**MODEL/PRODUCT/TOOL/FRAMEWORK EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Tool Reviewed:\_\_\_\_\_ Kerry Metlen: Rogue Basin Strategy:

TNC has demonstration sites across the nation -- Rogue Basin: 4.2 million acres, 2.1 million acres overly dense, annual need of 105,000 acres of treatment/year. Southern Oregon Forest Restoration Collaborative: technical team, have agency advisors as well. Have strong BLM and FS support to implement their work.

Small Group Members: Please listen carefully to the presentation for the tool you have been assigned to review. Record comments below related to your understanding based on what you hear. There will be a chance to get clarification with the presenter later in the day.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Criteria** | **Review Comments** |
| Tool Objectives | Generalized system to resolve landscape scale restoration treatments. : Resilient landscapes, fire adapted communities, safe and effective wildfire response, utilizing the National Cohesive Strategy.  Principled Approach: integrate local ecological references  Plan and monitor at multiple scales  Integrate protection/restoration  Utilized Hessburg's principles of restoration document. |
| Processes Modeled | Fire Regimes, FSIM runs, Treatment types like Rx fire and thinning |
| Vegetation classification used | Utilized Haugo restoration needs data. Added topography to Haugo's restoration needs to identify more specific locations. Identifying where LSOG should be retained. Thinking about climate change.  Use NSO habitat models and USFWS NSO recovery plan principles, RA10, RA32, RRA12  Natural Range Variability- Haugo  TNC document, "Conserving Natures Stage\*\*\*\*\*  Adapting forests under climate change, trying to avoid type changes in veg types.  Utilizing QRA  Taking a conservative approach, retaining older large trees, limited to existing roads, utilize NWFP riparian buffers, grounded in NSO recovery plan, limit ground based Harding, site specificity needed for project development   NSO habitat layers (a derived system)  Utilizing GNN data for output estimates...  GNN structure data  ILAP: PVT adn seral structural state- used heavily for fire modeling..  Land fire: fuel data and reference condition forest models  Other data for mapping high value resources.... |
| Treatment of uncertainty | Did not see it in the presentation... No structural uncertainty... |
| Spatial options/landscape size limits | Spatial options, landscape size limits:  Utilized the 6th field watershed, extent was sub regional   Not utilize able for treatment units... |
| Required inputs and possible  outputs | Land fire BpS  Departure maps, Haugo  FSIM  Costs  GNN for volume estimates  NOS habitat suitability layer |
| Scenario comparison capability/ease | Developed watershed based priorities for treatment by local fire community risk, large wildfire community risk, NRV, NSO habiitat, climate resilient landscapes. Polygon's are around 50,000 acre watersheds.  Developed "treatment themes" to estimate work needed: no treatment, fuels management, ecosystem resilience, long ranger or near range NSO habitat work.  Utilized GNN data to develop those to identify potential ranges of treatments, allowed for estimates of commercial volume. Went into an optimization model, used MARXAN (tried LTTD but did not work).  Created acres of treatment and volume by treatment type, identified which lands were accessible for mechanical treatment and acres that wildfire would be primary manager.  Identified what shifts could be made based upon treatment of eligible land based vs untreated landscape so you could identify how much area is available for treatment.  Can create wildfire management zones, and identify effects of different management scenarios on our ability to manage wildfires  Key use is to develop a framework for consideration of training... |
| Compatibility with other modeling systems | Talked about the other models they used...not sure what this question meant.  Could utilize other datasets as base inputs (NSO habitat, other veg data) could be done, |
| Documentation/training/ease of use/user interface | Not quite sure...Not sure about the documentation, is there a tutorial on how this was created... |
| **Criteria** | **Review Comments** |
| Planning horizon capability – how many years out can it “look”? 10, 50, 100? | Not sure on this, seemed designed upon recent historical information for short medium term planning. |
| Need for researchers to run the model | Technically capable people to create output. Would need some scientific review and validation of the modeling effort. |
| Data requirements: existing? readily available? | Mostly existing, some like FSIM would be needed, MARXAN would need to be run after the fact... |
| Feasible with existing computing capability? | Could run with existing GIS based computers... FSIM take |
| How simple is it to understand outcomes? | Will need some interpretations and issues with linking specific models. Need to better understand errors and variability of the outcomes statistically. Not in the brief presentation we saw...perhaps available in the publication |
| Are the drivers obvious and sensitivity known? | Not that we could see... |
| Is it transparent? Any black boxes? | Seems like a series of nested black boxes (models imputed into models)... |
| Can the model predict trends, or would other tools need to generate products to feed in for evaluation? | No time based function there... Could be a point in time assessment. |