



SNAMP Public Participation Team Integration Webinar

April 2nd, 2014 10am – noon

In attendance:

Elissa Brown – Sierra Nevada Conservancy
Sue Britting – Sierra Forest Legacy
Stephen Byrd – Southern California Edison
Michael Esposito – So. California Edison
Pat Flebbe –USFS Region 5
Russ Henley - California Resources Agency
Peter Hopkinson – UC Berkeley
Kim Ingram - SNAMP
Maggi Kelly - UC Berkeley
Susie Kocher – UC Cooperative Extension
Kelly Larvie– Calfire

Shufei Lei – UC Berkeley
Anne Lombardo - UC Cooperative Ext
Victor Lyon – USFS Tahoe National Forest
Dave Martin – USFS Sierra National Forest
Larry Peabody – USFS Tahoe Natl Forest
Kim Rodrigues - UC Cooperative Extension
Sarah Sawyer – USFS Region 5
Erin Stacey –UC Merced
Frank Stewart – California Fire Safe Council
Adrian Sulak – UC Berkeley
Sheila Whitmore – Univ. of Wisconsin

Webinar recording: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rhpjxAGgEaY>

I. Welcome and Overview: Susie Kocher started with a brief orientation of how to participate in the webinar. Dr. Kim Rodrigues welcomed the group, reviewed ground rules and the agenda before having participants introduce themselves. They were asked to share their affiliation and one desired outcome they had for the webinar. Most wanted an update, summary, to hear the results of research, lessons learned and see the big picture about collaboration. Kim provided a brief history of the Sierra Nevada Adaptive Management Project and then continued to serve as the facilitator for remainder of the meeting.

II. Overview of the PPT chapter of the SNAMP final report. Dr. Lynn Huntsinger gave an overview of the plans for the Public Participation Team’s final chapter in the SNAMP final report, to include: an Introduction, Executive Summaries, Chapters on Participation/Outreach, Engagement/Web and Learning and Working Together/Interviews. A chapter on Conclusions and Lessons Learned and Appendices sharing supporting information will conclude the team’s piece.

III. “Management Recommendations/ Lessons Learned” feedback: The remaining Principal Investigators for the Public Participation team reviewed their piece of the SNAMP footprint. In line with the “Results, Process and Relationship” triangle that SNAMP’s PPT finds important to successful collaboration Dr. Maggi Kelly shared her team’s work on “Results” through information tracking: to involve web analytics and content and citation analysis. Work done by PhD candidate Shufei Lei has looked at who is citing our publications, finding them largely in the United States and Europe. This is an important step in the closing of the AM loop, as we confirm that SNAMP’s information is reviewed and being considered in future planning efforts. The statistics of one publication’s journey beyond SNAMP are provided in the power point.

Susie Kocher then shared her team’s work on the outreach “Process”, providing a summary of who we have spoken to and what topics have attracted the most attention as well as how far away we have attracted participant through our use of long distance communication tools: news articles and blogs.

Shufei presented visual mapping work of his information network analysis. He has explored who participates in SNAMP and what they talk about most often. His new visual imaging techniques present a great picture of the effect an outreach team can have.

Lynn finished up by addressing the “Relationship” piece by sharing some of her team’s interview results and looking at how SNAMP has affected people opinions on forest health and other issues important to our various team: fisher, owl, water and spatial.

Kim encouraged the participants to share the pieces of our work they would find most valuable in our final analysis. What kind of management recommendations would be most helpful?

Question: *Can you explain the numbers in the map that show attendance by location?*

Answer: *The Graph about meeting attendance using different circle sizes shows cumulative total attendance numbers across multiple meetings; they are not totals for single meetings.*

Question: *Were citations on the blogs & news items self starting, or more of a result of outreach to/conversations with journalists and reporters? How did they find out about you?*

Answer: *The answer is it was a mix of both. We wrote articles where we found the opportunity and encouraged others to when we could. Our sock drive started as a blog, got tweeted by UCANR and went viral, resulting in attention from all across the U.S.*

Question: *Will you be including a description about the financial challenges for SNAMP in the final report. We hope the report will be honest about the challenges: including financial*

tensions, lack of post treatment years, and other rough spots in the road. The original boundaries and constraints on the project need to be clear in the final report.

Answer: That is a good point. Peter Hopkinson will be sure this is addressed in the final report.

Question: *The citation mapping is interesting. I am wondering if you know how the citations are being used in those locations.*

Answer: Shufei's citation information does not include that. He will explore how to add some of that information to the analysis. Vic Lyon, The northern site District Ranger offered that forests in the northern site are using SNAMP's owl publications to inform their work. Those who are developing GTRs for the Forest Service also find them useful. There is interest in more detail in Maggi and Shufei's work is

Question: *The citation information is interesting because it serves to help identify when the adaptive management loop may be getting closed and provides information on the places where information is potentially being used to inform/change management decisions. Is there a way to extract what citations were used in connection with management decisions?*

Action item: *Shufei will look into extracting management documents using SNAMP citations.*

Question: *Participants were interested to see what is being talked about most often in different circles; academics, blogospheres etc. Where is the attention focused? Fire? Owls? Fisher? It would provide a look at what people are thinking about. It would help understand the potential for controversy.*

Answer: Shufei has already done some of this that we did not have time to share on the webinar and we will need to find a time to share it.

V. PPT Integration metrics and final report: Lynn Huntsinger gave an overview of interview results on PPT's integrating questions about public perceptions about SPLAT effects. She summarized that participants agreed that treatment is better and has less impact compared to devastation from severe fire. Some were concerned that SNAMP treatments might be too light to protect from Rim fire type severe fire, or to effect wildlife and water. They said that short term impacts may cause some negative impacts, in some cases learned this was not as bad as they thought. Long term impacts were viewed generally positive, if reduces severe fire. Many thought prescribed fire would be more acceptable, but most recognized the difficulty. Lynn and Adriana found that learning from SNAMP is highly valued, but did not often change people's opinions, though it did broaden understanding and definitions.

Question:

Did you find that interview responses were correlated with stakeholder affiliation? (e.g. in general were folks who thought that treatments didn't do enough towards forest health more likely to have one affiliation or another?) Is there any correlation between certain opinions

and particular affiliations or demographic characteristics? Would there be any way to gauge the strength of those correlations?

Answer: The team has not noticed any connections but will consider this in the ongoing analysis.

Question: *Did*

people become more engaged in forest management and working in collaborative efforts because of SNAMP? Or was it just part of the picture as there were other efforts going on at the same time. How has SNAMP affected other local efforts? Did it motivate or discourage others to get involved?

Answer: This is difficult to get from SNAMP data. Dave Martin, District Ranger on the Sierra National Forest added that SNAMP was well timed, particularly in the south, to lay the ground work for many other collaboratives including Dinkey Creek, Willow Creek, and the Sustainable Forests Community Collaborative. SNAMP's lessons learned will be valuable. It has and will continue to enrich their toolboxes.

Question: *Will you be commenting on where the SNAMP*

process was most effective and where it was not? Could there be questions about this in before and after interviews?

Answer: This brings up the challenging of a project spanning so much time and the many turnovers in people involved. It does create some loss of information. The team will be sure to define their most effective processes. It will be important to address time constraints in discussing the survey and interview data. Some of these issues we may be able to capture in our final email survey in June. This conversation will inform the questions we choose to use.

Question: *In the final report, will you be revisiting the MOU and its expectations? It was focused on establishing an adaptive*

management process and public participation/ stakeholder focus. It would be good to reevaluate it, what parts of the original idea we were able to meet or not, and why. That would help to understand if the MOU is the right tool to use for these types of efforts involving high level conflict. This is important because of current revision going on in the three southern forests. They face similar issues around AM and monitoring.

Answer: That is a good idea – the team will work to include this.

Question: *Will you we address the role of the experimental scientist in the AM*

loop? How to incorporate research outcomes/scientists into the monitoring framework of the Forest Plans?

Answer: We will consider this.

Question: *Can you make an assessment of cost of the effort? Not just the UC*

budget but something that included stakeholder and agency participation; as people gave

up other opportunities to invest time in SNAMP's process. Stakeholders have born a cost also. Was the investment worth it? The procedures established for non-profits valuing volunteer hours, mileage and travel could be used.

Answer: PPT will look at developing this time estimate. We have good records and should be able to add some information.

VI. Next Steps/ Wrap up/ Evaluation: Kim Rodrigues asked for feedback on the webinar content and methods. Participants said that the presentation lengths were good and did not contain too much content. It was also noted that there was a good balance between presentation and discussion. There was an online evaluation survey filled out by five people after the webinar. All agreed that the webinar goals were clearly stated, there is a clear plan of action for the future and that they learned something new at the event. 83% agreed that the content met their expectations.

