



Cohesive Strategy Goals

- Resilient Landscapes •
- Safe & Effective Wildfire Response •

Collaborative Group - Meeting Key Outcomes

Meeting held March 10, 2021

Prepared by the Consensus Building Institute

Meeting in Brief

Science Talk: University of Washington researchers presented modeling and mapping tools to understand forest structures and compare treatment approaches to foresee potential desired conditions.

SOFAR is beginning work to carry forward its 2021 work plan. A biomass work group will meet on March 25 at 2:30 to work toward creating a wood processing plant.

Next Meeting: May 12, 2021 at 1:30

Have an announcement you would like to share via the SOFAR list-serve / website? Send information to Cameron Hager, CBI (chager@cbi.org)

Meeting Overview

Presentation | SOFAR Science Talks

[Presentation Materials: [Part 1](#) | [Part 2](#)]

The team at the University of Washington's Forest Resilience Laboratory presented mapping and data tools to enable better analyses of current and desired forest structure, ranging from stand-to-landscape scale. Professor **Van Kane**, leader of the Forest Resilience Lab, opened with the vision for the project in the Sierra Nevada as well as a broad overview of the work his lab has been doing for over a decade. Ultimately, the vision is to enhance stand-to-landscape forest resilience. They are trying to better understand the patterns of forest structure and the relationship to fire, drought, management, and topography.

Jonathan Kane, a research scientist working with PFC labs, presented on the several tools related to fire resilience: Pixel and Polygon Approaches. With the Pixel Approach, the team used reference conditions based on mid-elevation mixed conifer. Using examples from a dataset in the Tahoe National Forest, he explained how the Pixel Approach was able to identify 2/3 of the reference areas as near average. The reference area was also identified as much denser than the post-fire area. The second tool was the Polygon Approach. This tool was designed to be the "2.0" version of the Pixel Approach. The tool has not yet been used on an entire forest as it is still a relatively new. In his example, Jonathan explained that the Polygon Approach is more topographically defined than the Pixel Approach and gave different reference points to summarize data that the Pixel Approach could not address.

Always check website for meeting location and latest information: www.sofarcohesivestrategy.org

Bryce Bartle-Geller, a research analyst for the group, explained the third tool called RxGaming. In his presentation, Bryce focused on the various background information that was used to develop the tool. The background information included looking at the forest structure continuum among other metrics. For the tool itself, the user can see potential activity in the stand and then simulate treatments to achieve reference conditions. Licosim would then take the ideas developed at that level to the larger landscape level. Bryce explained that this is the ultimate goal, for the tools apply modeling at the stand level to then get to a larger landscape level with treatment plans.

Questions and Discussion

One participant asked a clarifying question about the metrics that were discussed regarding trees per acre. Van said that it's very tricky because LIDAR has a difficult time measuring trees per acre. Small trees challenge remote-sensing methods. He discussed the various reasons why the tools only give so much information. Bryce followed up with how RxGaming can remove smaller trees from the measurements. Jonathan Kane said this has been used in the field.

One participant asked Bryce to clarify treatment types in the RxGaming presentation. On this tool, it is not a fully based in field treatment. It's more about possible structure. This is a tool to help stakeholders and managers identify the approach to manage a forest. Van mentioned Malcolm North as a person who has discussed certain tools and methods like this.

The participant followed up with another question about doing a cost overlay for treating a particular area. Van said other tools must be employed for that purpose.

One participant asked Bryce to clarify RxGaming and Licosim. Bryce said that the RxGaming is about looking at what larger alternative treatments look like. Licosim is about running an entire national forest. Van said a big difference is that Licosim is going to require partnerships to implement. RxGaming can be used by just about anyone.

Bryce said the team worked with Mount Hero with RxGaming. They are looking for beta testers on all three tools. One participant would like SOFAR to be a candidate for beta testing. The Landscape Vision Work Group could discuss.

Van said the team would be happy to provide training on these metrics and workshops for people who need help understanding these layers. Participant would be very excited to learn about when the tools become available.

SOFAR 2021 Work Plan and Establishing Biomass Work Group

[\(View 2021 Work Plan Here\)](#)

Discussion and Feedback

Always check website for meeting location and latest information: www.sofarcohesivestrategy.org

The SOFAR collaborative provided feedback on its 2021 work plan that the group has been developing over the last two months via the collaborative, steering committee, and landscape vision work group. The overall goals of the 2021 work plan include a focus on tools and methods, funding for local initiatives, establishing a wood utilization processing center within SOFAR boundary, advancing partner project coordination, and maintaining safe egress/ingress. The Collaborative needs people to join a work group regarding the wood utilization processing center.

Many are excited to be discussing the possibility of a biomass facility and talked about various efforts with successful facilities across the state. A couple of participants mentioned possible project partners and what the Biomass Work Group could do to be active on making this facility possible.

One participant mentioned all the grants that could be available for these projects as well as focusing on finding investors in the area to continue to help with the efforts discussed among the group such as the Biomass facility.

Overall, there was general support for the work plan. The meeting closed with next steps including coordinating with people who volunteered for the biomass work group.

Next Steps

- **CBI will distribute notes and slides.**
- **CBI will schedule a biomass group.**

Updates and Announcements

Upcoming Meetings

Collaborative	Landscape Vision Committee
♦ May 12 ♦ Sept 8 ♦ Oct 13 ♦ Nov 10	• March 25 at 1:00
Always check sofarcohesivestrategy.org for meeting location and latest information.	