

Reduce the number of indicators to those that can actually be accomplished.

~Charter

The workgroup will develop and promote activities that bring state and Federal land management agencies and large primate rangeland owners together at all levels to utilize criteria and indicators for assessing rangeland sustainability in an integrated process.

Develop new interagency ways of doing the business of assessing sustainability on rangelands.

Define new practices to implement management to accomplish sustainability on rangelands.

~ Objective:

Encourage level, annual funding to accomplish assessment work on a 10 year cycle with a report every 10 years (2008 Budget) Strategy: Promote Congressional visits by SRR members to promote funding needed for above (2006-2011)

~ Objective:

Promote integration of existing inventory programs Strategy 1: Merge NRI and FIA as a first step and integrate these with BLM and other federal inventory systems on rangelands (2006) Strategy 2: Facilitate regular meetings of agency heads to encourage use of and funding for annual assessment program for sustainable rangelands (annual)

~ Objective:

Develop new practices to implement sustainable rangeland management.

Goal Group 2

Charter:

- Facilitate the development of multi-agency report
 - Federal agencies to work together on a National Report of Key rangeland SRR indicators in 2010 that could be used to help satisfy each agencies reporting
 - Define data requirements
 - Promote NGO involvement in development of assessment report
 - Promote multi – stakeholder involvement through workshops to insure acceptance and validation of the 2010 reporting process.
- Promote an organizational framework for recurring multi-agency assessments based upon continuous monitoring of key SRR indicators.

Action Plan:

- SRR to write a letter to USFS soliciting their agreement to promote and work on such a document
- Request the USFS and other agencies work together with other agencies to promote sharing of cooperation
- Development and maintenance of a data catalog (including QA requirements)

Overlaps:

- Engagement of NGOs, will require extensive collaboration with goal 4 group

Leaders:

- John Peterson, a person whom is capable of lobby for prioritization and completion of the multi-agency report
- John Mitchell for technical coordination of report

Goal Group 3: Promote Integrated Economic, Ecological, and Social Research for Rangeland Sustainability

Charter – Promote the capacity for researchers from economic, ecological, and social disciplines to consider the context of their research within rangeland sustainability. Spatial and temporal scales of research projects must be defined in order for results to be meaningfully integrated.

Defining the research agenda – should SRR define the framework, should we work to promote research priorities, should we identify needs? How do we efficiently collect data – standards for collection?

Action Plan (work plan and timeline, cost estimates)

CSREES, FS, BLM, ARS, ERS, NASS, USGS and other reps in DC form an informal rangeland sustainability research work group. Summer 2006 to begin.

Promote the formation of research teams (university and federal *and others as appropriate*) to develop grant proposals to address data gaps and integration questions. W192 already underway, opportunities for others. Most proposals will be due Fall 2006-Winter 2007 and then on-going.

Promote a research agenda to influence funding agency priorities. Major funding agencies are NRI, SARE, NSF. On-going.

Facilitate periodic national forums to review rangeland sustainability research. Facilitating the development of a rangeland sustainability research ‘community.’ Promote cross-disciplinary interactions. Meeting among interested parties at SRM meeting in Reno, 2007, and other meetings. Ensure forums include social, economic, and ecological aspects.

Promote the availability of data for research needs, analysis, and interpretation from all sources. Should there be a data registry developed? Explore if a group can do that (NBII, SRM, ESA, etc)?

Promote research activities geared towards identifying/developing standards, protocols, and methods.

Overlaps

Need to integrate with other goal groups on all of these, particularly in terms of research funding and standards and protocols development/agreement, as well as ‘community’ development and data catalog/registry

Leaders/Members

Need a non-federal researcher(s) to take the lead – maybe one social science and one biophysical science. Not sure who they are?

Ideas for leaders included Bill Fox, Lou Swanson

Goal Group 4: Effectively communicate and coordinate with stakeholders and others interested and involved in sustainable rangeland management.

Charter: Conduct in-reach, outreach, and marketing initiatives recognizing the importance of sustainable rangelands and the wide acceptance of ecological, economic, and social criteria and indicators. Engender broad support and participation for rangeland indicators. Communicate the role of SRR relative to other sustainability, indicator, and monitoring efforts in order to differentiate SRR’s work and appropriately position SRR to participate in associated efforts. Goal Group will attempt to answer the “so what?” and “why?” question.

Question: Does SRR need to develop a “business plan” or operational plan? If so, which goal group(s) should be involved in developing and disseminating such a plan? Need to define “community of interest” (economic and otherwise) for rangelands. (Focus on the whole elephant, not just the trunk, tail, tusks, etc.) And, once again, does SRR wish to articulate the concept(s) of sustainability as part of its outreach and marketing efforts?

Assumption: \$30,000 for this fiscal year budget for this goal.

Leadership and Membership: No leader identified. Membership: Loper, Bernard, Johnston. Staff: Maczko.

Overlaps: 1) Promotion of paradigms and practices; 2) relationships with other roundtables; 3) Ecosystems services section of the conceptual model (especially if a workshop to discuss this issue were to be held)

Objective A: Conduct bold and aggressive in-reach, outreach, and marketing initiatives resulting in recognition of the importance of sustainable rangelands and the wide acceptance of ecological, economic and social criteria and indicators.

Tactic 1: Update and maintain SRR website with up-to-date information and materials by May 2006 and monthly thereafter or as appropriate to meet organizational needs. (Katie Child?!)

Tactic 2: Update and continue to Implement Outreach Plan and associated audience/activity master matrix listed by category and prioritized for contact.

Tactic 3: Develop in-reach and outreach opportunities in the field to better connect with the rangeland resources.

Tactic 4: Update and continue to develop core thematic suite of materials and customize for different constituencies and stakeholders

Tactic 5: Explore possible coordination of outreach activities with other sustainable resource roundtables and other related C&I efforts (especially CEQ).

Tactic 6: Develop a method/approach for measuring how SRR is perceived and to determine “scoreboarding” for SRR accomplishments (direct or leveraged).

Objective B: Engender broad support and participation in joint efforts through the SRR Statement of Support (SOS) process

Tactic 1: Approach all organizations that have participated in SRR to date

and encourage their signature starting in April 2006.

Tactic 2: Hold a high-level leadership meeting of signing organizations to roll out SRR strategic plan and obtain concurrence for the strategic plan.

Tactic 3: Encourage signatories to participate in the implementation of the strategic plan.

Tactic 4: Hold “recruitment” meeting for nongovernmental organizations (alignment with leadership organizations meeting).

Objective C: Communicate the role of SRR relative to other sustainability, indicator, and monitoring efforts in order to differentiate SRR’s work and appropriately position SRR to participate in associated efforts.

Tactic 1: Develop core suite of materials and customize for different constituencies and stakeholders.

Tactic 2: Characterize the groups and contact person by their relevance to SRR and how work could be coordinated.

Tactic 3: Fact Book about rangeland issues/values and SRR Criteria and Indicators (one page per issue to facilitate use in solicitation and focused information exchange).

Tactic 4: Develop periodic accomplishments to date for use at briefings.

[Objective D should be undertaken by Goal #2?!]

Objective D: The SRR will facilitate coordination between other roundtables, agencies, and organizations involved with data collection and analysis, criterion and indicator and data set development.

Tactic 1: Facilitate development of coordination mechanisms across resource systems towards a national indicator strategy.

Tactic 2: Facilitate the establishment of institutional arrangements to assemble existing data to populate Rangeland C&I.

Tactic 3: Coordinate development of national rangeland monitoring system (not this phase of the SRR strategy).

Tactic 4: Facilitate development of a cross-walk among the several rangeland indicator sets developed by agencies, NGOs, etc. with the goal of promoting future integration of rangeland indicators by using common

definitions and protocols.

Tactic 5: Continue to provide a forum over the next 3 years for dialogue among stakeholders addressing acceptance and use of Rangeland C&I at the national, regional and local scales.

Leaders for goal groups

~Characteristics

- Scientific
- Practices and management
- Persuasive in new ideas
- Knows agencies

Goal 1 (Leader: Bill Fox, John Peterson, Gary Evans, Dick Loper) (members: Agency Reps Sherm Karl, Leonard Jolly, John McClain, JD Wulfhorst, Robert Washington-Allen)

Goal 2 (leader: John Peterson, John Mitchell, Lou Swanson, Bob Breckenridge,)
(Members: Idr list, Larry Bryant, Jeff Goebel, Doug Powell, Dennis Thompson, Ted Heintz, epa, Paul Geissler, Ron Shaffer, Sherm Karl, James Bernard)

Goal 3 (leader: John Tanaka, Bill Fox, Rick knight, Lyn Huintsinger, Barbara Allen-Diaz, Ev Byington, Tom Sisk, NAU ???) (members: Robert Washington-Allen, Cliff Duke, CSREES new hire, Allan Torell, W192(1781), Lori H.,

Goal 4 (Leader: Stan Hamilton, Lori H., Dick Loper,)
(Member: James Bernard, Gary Johnson, Kristie (Staff), Dennis Becenti, John Peterson, Benny Romero, Rooter Brite, TNC, Land Trust Alliance, Katie Child,)

Priority Activities:

- *1. Linkage and support of the Pilot Study (Special Task Group- Goal Group 1)
2. Develop specific relevancy statements (Goal Group 4)
3. Indicator evaluation/ clarification work group (Temporary-James, Goal Group 2)
- *4. ESA workshops and such- outreach to the scientific community (Goal Group 4)
- *5. Mailing Statement of Support (Secretariat)
- *6. Website revision (Secretariat)
7. Linkage with Heinz (reconnecting) (Temporary Group- John, Goal Group 3)
8. Put together a paper on the conceptual model (Temporary Group- Dan, Goal Group 3)
9. Revisit treatment of ecosystem services in conceptual model (Modeling Group- day before, Goal Group 3)
10. Develop business plan approach for phase 3? (Secretariat)
11. Revisit scale question (Goal Group 1)
12. Engage deputy Chiefs in this process (Goal Group 2 or 4)

13. Proposals for the Farm Bill? (Goal Group 1)
- *14. Include the meeting Kristie (3rd National Meeting on Grazing Lands)
15. Update/ Keep connected with Agency leadership (Pilot progress) (Goal Group 4)
16. Promote infrastructure

Today:

- Socio-economic indicators
- Outline what needs to happen and the possible time line
- Workshop planning (3rd annual National Meeting)
- Review the measurements for the 4 indicators

Goal Group Formation and communication: Dennis will take the information discussed at this meeting, and get back to the members with the arrangements.

Information Sheet to Include in Pamphlet Update:

- One used in the Pilot Study
- Request input from former criteria leaders

Priority Activities:

- *1. Linkage and support of the Pilot Study (Special Task Group- Goal Group 1)
2. Develop specific relevancy statements (Goal Group 4)
3. Indicator evaluation/ clarification work group (Temporary-James, Goal Group 2)
- *4. ESA workshops and such- outreach to the scientific community (Goal Group 4)
- *5. Mailing Statement of Support (Secretariat)
- *6. Website revision (Secretariat)
7. Linkage with Heinz (reconnecting) (Temporary Group- John, Goal Group 3)
8. Put together a paper on the conceptual model (Temporary Group- Dan, Goal Group 3)
9. Revisit treatment of ecosystem services in conceptual model (Modeling Group- day before, Goal Group 3)
10. Develop business plan approach for phase 3?

(Secretariat)

11. Revisit scale question (Goal Group 1)
12. Engage deputy Chiefs in this process (Goal Group 2 or 4)
13. Proposals for the Farm Bill? (Goal Group 1)
- *14. Include the meeting Kristie (3rd National Meeting on Grazing Lands)
15. Update/ Keep connected with Agency leadership (Pilot progress) (Goal Group 4)
16. Promote infrastructure

Today:

- Socio-economic indicators
- Outline what needs to happen and the possible time line
- Workshop planning (3rd annual National Meeting)
- Review the measurements for the 4 indicators

Goal Group Formation and communication:

Dennis will take the information discussed at this meeting, and get back to the members with the arrangements.

Information Sheet to Include in Pamphlet Update:

- One used in the Pilot Study
- Request input from former criteria leaders