Participants
UCST: John Battles, Ann Huber, Kim Rodrigues, Maggi Kelly, Lynn Huntsinger, Adriana Sulak, Scott Stephens, Anne Lombardo, Susie Kocher, and Doug Tempel

MOUP:
USFS: Mike Chapel, Beth Pendleton, Dave Martin, Jan Cutts, and Terry Johnson; DWR: Frank Gehrke; CAL FIRE: Crawford Tuttle; USFWS: Cay Goude and Amy Fesnock.

Purpose of Call
UCST requested this call to discuss the status of funding delays, since they will potentially have serious impacts upon the science teams if not rectified soon.

Summary of Outcomes and Agreements
1. John reiterated the threat of state funding delays upon the innovative science of UCST.

2. Updates on delayed funds:
   - DWR Contract (Dept of Water Resources) - The signed DWR contract is now at USFS. The next step is for USFS to send the bill and the State to pay it.
   - SNC Grant (Sierra Nevada Conservancy) - UC and SNC have agreed to the negotiation terms. The SNC grant is almost in hand.
   - SWIG grant (from Dept. of Fish and Game) - will take another month for DFG to process.

3. It looks feasible that the DWR contract will be executed by August 15th.

4. Long-term funding strategy for SNAMP - Mike agreed to lead the effort to bring the MOUP together to develop a better way to fund UCST. He will work on an initial meeting to take place soon, potentially in early September.

5. John agreed to meet with the new director of the Dept of Fish and Game (DFG) and the DFG deputy director that is working on SNAMP to give a briefing on the science team's work on SNAMP, with a focus on the fisher research.

6. Crawford, Cay, and John will work on a time to set up the meeting with the Donald Koch, the new DFG director and/or the deputy director in September or October. Other MOUP may be present at the meeting. The hope is that with a new regional DFG director, it is a chance to engage DFG more with SNAMP.

7. The USFWS director will receive a formal invitation to the November 5 meeting.

8. Agreement to post notes from this meeting to SNAMP website.
MEETING NOTES

I. Funding Delays

Impact on UCST
John introduced the call by stating that the Q.5 meetings are logistical in scope. John explained that the key threat of funding delays is upon the innovative science of UCST. (Summary of the overall impact and impact to individual science teams was sent to all MOU partners prior to call. This document is appended to the end of these notes.) John acknowledged that UC also takes responsibility for past delays in funding, at least in part because of the UC’s agreement to waive fees related to SNAMP contracts and grants.

Status of DWR contract
Frank walked the signed contract over to the USFS Vallejo office this week. The next step is for USFS to send the bill and the State to pay it. Frank and Mike were not sure how long exactly the payment process would take. Frank thought the process could go fairly quickly. John reiterated that it needed to be executed by August 15 (before federal fiscal close) to avoid serious impacts to the science team. Mike believes this is feasible.

(Update from August 4, 2008: Mike expects that by the end of the week USFS will have the funds in hand. Frank has told Mike that DWR is standing by ready to pay it as soon as they receive the bill. They are working out the details on where and how the invoicing and payment should be made. USFS is sending the bill today. August 15 is the last date that USFS can transfer funds within this fiscal year, which ends September 30.)

Status of SWIG grant
DFG (Esther) has said they will finish processing within a month. In the meantime University of Minnesota is advancing the money to the Owl Team, based on the promise from UC that the money exists and will come soon. UC will not be willing to do this much longer without a contract.

Status of SNC grant
UC and SNC have finally agreed to terms of the liability clause in the contract. The grant is nearly at hand.

Crawford points out that SNC has expressed lingering frustration over the agreement, and it is uncertain if they will want to approve another contract. At the last Integration Team meeting, a SNC representative told Ann and Mike that they would like the UCST to submit a proposal for the next round of grant proposals. John expressed that we have pushed UC as much as we can regarding the negotiations/liability clause. SNC will be invited to the November 5 SNAMP meeting, and it hoped that attention to SNAMP at a higher level might help to resolve the issue. John suggests that we find a third party to be the next grant applicant to SNC.

II Other discussions and updates from MOUP members on call
**Letters of Invitation to November 5 SNAMP Meeting**
The group discusses which leading SNAMP agency directors / leaders will receive a formal letter of invitation. Cay wants one to be sent the USFWS regional director. Mike agrees that he will receive one. Only SNAMP agency leaders that will not be sent formal invitations are USFS, USFS PSW, and the CA Resources Agency (they are all signatures on the invitation).

**Fisher Plane**
Beth reported that USFS has completed acquisition of the Fisher Team plane and hiring of the permanent pilot. USFS has committed to the aerial support for the duration of the project. She acknowledged the support from Mike and John Litton.

**UCST Briefing with New DFG Leadership**
Cay strongly urges that John / UCST meet with the new DFG director (Donald Koch) and/or the DFG deputy director that is involved in SNAMP in order to give a briefing on SNAMP before the November 5 meeting. It may help with the next SWIG grant and it is a chance to engage DFG more now that they have new leadership.

John agreed to do this. He and potentially other members of UCST will talk about the innovative, integrated aspects of the project, and focus on the value of the wildlife research, especially as it can add to DFG’s understanding of fisher.

Mike says Donald Koch has already been asked for a briefing, but Cay points out that it would be different because the request would be coming from the science team, not from the Forest Service. Mike believes there is interest and involvement from DFG staff. There is discussion about when the briefing should occur.

It is agreed that the meeting should occur in September or early October. Crawford, John, and Cay will work together to decide on a date and request the meeting.

Kim expresses concern about communication between agency partners. She offers to assist in communication with the upcoming efforts regarding developing a long-term funding strategy.

**Long-term funding strategy for SNAMP**
Mike agreed to lead the effort to bring the MOUP together to develop a better way to fund UCST. He will work on an initial meeting to take place soon, potentially in early September. John would like Michi Takata (UCST financial officer) to be present at the meeting. Beth likes the idea of Kim helping to facilitate communication at the meeting.

**UCST impact on Last Chance and Sugar Pine Projects**
John asks Jan and Dave if UCST’s requests to delay treatments and the finding of the fisher natal dens have infringed on their ability, given the fact that UCST research is not supposed to influence how treatments on Sugar Pine and Last Chance Projects are implemented. Dave says that regardless of the source he appreciates any decisions that help make better decisions and a better product in the end.
**Upcoming Fisher Integration Team Meeting**

- Mike hopes IT meeting will discuss and address how to deal with fisher den movement, since ROD 2004 guidelines do not address this. The fisher natal den findings and den movement are an unexpected opportunity for adaptive management to be applied.
- Cay points out that it is an opportunity to demonstrate how SNF is employing adaptive management to their management.
- Dave points out that the interim guidelines were developed with input from the best fisher minds. He hopes the IT group will allow them to continue to make best use of knowledge from fisher biologists. The Fisher Integration Team meeting will occur before the final Last Chance Project decision is published, so there will be opportunity for input, but major changes should only be made if absolutely necessary.

Agreement to post notes from this meeting to SNAMP website.

*SEE NEXT PAGE for attached summary of impacts that funding delays have upon UCST, which was distributed to MOUP prior to the call.*
UPDATE from UC Science Team -- Funding delays risk the success of SNAMP

OVERVIEW

As of 7/31/2008, we have yet to receive any definite action on contracts from the DFG and DWR. These two grants total over $824K in Year 2 funding.

The persistent delays endanger the scientific innovation of the SNAMP research project.

The essential integration of field science from different research teams requires a coordinated collection of data. Lack of funding has reduced this coordination.

The UCST remains committed to the principle that an integrated analysis is absolutely essential to the success of SNAMP.

The UCST also promised to run this study in an open, transparent manner. Thus we need to inform all stakeholders of the current risks to the project.

DETAILS

1. Status of five current funding sources (7/31/08)

**USFS.** We have received $900K of year 2 commitment and are processing an additional $283K.

**SNC.** UC and SNC have finally agreed to contract language. We are in the final stages of processing the $123K grant. I have received the signed contract but now must acquire signatures of the Dean to accept the specific detailed accounting requirements stipulated by the SNC.

**RLFF.** This grant has been received by UC Berkeley’s Sponsored Programs Office and they are reviewing the contract agreement. The expectation is that the $100K will arrive shortly.
SWIG grant via DFG. We were notified by the DFG that it would take another month to process this award. Our understanding is that the federal award has been received by the Department of Fish and Game. So “the money” ($191K) is there. The problem is that the grant’s official start date was May 1, 2008. This money funds the owl research but none has been released. The University of Minnesota continues to forward the money on the guarantee from UC Berkeley that the money is forthcoming. This situation cannot continue indefinitely.

DWR grant. The contract is in the final stages of being approved by the Department of General Services. We expected to hear by the end of this week on its status. The $633K is an amendment to an existing DWR-USFS agreement. UC Berkeley has already sent the grant application to the USFS. However, the USFS has to process the grant quickly to avoid the holding pattern that occurs in federal agencies near the federal fiscal year close on August 15.

2. Consequences of persistent funding delays

The fundamental contribution of the UC science team to SNAMP is the application of the best science to difficult questions regarding the impact of forest management on ecosystem function. A key innovation of our approach was the framework of an integrated multi-metric approach. This emphasis on integration was lauded by many of our science peers during the independent review process. The persistent delays in funding for the first 14 months of SNAMP endanger this attempt. It is impossible to determine the exact point when the delays will reduce our capacity to do exceptional work but we are approaching it rapidly.

This opportunity to do exceptional science compels the UCST. As a group we remain committed to the principle that an integrated analysis is absolutely essential to the success of SNAMP. Below we list the key concerns of each research team and their specific constraints.

Project Integration (Battles, Huber)

The delays in funding force constant scrambling. This emergency management mode diverts the team from an essential task – working to integrate results from multiple disciplines.

Fire and Forest Health (Stephens, Battles)

Despite the fact that Forest team’s field work and data analysis is on schedule, an integrated SNAMP effort is vital. Unless this project continues as planned, the ability to actually manage these critically important federal lands will further stagnate.

Owl (Gutiérrez)

The owl team narrowly diverted a shut-down in the middle of the field season due to the lack of funds. The uncertainty reduced morale among the field crew and created a great deal of stress for all involved.

Fisher (Barrett)
Barrett is in France and could not be reached to add to this summary.

**Spatial (Qinghua, Kelly)**

If funding is not received by August 15, the Berkeley team will not be able to continue contributing and the current PhD student working on SNAMP will have to be transferred to a different project.

We do not have LiDAR data and other high-resolution images for Last Chance (TNF). This data is an essential remote sensing product for all teams. If funding is not received by August 15 we will not be able to acquire LiDAR this year. Acquiring LiDAR a year later will increase the chance for confounding events (storm, fire), introduces more uncertainty in the analyses, and increases cost.

**Water (Bales, Conklin)**

Further delays in funding increases the danger of missing next spring's runoff. If that happens the water team will need to change their experimental approach because they will have less pretreatment data, increasing uncertainty in results.

Current funding delays have already impacted the Water Team’s schedule of research. They have had to reduce staff for summer instrument installations and hydrological modeling work. Combined with delays in ordering equipment, they will have to push installation deployment back until the end of summer or fall, and will need to hire additional staff.

**PPT (Huntsinger, Rodrigues, Kelly)**

If funding is not secured to maintain an integrated team, the PPT would shift their message(s) when working with the public to clarify the changes in SNAMP that result from these funding constraints.