
SOFAR LANDSCAPE MEETING

APRIL 12, 2017, 1300-1600 AT ENF SO

Attendees: [Heather Campbell](#), [Jennifer DeWoody](#), [Becky Estes](#), [Duane Nelson](#), [Norma Santiago](#), [Kathy Smith](#), [Ben Solvesky](#), [Kevin Vella](#)

WORK PLAN

What do we want to accomplish/produce this year, by when do we want to accomplish it, and who works on it?

3 Sub-groups: Desired Conditions, Prioritizing treatment areas, Fire response

- A. Develop Desired Conditions for each zone and identify zones on the landscape:
- Defensible Space (was called “built community” in previous meetings)
 - Community Defense Zone
 - General Wildfire Threat Zone
 - Managed Fire Zone

Nominated participants: [Pat Manley](#), [Mark Egbert](#), [Becky Estes](#), [Duane Nelson](#), [Heather Campbell](#), [Kathy Smith](#)

- B. Develop criteria for how to prioritize treatments across landscape:
- Spatially strategic prioritization
 - Indicator measures
 - Identify upcoming/ongoing treatments or projects

Nominated participants: [Ben Solvesky](#), [Travis Thane](#), [Kevin Vella](#), [Jennifer DeWoody](#), [Dana Walsh](#)

- C. Pre-attack and evacuation plans for the SOFAR watershed
- Locations of needed facilities (helipads, camps, etc.)

Nominated participants: [Travis Thane](#), [Heather Campbell](#), [Duane Nelson](#), [Brian Veerkamp](#), [Jay Kurth](#), [Kathy Smith](#)

We recognized the challenge of maintaining momentum and reaching goals when attendance varies month to month. To address this challenge, we recommend identifying one lead person to maintain continuity and organize progress. We also suggest using flexible methods for participation whenever possible so that those who cannot attend meetings may still provide input on drafts, contribute (upload) data or layers, or participate thru telecom or virtual means.

PRODUCTS

1. GIS exercise to identify priority areas (Group B) GOAL FOR DRAFTS BY **OCT. 31, 2017**
2. Description of desired conditions (Group A) GOAL FOR DRAFTS BY **JULY 31, 2017**
3. Road map of travel routes, needed facilities (Group C) GOAL FOR DRAFTS BY **JULY 31, 2017**
4. Map of all primary and secondary fuelbreaks within SOFAR area (whole-lands approach, not by land owner); Identify current conditions of each (Group B) GOAL BY **JULY 31, 2017**

Needed items to proceed = GOAL TO HAVE GATHERED AND ACCESSIBLE BY **JUNE 15, 2017**

5. Platform to store and share info (sharepoint-like? Google drive? Kendal working on this?)
6. Current vegetation layer (Group A)
7. LiDAR (Group A)
8. Ongoing or planned projects (including ongoing maintenance activities) (Group B)
9. Google Earth Timeseries (Group B)
10. CWPP project maps (Group B)
11. FRID regional data layer (Group B)
12. Infrastructure layers (Group C)

Partners in success

13. SPI
14. Fire Safe Councils
15. CalTrans
16. Fire Management experts

Funding?

VALUES THOUGHT EXERCISE WORKSHEET

Thank you to all who returned the spreadsheet with your input! In discussing the results we found there was confusion about the measures (0, 1, 2) and process, so we are providing these results with the realization that some may want to revise their input after reviewing the instructions tab of the worksheet (especially the new “keep in mind” part).

Jennifer presented the results of the survey in two parts (both in the attached excel file). First we reviewed those ranking for which the group reached consensus through the survey (the things we all agree on and hopefully don't need to review). These items are listed on the tab “Concurrence 1”.

Then we discussed the items that had disagreement across surveys. These values are highlighted on the tab “Survey results”. Cells with bright yellow highlighting identify values

where responses were received for the high (2) and low (0) categories, indicating possible disagreement amongst members. Alternatively, with the confusion around the instructions, we now see this could indicate different interpretations of the survey, which is why we are asking folks to review and possibly revise their responses.

On the “Survey results” tab, the pale yellow highlighting identifies values which did not gain clear consensus but were trending in the same ranking. The disagreement is a matter of scale or intensity, so hopefully easier to explain or resolve.

As a group we reviewed some of the values, and we reached a consensus (though not necessarily unanimous) on the rankings by landscape zone. These decisions are marked by an * in the cell of the final rank (0, 1, or 2) on the tab “Concurrence 2 – meeting”.

Next steps:

1. If you would like to volunteer for one or more sub-group, volunteer to lead or nominate someone to lead a sub-group, or have questions, additions, or comments on this plan, please forward to Ben (ben@sierraforestlegacy.org) or Kendal (kendalyoung@fs.fed.us) or Jenn (jadewoody@fs.fed.us).
2. Start to schedule sub-group meetings and gather needed information. Identify and build the information-sharing platform.
3. Review the “values thought exercise” worksheet and send your revised scores and/or input on the remaining highlighted values to Jenn (jadewoody@fs.fed.us) by **Friday, April 21** so that we might reach consensus before the May meeting.