Joint IMAP User Group and Technical Review Team Meeting
July 20, 2007
9am – 4:00 p.m.
Room 315
Edith Green/Wendall Wyatt Federal Building
1220 SW Third Ave.
Portland, OR

Meeting Emphasis:

- Finalizing the User Group Charter
- High Priority User Group Questions
- Review of Projects

Attendees:

Gary Lettman	ODF	glettman@odf.state.or.us
Miles Hemstrom	USFS-PNW	mhemstrom@fs.fed.us
Jim Alegria	BLM/FS	jalegria@fs.fed.us
Kim Titus	BLM	ktitus@blm.gov
Theresa Burcsu	USFS-PNW	tburcsu@fs.fedu.us
Rick Brown	Defenders of Wildlife	rbrown@defenders.org
Jamie Barbour	USFS-PNW	jbarbour@fs.fed.us
Shawne Mohoric	USFS-R6	smohoric@fs.fed.us
Darius Adams	OSU	darius.adams@oregonstate.edu
Mike Bondi	OSU-Extension	michael.bondi@oregonstate.edu
Tom DeMeo	USFS-R6	tdemeo@fs.fed.us
Matthew lawhead	ODFW	matthew.a.lawhead@state.or.us
Rod Krahmer	ODFW	rod.w.krahmer@state.or.us
Dave Walters	Roseburg Forest Products	davew@rfpco.com
Angus Brodie	WA-DNR	anus.brodie@dnr.wa.gov
Andrew Herstrom	ODF	aherstrom@odf.state.or.us
Janet Ohmann	USFS-PNW	janet.ohmann@oregonstate.edu
Linc Cannon	OFIC	linc@ofic.com
Steve Hobbs	Board of Forestry/OSU	stephen.hobbs@oregonstate.edu
Jerry Beatty	USFS-PNW/WWETAC	jbeatt@fs.fed.us
Ted Lorenson	ODF	tlorenson@odf.state.us
Melinda Moeur	USFS-R6	mmoeur@fs.fed.us

Abbreviations

IMAP	Interagency Mapping and Assessment Project
UG	IMAP User Group
POG	Policy Oversight Group
TT	Technical Team
PR	public relations

Meeting Minutes

Agenda Item: User Group logistics

Steve/Shawne

Agenda Subitem: Federal Advisory Committee Act issue resolution

Problem

- The previous draft charter would have been subject to FACA because it granted decision-making rights to non-federal, non-state members.

Issues with FACA

- requires that the IMAP-UG charter would have to be approved and granted by the FACA board →often takes about 2 yrs
- the group cannot meet while the charter is in the FACA review process

Discussion

- Rick Brown agreed that the solution above is reasonable
- Steve Hobbs noted that the FACA discussion is meant to provide clarity to the problems involved with operating as a FACA organization, and not to discourage NGO involvement

Conclusions

- Restrict IMAP-UG decision-making membership to federal and state people
- Provide for non-decision-making interested parties (e.g., NGOs) the means for communication with the IMAP-UG
    - Communication means should describe how the UG:
        - conveys information about IMAP process to non-decision-making users
        - receives information from the non-decision-making users
    - Communication lines should specify
        - How the UG receives input
        - When the UG receives input
        - Where the UG receives input

Agenda Subitem: Finalize User Group charter

Discussion

- Shawne Mohoric moved to:
    - change all occurrences of Policy Oversight Group to User Group in the charter
    - remove statement on pg. 3 beginning with "The User Group and Technical Team will…not trigger the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act."
    - Add "Group Norms" to the section titled "Decision Making Process and Decision Communication"

Conclusions

- Charter is approved

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ change all occurrences of Policy Oversight Group to User Group in the charter	Morman	Feb mtg
✓ remove statement on pg. 3 beginning with "The User Group and Technical Team will…not trigger the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act."	Morman	Feb mtg
✓ Add "Group Norms" to the section titled "Decision Making Process and Decision Communication"	Morman	Feb mtg

Agenda Subitem: Procedures for receiving input from interested parties not listed in the charter

Discussion

- Suggestions were requested by S. Hobbs, none received
- S. Hobbs suggested that the procedures be informal, the time period during which input can be received be formalized
  - In meeting agendas
  - In the charter
- R. Brown seconded that the input process remain informal
- D. Walters suggested that as long as people can sit in and provide written comment, that the informal procedure is agreeable
- K. Titus: suggested that NGO people can participate in subcommittees
- S. Mohoric suggested that subcommittee work could be a grey area of FACA

Conclusions

- NGOs can participate actively through the Technical Team and working groups

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Formalize when NGO input can be received by providing wording in the UG Charter	Morman	Feb mtg
✓ Include time in meeting agendas in the future for NGO input	Feb meeting organizer	Feb mtg

Agenda Item: Status report on IMAP development and current projects--Blue Mountains Analysis

Miles Hemstrom and Technical Review Team

Overview of GNN – J. Ohmann

- Products online
  - Forest structure & composition
  - Woody species composition
- Accuracy is assessed and tools provided for user for additional accuracy assessment
- Timeline
  - Mostly finished with Oregon, will have finalized products by end of year
- Data

4

- o Imagery used: 1996, 2000 for Oregon; 2006 for Washington
  - o Working with the USDA Forest Service Remote Sensing AC (RSAC) for image mosaics
  - o 2010 imagery inclusion somewhat dependent on the plot data for it
  - o Multidate analysis will be involved for WA, but funding is uncertain
  - o Some discussion with the Park Service for data (T Demeo)
- Discussion
  - o Validation & accuracy
    - GNN considered by developers to be useful to the watershed scale <u>at the finest</u>
    - Evaluation of the accuracy has been done by the GNN folks. They also provide a suite of accuracy assessment tools
    - Work at the National level (new pilot) will continue to clarify the data's usefulness and accuracy
    - Difficult to assess at the watershed and finer scales due to lack of independent datasets for validation
    - Accuracy good at the Ecoregion, but variable at the plot level due to variability in the vegetation characteristics and veg. types
    - Accuracy is ultimately dependent on the question—the question should match the scale of the data
  - o Data and context--the developers provide guidance on the data limitations, but the users will have to make decisions on how to use the data.
    - Some guidance can be implemented by packaging the data in ways that make specific applications deemed as inaccurate difficult to carry out
    - Make some levels of data available on very limited basis (e.g., via personal contact only)
    - Make user guide and reviews available
  - o Inappropriate use of data can become a PR problem
- Conclusions:
  - o GNN in combination with other data sources (e.g., ReGAP) provides complete coverage of vegetation data for Oregon and WA
  - o A report on the accuracy of GNN should be provided to the UG at the next meeting
  - o Its best to avoid inappropriate use of data

Study Area – M Hemstrom

- Nonforest vegetation data from ReGAP
- Forest veg. data from GNN
- 21 state and transition models
- 14 ownership/allocation
  - o source of this is… the state?? (need confirmation of the source here)
- Forest model validation will occur with FVS and forest inventory data

Current work: Blue Mountains – M Hemstrom

- Validation/refining of the forest models in process
- Processing output and tools are being developed
- Working to link methods with the UG questions

Current work: East Cascades – M Hemstrom

- Vegetation data complete
- Models are partially complete

Current work: SW Oregon – M Hemstrom

- Veg. data nearly complete

Current work: Other areas in initial stages of model building and data compiling – M Hemstrom

- NW Oregon
- W Washington
- E Washington

Inclusion of development zones/ Land use – G Lettman

- Mapping of land use/development complete in COLA
- More than half of the state of Oregon complete
- Rates of development are being researched by Jeff Kline (USDA-FS)
  - Will integrate with the timber supply and market modeling being done by D Adams
- Data has application with the interest being generated by Ballot Measure 49 which is basically a rewrite of Ballot Measure 37
- Allows for "what-if?" games with development

COLA landscape probabilities – M Hemstrom

- Gets at the question: How acceptable are potential booms and busts in the future?
- Various processes are being researched for inclusion in the modeling efforts, e.g., development, climate change

Additional Discussion

- How can validation be balanced with the needs of managers?
- How can validation use empirical data?
- How do we move from modeling results to policy?

Conclusions

- Documentation is critical
- Validation and testing is critical

- Better output tools are needed
- Ad hoc nature of IMAP is both beneficial and difficult
- Balance required between detail and elegance/simplicity in the models
- Questions from the UG are important for guiding IMAP work
- Use of empirical (inventory) data through application of FVS is essential
- Consistency will occur through the use of documentation, validation and testing (FVS)

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Presentation of GNN accuracy, validation, & use	J Ohmann	Feb mtg.

Agenda Item: IMAP Questions

Mike Bondi

Discussion

Expectations (survey of room)
- Prioritization will guide workers in the next stages, Prioritization of most critical questions desired by working group
- Confusion expressed (by A Brodie) about whether Miles and company are going to do the work to answer the questions when there are users who will use /could use the information
- Discussion of questions will help workers/Tech Team identify what can and can't be done

Prioritization

Discussion of the categories; initial goal to identify top priority categories
- T Lorenson (ODF): All are important
- J Alegria (USDA-FS/BLM): Land use change is huge—all other categories are dependent on land use change
- A Brodie (WADNR):
  - Forest characteristics are essential to the methods (WADNR top priority)
    - What have we got? How much forest is there?
    - IMAP is viewed as an extension of FIA data; it's "GIS-enabled" FIA data; IMAP adds value to FIA data
  - Fire and Insects/Disease (second priority)
    - Answers to baseline questions are needed
  - Aquatics (third priority)

7

- o K Titus (BLM): BLM wants to explain to Congress that management is having a positive impact
    - To do this, BLM needs to quantify the impacts
    - Important questions are peppered throughout the list presented at this meeting and thus no single category can be named as top priority
- o R Krahmer (ODFW): All categories are important
    - Land use change, Fire and Insects, Water Quality/Aquatic, Wildlife questions are complex, Invasives
- o S Hobbs (BOF): How well can IMAP answer wildlife questions?
- o M Hemstrom (USDF-FS): depends on the scale: patch vs. watershed; patches aren't modeled, such questions can't be answered with IMAP
- o L Cannon (OFIC): Forest Characteristics and Forest Products important
    - Forest biomass getting lots of recognition in congress, including incentives for production.
    - Can IMAP look at such issues?
- o S Mohoric: Forest characteristics, threatened and endangered species (Wildlife); Forest products important
- o T Lorenson: what additional data might be necessary to collect?
    - E.g., info on invasives may not come from FIA data
    - Recognize how to link different issues
    - Production function building is important
- o M Hemstrom: can use the watershed level analysis to guide more detailed analyses later on
- o R Brown (DW): Forest characteristics are not very interesting or useful by themselves
    - Broader looks (landscape) / contexts are what are interesting and important
    - Production function development is important
- o A Brodie: Can't go from broad to fine for wildlife in [his] experience
- o R Brown: uncertainty need to be articulated but shouldn't stop the efforts from moving forward
- o J Alegria: understanding where forests are comes from land use change
    - Process: Land use change causes changes in forest characteristics and other categories
- o S Mohoric: May have been more efficient to have the prioritization of categories done prior to coming to the meeting [by the various agencies]
- o A Brodie: The are two "supercategories"
    - Current conditions
    - Future conditions
- o Consensus
    - Categorize questions by current vs. future

8

- Omit undoable questions → M Hemstrom and folks did this during lunch
- Recognize that some are basic to the entire process
- Questions that need re-wording can be re-worded later
  - Wildlife question #3
  - "Research" question categories can be changed to "Assessment and Analysis"
- Clarity is needed as to the resolution of the results possible (results resolution)
- Another meeting (Tech Team meeting?) may be aimed at identifying other tools/methods for getting at questions that cannot be solved using IMAP methods as they stand at present
- All categories/questions should be considered in prioritization
- The questions are the start of a "conversation" between the UG and the TT, and the workers

Prioritization procedure:
- Questions grouped by M Hemstrom, J Ohmann, others:
  - Doable using IMAP today
  - Require additional work/linkages/derivation
  - Might be doable, but not with the current wording
- Voting carried out under the statement "My agency's expectations for IMAP are ___."
- Colored Dot System
  - 13 dots provided to each User {(N+1)/3} = 13
  - Power votes: each voter had one opportunity to apply 2 dots to 1 topic
  - Blue: Federal – USFS-R6, BLM
  - Yellow: State – ODF, ODFW, WDNR, BoF
  - Green: Industry – OFIC, Roseburg
  - Red: NGO – DW, TNC
- Technical Team members did not vote
- Questions listed as they appeared on the document circulated for this meeting
- Dots placed by each question, specific organization identified on the dots

Conclusions
- Difficult to prioritize categories and questions
- Interagency interest in questions can be determined using the "dot" system
- Results are located in **Table 1** at the end of this document

Agenda Item: Research Handoff/ Building Institutional Capacity

J Barbour

Presentation

- Practitioners & scientists coming together in IMAP
- IMAP needs some definition
  - After Forest Planning cycle what will happen to IMAP?
  - What's the IMAP life cycle?
- Need to think about the life cycle, process
  - Process: Develop → Test/Revise → Deploy → Improve & Maintain
- Issues:
  - Contributed time & effort is not accounted for in the current budget:
    - Management of project (e.g., project manager)
    - Development/transfer to users
    - User support

Discussion

- J Beatty: What will be transferred and how? By chunks? The whole thing?

Agenda Item: Study Plan draft / template

G Lettman

Discussion

- Overview of review of the template, the thought process behind it
- Composed of questions, background, methods, products, timeline
- The template has some limitations, but serves to provide an idea of what format the individual category and question study plans could take.

Conclusions:

- Powerful because pulls aspects of IMAP & its modules together
- Variables that will go into the work, data, where data will maintained need to be explicit in the plans.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Finalize study plans for questions	G Lettman & M Hemstrom	Feb. mtg.

Agenda Item: Technology Transfer

S Mohoric

Presentation of key points

- Four areas of need
    1. Map and data delivery (website and ftp site)
    2. Metadata and documentation (user guide)
    3. Training
    4. User support (troubleshooting & helpdesk)
- Need more ideas from the UG to make the document less Forest Service-oriented
- Please circulate the Tech Transfer Document

Discussion

- Scope can be broadened and included in the business plan
- Look more broadly to the end users
- Provide tools for users for assessment & analysis

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Comments should be directed to T Demeo or Theresa Burcsu	User Group Members	Jan 15
✓ Cover letter, deadline, who gets the comments need to be attached to document prior to circulation	T Demeo/Theresa Burcsu	Nov

Agenda Item: Co-chair selection for state partner representation

S Mohoric

Discussion

State co-chair alternates between OR & WA. Upcoming year: Washington's turn.

Conclusions

Federal co-chair: S Mohoric
State co-chair: A Brodie
Designated staff: David Morman (ODF)

Agenda Item: Overview of Meeting and Action Items

S Mohoric

- Charter adopted: minor edits needed
    - Add wording on how to involve NGOs
- Add time to agenda for NGOs
- Clarity needed on where to go with prioritization of questions
- Study Plan draft approved
- Technical Transfer Plan draft approved

      o   Partners need to solicit comment on technical transfer strategy

Next Meeting: February 1, 2008

Agenda Items for next meeting include but not limited to:

- Data validation (GNN, FVS)
- GNN Accuracy
- Budget
- Outputs/status/publications
- Memorandum of Understanding

Table 1. Prioritization of the IMAP questions results. Numbers represent the number of dots each question received. Font color corresponds to the dot color. See bottom of table for partner summaries.

Question Category Name	Question ID	Current /Future	IMAP can do	Federal Dots (blue)		State Dots (yellow)				Industry Dots (green)	NGO Dots (red)	Individual Results		Group Results	
				BLM	FSR6	BOF	DNR	ODF	ODFW	O1	O2	Total	Rank	# of User Groups	Rank
Forest Characteristics	1		Y	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	10	1	4	1
Fire, I&D, HRV	1		Y	1	1	1	1	1	2	1		8	2	3	2
Forest Characteristics	2		Y	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	7	3	4	1
Wildlife Research	1		M	1	1	1		1	2		1	7	3	3	2
Fire, I&D, HRV	8		Y			1	1	1	2	1	1	7	3	3	2
Land Use Change	6		Y	2			1	1	1		1	6	4	3	2
Aquatic Research	1		M	1			1	1	2		1	6	4	3	2
Forest Characteristics	3		Y			1	1	1		1	1	5	5	3	2
Fire, I&D, HRV	3		Y	1	1	1	1			1		5	5	3	2
Fire, I&D, HRV	5		M		1	1		1			1	4	6	3	2
Fire, I&D, HRV	7		Y				1			2	1	4	6	3	2
Invasive Species	1		M					1	2		1	4	6	2	3
Land Use Change	2	C (F)	Y			1	1		2			4	6	1	4
Forest Characteristics	4		Y				1			1	1	3	7	3	2
Aquatic Research	2		M	1					1		1	3	7	3	2
Land Use Change	3		Y		1	1			1			3	7	2	3
Wildlife Research	3		M	1					2			3	7	2	3
Fire, I&D, HRV	4		Y		1	1	1					3	7	2	3
Fire, I&D, HRV	6		Y		1	1		1				3	7	2	3
Invasive Species	3		N	1		1			1			3	7	2	3
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	3		Y	1				2				3	7	2	3
Forest Products	2		M					1		1		2	8	2	3
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	2		M							1	1	2	8	2	3
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	6		Y		1				1			2	8	2	3
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	4		Y			1			1			2	8	1	4

Question Category Name	Question ID	Current /Future	IMAP can do	Federal Dots (blue)		State Dots (yellow)				Industry Dots (green)	NGO Dots (red)	Individual Results		Group Results	
				BLM	FSR6	BOF	DNR	ODF	ODFW	O1	O2	Total	Rank	# of User Groups	Rank
Land Use Change	1	C	Y				1					1	9	1	4
Land Use Change	5		M	1								1	9	1	4
Forest Products	3		M							1		1	9	1	4
Invasive Species	2		N						1			1	9	1	4
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	1		Y		1							1	9	1	4
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	5		Y							1		1	9	1	4
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	7		Y		1							1	9	1	4
Use of IMAP DataScale Etc.	8		Y						1			1	9	1	4
Land Use Change	4		M									0	10	0	5
Wildlife Research	2		M									0	10	0	5
Aquatic Research	3		N									0	10	0	5
Fire, I&D, HRV	2		N									0	10	0	5
Forest Products	1		M									0	10	0	5
Total				13	12	14	13	15	24	13	13	117			

	Dots	Voters
Fed (Blue) Totals	25	2
State (Yellow) Totals	66	5
NGO (Red) Totals	13	1
Industry (Green) Totals	13	1