NOTES/HANDOUTS
for
Northern Great Plains Network I&M
Technical Committee Meeting
Rapid City, South Dakota
February 9, 2005

1:00pm Intro Licht

1:05pm Integrate 3 Monitoring Programs Licht et al.

- Present recommended approach
- Present future actions

The following comes from an email by Amy

1. What information must you have to meet your program's requirements?
2. What additional information would you like to have to better meet your program's goals?
3. What can you contribute (data, money, people, etc.) to the combined/coordinated effort? Think of this in terms of best case, worst case, and most likely scenarios.
4. What tasks do you anticipate *must* remain separate from the combined effort?
5. What are the potential obstacles to coordinating or integrating these programs, and how could they be overcome?

Up until now, the conversations have primarily been between I&M and Fire Effects. Both of these programs have already answered the above questions to some degree. We need to spend more time on how EPMT will fit in with this.

Summary

1. Sometime in 2003, all of us and Taran met at Wind Cave to discuss the possibilities of coordinating efforts. The main focus was for everyone in the room to become familiar with each other's programs. An important outcome of the meeting was greater communication between Fire Effects and EPMT regarding exotic plant control activities in the vicinity of Fire Effects monitoring plots.

2. In October 2003, Dan and I spoke with Jim DeCoster, regional fire ecologist, about the effort to coordinate/integrate programs. We also talked about how the Heartland I&M network was incorporating Fire Effects monitoring into their protocol. Jim DeCoster basically approved of our efforts to try to work things out.

3. In late 2003, Cody, Dan, and I met to do some back of the envelope calculations as to how much time, personnel, and money would be available if Fire Effects and I&M completely integrated their vegetation monitoring efforts. This yielded some ballpark figures for the potential

number of veg monitoring sites that could be allocated to each park; these were incorporated into the straw dog I&M veg monitoring protocol.

4. In early January 2004, Cody and I had an informal meeting regarding the proposed coordination with Dick Bahr (national fire office), Jim DeCoster, Nate Benson (national fire ecologist), Andy Thorstenson, and Jim Cheatham while at a workshop in Omaha. I shared the draft straw dog and Cody shared his draft of his presentation for the upcoming NEKOTA meeting. Discussion also included how all these programs fit with the vegetation mapping program. All there were supportive and even enthusiastic.

5. In mid-January Dan, Cody and I presented the idea from different angles to the I&M technical committee and various other interested parties. No tomatoes were thrown.

6. This field season, the Fire Effects monitors installed new plots in a burn unit at THRO following the systematic, without stratification, approach suggested in the straw dog protocol. The Fire Effects field crew expressed some dissatisfaction with the method because, as expected, only the major vegetation type was represented in the plots.

7. In late September, I attended a workshop in which the Pacific West Region began an effort to develop methods for monitoring restoration success. The theme was basically the same as what we're trying to do, but the approach was somewhat different. Progress with this group does not seem to be rapid.

8. In early December, Dan proposed using some of his funds for a pilot study in 2005. Exactly what we would study is yet to be determined, though I suggested concentrating on sampling method, not spatial allocation of sampling sites.

Bring USGS Paper

2:30pm FY05 Budget Licht

Projected FY06 budget is $306k.
Committed expenses are:

Assessments	=	$6k	(assuming 2%)
Licht	=	$72k	(I&M Coordinator at .75 FTE)
Brumm	=	$64k	(Data Manager)
Wilson	=	$30k	(Bio. Tech at .5 FTE, other .5 shared with MORU)
Admin clerk	=	$3k	(DETO staff for FY05)
NEKOTA	=	$2k	
Travel	=	$10k	(travel for I&M staff)

Discretionary expenses are:

Bynum	=	$30k	(temporary Bio. Tech)
Bio. Tech.	=	$8k	(summer hire)
Admin clerk	=	$5k	(hire I&M admin clerk late in FY05)
Experts Meeting	=	$10k	(travel for outside experts; hope to have in Sept.)
Pilot Study	=	$20k	(staff, travel, supplies for Symstad pilot study)
Water Quality	=	$15k	(additional funds to conduct another sampling run in 2005)
Plant Studies	=	$4k	(a potential project to fill in some gaps on the plant lists)
Summer Tech	=	$8k	(help with data management and other duties)
Imagery	=	$10k	(acquire and digitize historic aerial images of parks)
Computers	=	$5k	(for seasonal staff and to replace old equipment)
Misc.	=	$4k	

Total = $306k

Other items suggested herbarium review, vehicle, more herp work, water study at MNRR

3:00pm Break

3:15pm FY06 Budget Licht

Projected FY06 budget is $855k. Committed expenses are:

Assessments	=	$17k	(assuming 2%)
Licht	=	$100k	(if fulltime I&M)
Brumm	=	$67k	(Data Manager)
Wilson	=	$62k	(if fulltime)
Bynum	=	$30k	(can keep on until 6/06)
Admin clerk	=	$35k	(assuming hired and fulltime)
NEKOTA	=	$2k	
Travel	=	$10k	(travel for I&M staff)

Possible expenses are: vehicle, Plant Ecologist, Aquatic Ecologist, air or weather monitoring, stations, water quality probes, synthesis and analysis of old park data,

3:45pm Fall “Experts” Meeting Licht

- Purpose of meeting
- Location, date, duration
- Participants

4:15pm Wrap up and Feedback on I&M Program Licht