



## Idaho Lands Resource Coordinating Council

Thursday, November 1, 2018

IDL Coeur d'Alene Office – Sundance Rooms

### MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ken Knoch, ILRCC Chair, City Foresters/Idaho  
Parks & Recreation Association

Bob Howard, Idaho Emergency Managers  
Association

Chris Schnepf, UI Extension Forestry (alternate)

Elaine Clegg, Association of Idaho Cities

Gordon Sanders, Idaho Forest Owners  
Association

Hannah Sanger, Urban Issues

Janet Funk, Idaho Tree Farm

Joe Adamski, Bureau of Land Management

John DeGroot, Nez Perce Tribe, Forestry and Fire

Aubrey Hoxie, NRCS (alternate)

Knute Sandahl, ILRCC Vice-chair, State Fire  
Marshal

Lisa Ailport, Idaho Chapter, American Planning  
Assoc.

Mike Wolcott, Association of Consulting Foresters

Norris Boothe, Coeur d'Alene Tribe, Forestry

Robyn Miller, Land Trust Organizations

Tim Maguire, Urban Forestry Collaborative  
Groups / Bioregional Planning

Janet Valle, USDA-FS, State & Private Forestry

Gregg Servheen, Idaho Dept. of Fish & Game

Janet Valle, USDA-FS, State & Private Forestry  
(remotely)

### AGENCY STAFF & GUESTS PRESENT:

Ara Andrea, Bureau Chief, Forestry Assistance,  
IDL

Tom Eckberg, Forest Health Program Manager,  
IDL

Mary Fritz, Stewardship Program Manager, IDL

Tyre Holfeltz, Fire Prevention & Risk Mitigation  
Program Manager, IDL

Jennifer Russell, Project Coordinator, IDL  
Diana Rauschenbach, Forest Stewardship  
Program, IDL

Erika Eidson, Forest Health Specialist, IDL

Andrew Mock, Technical Services, IDL

Cheryl Simmons, NRCS

### Welcome/Introductions

Chair Ken Knoch welcomed members, alternates, and guests to the meeting, followed by introductions.

### Last meeting follow-up items and recap

No changes recommended to June 20, 2018, meeting notes.

## **Shared Stewardship USDA & BLM Fire Modeling**

Ara Andrea reported that during the past summer, Department of Agriculture Secretary Perdue passed out a Shared Stewardship initiative. The Shared Stewardship initiative directs the Forest Service to share decision space with the states, the tribes and other landowners. The Forest Service will be jointly setting priorities and collaboratively choosing the right tools in the right areas to implement cross-boundary work where we will focus both the federal and the state resources. The directive asks the Forest Service to work with the states in determining where the most meaningful treatments should take place to reduce the threats and increase benefits of forests. Congress wants meaningful metrics, not all the narrative. The Shared Stewardship initiative is expected to happen and next year's federal budget for the Forest Service and will be tied to actual implementation of this directive.

What Secretary Perdue and others have said about the Shared Stewardship initiative includes a lot of the projects that we deal with under our State & Private Forestry program grants—especially our fire-risk-mitigation and fuels-reduction projects. Much of this was born out of the numerous trips that Perdue and Vickie Christensen did with the communities of people all over the West following bad wildfires. There is a lot of focus at this point on fire risk mitigation treatments. To IDL, in large part, this translates to expansion of GNA work. There is a big focus from the USDA on GNA work and how successful it has been. IDL is one the trailblazers and one of the most successful states in the nation in implementing and carrying out GNA timber sales and improvements on national forest systems. Two weeks ago, we had a GNA program review by USFS auditors from Albuquerque. We are awaiting the report and it was good to have contract specialists and fiscal managers from the Forest Service give us clarity around what we can/cannot do with timber sale receipts. We've worked with Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest to break through that threshold as was the intent of the overall GNA effort. We are utilizing small amount of timber sale program receipts (as appropriate) to spread like treatments on private ground in those burned areas around the Nez Clear. It is a perfect example of the cross-boundary work that we're being directed to do in the Shared Stewardship initiative.

The Forest Action Plan (FAP) revision will be taken seriously under this Shared Stewardship initiative. IDL has already been approached by the Forest Service to exchange state spatial datasets, indicating where treatments have been done and where they are planned to occur. There is also an increased media focus on LSR-grant project work, USDA recently posted online about the cross-boundary work that we are currently doing.

## **Forest Stewardship**

A nationwide USFS effort has been going on for a least a year to modernize the federal forest stewardship program. At the state-level, that program is managed by Mary Fritz. Right now we receive baseline funding with additive funds based on the number of forest stewardship plan acres on private forest lands throughout Idaho. The metrics that we use for our accomplishments will likely change. The USFS gave the

states 3 different options for running the future Forest Stewardship Program; however, the last two options given are not really viable.

Option 1: States would focus federal Forest Stewardship activities in priority landscapes of public importance with resource issues that need to be addressed and lead to action.

Option 2: Transferring everything to a joint chief's application process

Option 3: No change

Mary reported that there is no indication as to what the new accomplishment metrics will be. The focus is around fire, water and wildlife habitat, and jobs so the metrics will likely be related to that. It will be necessary to take the work we do and filter it in such a way to produce metrics that show what's happening on the ground. Details on how the Forest Stewardship Program will change are expected in 2019.

The Nez Perce-Clearwater National Forest (working with NRCS), along with IDL, just submitted a Joint Chiefs Landscape Restoration grant application to expand our restoration efforts in the Clearwater Basin.

## **Forest Action Plan**

### **Climate, Air and Water Models**

Previously reviewed and accepted during June 19, 2018 meeting.

### **Fire**

Tyre Holfeltz presented 2009 maps and 2018 maps for comparison and final approval. The map was masked out at 10 inches precipitation; resolution 30 meter pixel for all. For the veg layer, the 2016 rapid refresh was used, additionally vegetation was reclassified from 3 categories to 6 (grass, grass shrub, grass tree, shrub, shrub tree, tree). WUI increased by approximately 30% due to redefined by counties in their CWPP updates. For counties designated as all WUI, Tyre punched out agricultural, baron, and water, which is more indicative of burnable landscape.

The WUI layer is included because of historical use and associated impacts with human development. WUI also adds additional complexity during event response.

The model represents the probability of damaging fire and is projected in a gradient view with warm colors representing more damage to cool color representing less damage. The title for this model will be Relative Fire Risk, moving forward in the development of the narrative for this section.

### **Forest Products Economics**

Forest products economic impacts were reviewed during the last meeting. For this go-around, saw log, pulp wood and biomass procurement for existing facilities were included. It is based on formulas with the Merchantability layer that calculates net revenue per delivered log truck with travel time and costs. Five zone were created. Five being the highest areas of need or priority that includes an economic multiplier at the county level. The economic multipliers are based on an economic analysis model called IMPLAN. An

economic multiplier was not considered or used in the 2010FAP. Economics are important because additional dollars from saw mills production that would generate X dollars into the local economy along with labor income could provide a look at the economic benefits to a county or community. Additional dollars of direct labor from a saw mill and income to a local economy, such as salaries, and indirect jobs are taken into account when adding an additional log in the saw mill. Generally, if you stay within the closest place to the mill, you're going to have a better financial return. The further away you get from the mill, the less revenue and the less effect it's going to have.

Committee members were uneasy about taking a national model developed at a county level for economic inputs. Another multiplier presented at the last meeting was called the Human Capital that influences planned future existing facilities might be built. Based on internal IDL discussion and comments from the last meeting, we took Human Capital out of the model so our focus would be on supporting existing facilities.

Suggestions/concerns: Future discussion places where the economy is depressed and there might be opportunities to build economic capacity, given proximity of wood products if there was a facility there to process them; whether the three layers, Merchantability, Economic Multipliers and Human Capital properly represent the right picture; whether the map indicates the biggest bang for the buck; that the group has very competing ideas as to what the outcome is? When viewing the map several areas in the state did not resonate at the highest priority or bang for the buck as was expected. There was caution to look at what the data is giving us and not what we want to be.

Outcome: Several voices stated they did not want use the Economic Multipliers and go with the Merchantability layer only.

### **Insects**

Erika informed the group that this was a really complex topic especially for non-climate modelers. We were restricted to existing data that is out there and to studies that cover the needed range and scale and also have geospatial data. We're trying to be the least subjective as possible given the range of concerns that people might have about different species, etc... We have this academic paper from 2006, they took current land cover types for 25 biotic communities that were predetermined by an earlier paper. They took those land cover types, looked at current climate data and created basically a climate profile associated with each of these biotic communities. Then they ran climate models from the IPCC predicting 1% increases in greenhouse gases from 1990 onward to predict climate variables for 2030, 2060 and 2090. Then they used those predicted future climate variables to run multi-variate statics and predicted what land cover types will be occupying different areas of Idaho in the future.

We are using the data available and trying to tackle how those climate changes may pose risks to our forests. We tried to target areas that are predicted to undergo a lot of landcover change and use that as kind of a proxy for that looking at areas that are going to be the most stressed. The reason we looked at it that way is because if it changes from 1 land cover type to another, to me that indicates that the climate change is so stressful to the species existing there currently that they are fading away and something else is

coming in. We used that as a proxy for stress due to climate change. We created two layers: one for the magnitude of change and one for the frequency of change. Taking the magnitude of change, the forest to non-forest, the question with that layer is, of the four future climates snapshots now provided here, how often will an area be forest? We chose to prioritize forest just because this is going to be the *forest* action plan.

For the frequency of change, the blue areas are the areas that underwent one land cover type change, yellow is two type changes, red is three type changes and that's masked versus unmasked. We overlaid those two layers and we rated the magnitude of change a little heavier than the frequency of change and came up with this final climate change risk. This is what it looks like without the mask, white indicates areas that didn't change forest type at all.

Elaine: Do we have the underlying data for the special landscape step because that is all under the mask and it is clearly going to have a lot of change. How will we deal with that? Change will impact that species and the other things that affect the forest, right? Why do we have it as a special landscape area and what are we going to do with it?

Tim: Are we asking the right question? Going out 90 years for a document that will be re-written in 8-10 years, I don't think is a very wise decision. I think we should take a look at the first 30 years and prioritizing that.

Erika: Since this data is a little bit older, the 30 year snapshot is only really 20 years. The other consideration is that some of these areas, particularly in southern Idaho, you may only be able to make one entry or do one treatment in 90 years.

Chris: I think of no good reason to go out further than you have to. Going out 90 years automatically puts a big red flag for people who are looking for demons to chase. I tend to think of this more as integrated with some of the other things that are in the plan, like what the effects are of disease cycles. I think the hydrologic connection, you know the climate extreme, more rain than snow effects of that on our roads, culverts and bridges is the stuff that is a little more straight forward to look at the models than how plastic our vegetation is going to be in response to some of these things

Andrew: So you're thinking we should do prediction in changes in precipitation over time?

Chris: Yes

Andrew: the problem is finding the data to say the story you guys are talking about

Chris: Does this process require us to deal with climate change specifically or explicitly? I think this is something we should talk about. The question is how much do we have to lead with our chin on this?

Tim: I think the climate change topic is a very sensitive issue and I think we've talked about it at the Idaho Falls meeting as to whether doing this as a narrative or a data thing. What we are trying to do here is identify greatest bang for our buck. If you build a functional system, it's going to be able to handle climate change better. If what we are trying to do is build a functional system for our forests that means we're building with an inherency to deal with that climate change. I'm advocating more for narrative for talking about the different possibilities we have and how our forest action plan addresses those.

Ara: What we are attempting to do here is taking it very high level. Where do we get the biggest bang for the buck? This is one element of the forest health you are going to hear about. This whole forest thing is about where the stressors are coming from. There is going to be stress, we don't know the level of change we've got. Where is that going to result in stress so that we can go in and over the next lifetime and maybe really do some heavy duty resiliency?

### **Bark Beetles**

Erika presented. We took the ones that are related to stand characteristics that we can use as a predictor. The smaller maps are the host type basal area associated with these major bark beetles overlaid with areas of current activity. We used this info to model the risk of these four major bark beetles and added them together with overall stand density. This is because you can have a host type in an area where the actual host itself isn't dense, but we may be looking at a dense stand. We overlaid those five layers into this final bark beetle risk layer. This hasn't change since the last meeting.

### **Balsam Woolly Adelgid**

Erika presented. It is a very small, invasive insect that feeds on true firs. It hunkers down and creates a huge problem for true firs. We first looked at host risks. In region one, it seems to be affecting the subalpine fir more than the grand fir so I weighted the subalpine fir more heavily 'risky' than the grand fir, and in region 4 I rated them equally. I took that host risk layer and overlaid it with distance to known balsam woolly adelgid infestation. That's from decades long road surveys where folks went around and picked different areas to survey and reported whether they found an insect or not. I add a small bump of risk for region 4 because they are seeing more dramatic damage. This may be because those areas are drier.

### **Douglas-fir Tussock Moth**

Erika presented. I took every layer from every year that we had data, dating as far back as 1940. I overlaid each year where there was defoliation mapped. The pixel values represented in this layer are the number of years that spot has experienced defoliation due to Douglas-fir tussock Moth. Most of them were like 0 to 5 but some areas actually had 11 years of defoliation. It was done this way so that if grouping by decades you're still showing data that shows consecutive years of defoliation. This retains all of that information. I also included the basal area of host because where you have hosts the risk is not 0 but I weighted this much less heavily than where we have this historical information where the moth populations are and have caused damage before. I overlaid those 2 layers to create this final map and you can see the areas where we've had problems in the past but we are not calling the rest of these areas 0 risk because they do have hosts in there.

### **Root Disease**

Erika presented. The Forest Service has an insect and disease modeling portal with existing files that have been published that we could access. I found a conglomeration of models that I thought may work. I did this in consultation with forest pathologists from regions 1 and 4. Region 1 has a root disease model developed by actual data where folks went out to plots and looked at mortality in this area. For region 4, I took an armillaria model which is based on literature and research. Actual data from plots was not available.

### **White Pine Blister Rust**

Erika presented. These were models provided by the NIDRM portal. This one was taken directly from the published model for western white pine blister rust risk, it takes into account host type, relative humidity, temperature, precipitation. Same thing for whitebark pine and limber pine, and we put all three together for final layer.

### **Noxious weeds**

Andrew presented. Data was obtained from a consolidated dataset from Department of Agriculture. We pulled out 66 species of noxious weeds and pull out points where weeds have been found. We take those individual statistical points and roll it out to a watershed layer and we class that from 1-5. There are a lot more watersheds with invasive species than last time. The substantial change may be due to better reporting. The other reason may be because the weeds are more spread out.

### **Wildlife**

Tyre presented to the group the wildlife piece of the puzzle part of the modeling. The previous state wildlife action plan was used because the current plan is not quite ready yet.

Greg explained that there is updated state wildlife action plan with a new list of species and greatest conservation need that we do want to incorporate but is not quite ready yet. In paper sense, is done. Now we are making sure all our data and layers are built to reflect that. That Information system will then be connected to decision support so that you get online and get this information. Wildlife movement and migration routes, winter ranges, summer ranges for big game and connectivity models should be together in the next calendar year. We're using the old stuff as a "hold". Because the new secretarial order coming from the department of interior the wildlife migration movement and the need to prioritize that, we're getting additional capacity that's going to crunch all that data and hopefully plug that in.

### **Narrative format for models**

#### **Benefits**

Tyre discussed some of the issues encountered and the conditions we're constrained by to help us build the benefits and the threats. For comparison purposes you have 2009 on the right and benefits on the left, these are water, air, forest products and wildlife. Cool colors are places with fewer counts, darker colors are places with greater counts.

## **Threats**

Tyre presented 2009 and 2018, on threat side is development, fire and forest health. There has been a change partially driven by the development layer that will need to be addressed. There is change in the Clearwater area likely caused by forest health, fire and noxious weeds.

**Suggested changes:** Adding a recreation benefit; dividing the maps into high risk, high benefit and high risk, low threat and so forth; take a look at development pressure using forested private percentages; removing the masks on the model; adding an optional highest magnitude layer; Ara confirmed both exercises requested from Andrew need to be built as well as other changes will be emailed to the group. Datasets are to be finalized prior to the February 2019 meeting.

## **Review of Resource Strategy**

**Goal 1:** Idaho's forests are diverse and resilient to climatic changes and other natural and unique stresses.

**Suggested changes:** Add "adapt" or "adaptive"

**Goal 2:** The ecosystem benefits that Idaho forests provide are identified, maintained and enhanced.

**Suggested changes:** None

**Goal 3:** Forest lands with the highest benefits are identified, protected and enhanced.

**Suggested changes:** None

**Goal 4:** Forest ecosystems are resilient to human activities (development, recreation forest practices, noxious weeds, etc...)

**Suggested changes:** Forest ecosystems that are more resilient to human activities (development, recreation forest practices, noxious weeds, etc...) No final version was agreed upon.

**Goal 5:** Forest-based wood product markets are economically vibrant and sustainable.

**Suggested changes:** None

**Goal 6:** Idaho has an integrated framework for implementing the Idaho forest action plan which guides project development and legislative/policy actions. Framework will promote cohesive management of Idaho's urban and rural forests.

**Suggested changes:**

Goal 6: The framework will promote cohesive management of Idaho's urban and rural forests.

Strategies and treatments that apply to urban as well as rural

Goal 7: Idaho has an integrated framework for implementing the Idaho Forest Action Plan which guides project development and legislative/policy actions.

Ara Andrea thanked Lisa Ailport for her six-year membership in ILRCC. Lisa has accepted a new position which leaves her with little opportunity to continue participation in the group. Lisa thanked the group and informed the council that her employer had nominated Mauri Knott as her replacement.



Ken Knoch informed the group that this is his last meeting as Chair. Knute will be taking over as Chair and Vice-Chair will be determined in the future.

Mary stated she would Vice-Chair nominations for someone from forest stewardship.

Next Meeting is February 28-29, 2019

Meeting adjourned at 4:00 pm