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Executive Summary

- Meetings were held with the SNAP Recreation Team and the SNAP Cultural Resources Team to request assistance in the development of the science strategy. Draft versions of interagency goals, subgoals, science questions, and associated tasks were given to each team for review and input.
- Plans were prepared for the peer review of science proposals submitted for consideration as Conservations Initiatives in SNPLMA Round 9.
- Proceedings of the natural resources management workshop held on September 13 were completed and sent to the Science & Research Team for review by members.
- An important focus of the Science and Research Team was the development of a Round 9 proposal to provide funding for the implementation of the science strategy once it is completed in August, 2008. A proposal was prepared and submitted that includes peer review, synthesis, and outreach components.

Summary of Attachments

- Team meeting agenda and notes.

Program Activities

Science Team Facilitation

One team meeting was held during this quarter on November 15. Prior to the meeting, a draft agenda was prepared for review by the team leader. The final agenda was then distributed to team members. Following the team meeting, minutes were summarized, distributed and posted on the team Website (GroveSite).

Science Steering Committee

The Science and Research Team is continuing to address the need for and the mission of a Science and Research Steering Committee. The first task for this team will be the review of the science strategy in June, 2008.

Partnerships

Two meetings were held during this quarter to request the assistance of other SNAP teams in the development of the Science and Research Strategy. On October 17, Drs. Craig Palmer and Jennell Miller (UNLV), and Carrie Ronning (BLM) represented the Science team in a meeting with the Recreation team. At that meeting, Dr. Palmer explained the overall science strategy and discussed the importance of identifying research needs of the
Recreation Team. A draft set of interagency goals, sub-goals, and associated science questions related to recreation was provided to the Recreation Team for their consideration and review.

A similar meeting was held with the Cultural Resources Team on October 31 in Boulder City. After a presentation, they were also provided with a draft set of interagency goals, sub-goals, and associated science questions related to cultural resources. Several of their team members volunteered to review this information prior to their next meeting in January, 2008.

Phase I Strategy

The S&R team coordinates peer reviews for science proposals that had been submitted for funding as SNPLMA Conservation Initiative nominations. During this quarter, a plan was completed for the review of science proposals submitted during Round 9. The due date for submissions to this round was December 20, 2007. Review forms were finalized and a timeline developed to complete external peer reviews in a judicious manner.

Phase II Strategy

An important event during the previous quarter was the natural resources management workshop held on September 13. Proceedings of this workshop were completed and sent to the Science & Research Team for review. These proceedings will be finalized and sent to workshop participants in the near future.

The main focus of efforts during this quarter was the development of a plan for the implementation of the Science and Research Strategy during the first two years (FY 2009- FY2010) so that it could be incorporated into a Round 9 proposal from the Science Team. This plan was presented to the Science and Research Team at their November 15 meeting. Based on discussions at this meeting, a pre-proposal was prepared and reviewed by the team. This pre-proposal was submitted to the SNAP Board for its approval.

With the approval of the SNAP Board of the pre-proposal in early December, the team requested that a full proposal be prepared. A first draft was completed and sent to the team for review. This proposal included three activities:

1. Peer Review: Continued peer review of SNAP Science and Research Strategy-related projects proposed for southern Nevada Conservation Initiatives funded through SNPLMA
2. Synthesis: Synthesis of southern Nevada Conservation Initiatives relevant to the SNAP Science and Research Strategy that were funded by SNPLMA Rounds 4-6
3. Outreach: Requests for Proposals (RFPs) and Broader Scientific Community Engagement

A conference call was held on December 13 to provide suggestions for improving the proposal. Based on these comments, the proposal was revised and submitted by the December 20 deadline.

Submitted by:

Margaret N. Rees
Principal Investigator

December 31, 2007
Date
Interagency Science and Research Team Meeting

Participants

Interagency Science and Research Team:
- Kent Turner, NPS (Team Lead)
- Carrie Ronning, BLM
- Amy LaVoie, USFWS
- Randy Sharp, USFS
- Craig Palmer, UNLV PLI (Project Manager)
- Jennell Miller, UNLV PLI

Upcoming Meetings

Interagency Science and Research Team Meetings:

- November 14, 2007 | 9 am to 2 pm | Interagency Building

Science and Research Team Action Items

- Jennell and Craig will develop a draft list of terms and definitions to serve as a glossary for the S&R Strategy
- Team members will e-mail their lists of habitats and species
- Jennell will create a draft “pre-proposal” worksheet to be used in the peer review
- Craig will provide an update on the status of each chapter of the Science and Research Strategy at the next S&R Team meeting on Nov. 14.

Meeting Summary

1. **All Agency Natural Resource Management Science Workshop**
   Interagency Science and Research (S&R) Team members reviewed both their overall impressions and the outcomes of their individual sessions at the workshop held on September 13.

   **Overall impressions:**
   BLM, NPS, USFS, and USFWS agency staff all provided overall favorable feedback on the workshop. Positive comments were noted related to the keynote presentation given by Rebecca Gravenmier on the development of the Northwest Forest Plan. The presentation was found to be interesting and applicable to the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. As expected, a few participants perhaps felt that attending the meeting was not the best use of their time, due to the large number of on-the-ground tasks they have.

   Concerning the breakout group sessions, individuals liked the fact that they could tweak the work that went into and resulted from the May and August, 2006 Desert Research Institute workshops. It does appear that, among staff, some skepticism exists about how the strategy is going to work. A few misconceptions about the purpose of the strategy also were evident. Agency staff questioned one team member, “Does an interagency team direct what agencies do?” Agency staff also emphasized the importance of defining terms used in the strategy and in establishing clear boundaries regarding how strategy will be implemented.
Staff members brought up the topic of education, and where it would fit in the strategy (education falls under Goal 2–sub-goal 2.3, which was not covered in this meeting). The team agreed not to lose sight of this sub-goal. After Goal 2 undergoes the same process as Goal 1, the S&R Team will ensure that the topic is adequately covered, and if not will consider infusing it back into individual sub-goals.

The SNAP Board reacted favorably to the workshop and was very pleased with the presentation by Rebecca Gravenmier. Carrie noted that Juan Palma emphasizes the importance of regular consideration and review of the purpose of the strategy. The SNAP Board is also interested in understanding how the SNAP Strategy can be applicable outside of its current boundaries (e.g., how can it fit with the Mojave Desert Ecosystem Initiative). The Mojave Desert Ecosystem Initiative is a consortium of manager-level individuals with land management responsibility in tortoise habitat in Arizona, Utah, and Nevada. Its primary drive is ecosystem stressors such as invasive weeds leading to increased fire, which, in turn, results in the loss of tortoise habitat. Craig has already presented the S&R Strategy PowerPoint to this group on Aug. 21. It was also noted that the completed strategy is intended to inform decisions and describe SNAP science needs. Although the SNAP Board discussed whether there should be a broader team (at the meeting of the Mojave Desert Ecosystem Initiative), nobody wants a competing science team.

**Breakout Session Results:**
The wording of Goal 1 was reviewed and finalized, taking into consideration the comments made by agency staff at the workshop. Each S&R Team member then presented the results of his or her breakout group, each of which focused on one sub-goal. The team worked to finalize the wording of the sub-goals and associated tasks, also incorporating suggestions received after the workshop from agency staff. The resulting, agreed-upon text is shown below.

**GOAL 1**
**RESTORE, SUSTAIN, AND ENHANCE SOUTHERN NEVADA ECOSYSTEMS**

1.1  Manage wildland fire to sustain southern Nevada ecosystems

a.  What are effective pre-fire strategies for maintaining ecosystem health in southern Nevada?

- How do we sustain and maintain appropriate amounts of fire in healthy ecosystems?
- How do we reduce fire in non-adapted ecosystems where fire has been artificially increased?
- How do we restore or mimic fire in fire-dependent ecosystems where fire has been excluded?
- What management practices could reduce fire occurrences that result in unwanted type conversion?
• How effective are fuels treatments in restoring fire to its natural role in the ecosystem?

b. What are the effective post-fire practices for maintaining ecosystem health in southern Nevada?
   • What are the most effective short-term and long-term restoration treatments?
   • Do post-fire practices affect listed species populations?

c. What are the effects of current fire management strategies on the long-term health of ecosystems in southern Nevada?
   • What suppression strategies and techniques can be used in southern Nevada ecosystems to minimize impacts?
   • What suppression strategies and techniques can set the stage for post-fire recovery in both fire-dependent and fire-intolerant ecosystems?

d. What effect does the changing role of fire have on the health of Southern Nevada ecosystems and on species biodiversity?
   • What are post-fire effects on desert seed bank (both native and exotic)?
   • What effects have fires had on the conditions of “biodiversity hotspots” and spring areas?
   • What effects do non-native plants have on fire behavior, frequency, and intensity? What role should fire play today in areas with invasive plant species?

e. What is the historic role of fire in southern Nevada, what is its current role, and is that role changing?
   • What is the history of wildfire starts and spreads? How do today’s fire patterns compare to historic fire patterns
   • Is there a way to predict future fire conditions?

1.2 Protect southern Nevada ecosystems from adverse impacts of invasive species
a. What are the known or potential species of concern and what are their basic biological attributes related to invasiveness?
   - What is the current distribution and abundance of known invasive species within Southern Nevada or nearby within the desert Ecoregion?
   - What ecophysiology, genetics, population biology characteristics, or transfer mechanisms are related to invasiveness and available for characterizing invasiveness?

b. What are the effects of invaders?
   - What are their effects on community structure and ecosystem function?
   - What are the values at risk, including the socioeconomic impacts?

c. What are effective management methods for investigation, prevention, control, and eradication of invasive species?
   - What are the vectors for invasion that provide agency opportunities for prevention?
   - What are the most effective means of early detection and inventory?
   - What are the thresholds at which treatment is necessary for protection of the ecosystem?
   - What are the most effective methods of treatment available for high priority invasive species?
   - What are the methods for evaluating the effectiveness of treatment programs?

1.3 Restore and sustain proper function of southern Nevada’s watershed and landscapes

a. What are the effects of ‘external’ (anthropogenic) activities to the health of the landscape?
   - What approaches can be used to predict trend and future conditions of the landscape? (monitoring; alternative futures model-conceptual empirical modeling)
• How are management actions affecting the health of the landscape?
• What human activities are modifying (e.g., fragmentation) or sustaining the health of the landscape?
• What role does ‘disturbance’ play in maintaining a healthy and sustainable ecosystem?

b. What are the ecosystem processes that modify or sustain the health of the landscape?
• What are the dynamics and ‘interrelationships’ of the physical and biological elements in a healthy ecosystem, and what are the key physical and biological attributes of a healthy and sustainable landscape?
• What approaches (i.e., physical and biological monitoring; indicator species) can be used to predict trend and future conditions of the landscape?
• What role does (and has) climate change played in modifying the current ecosystem?

c. What are the hydrodynamics, both surface and subsurface water that sustains or modifies the health of the landscape?
• How is water use, whether by non-human or human consumption, effecting water quantity and quality within the landscape?
• What are the dynamics between surface water and ground water?
• What is the spatial relationship of surface water with in landscape?

d. What are effective techniques for restoration* of the landscape?
• What are key baseline parameters that are needed for establishing/developing appropriate restoration* techniques?
• What are criteria or key elements that can evaluate successful restoration (i.e., biological recovery)?

* Restoration includes “reclamation.”

1.4 Sustain and enhance southern Nevada biotic communities to preserve biodiversity and maintain viable populations
a. What are the key threats and stressors and their effects on sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems?

- How are the direct and indirect threats and stressors affecting sensitive species (e.g., distribution, reproduction, etc.) and habitats of concern?
- What are the best methods or techniques for measuring how key threats and stressors impact sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems?
- What is the critical threshold of impact for sensitive species or habitats of concern?
- What are the key threats and stressors and their effects on sensitive species?
- How do we protect sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems from key threats and stressors?
- How do we reduce key threats and stressors to sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems?

b. How do management actions affect sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems?

- What management actions have an effect on sensitive species and habitats of concern, and how do they respond?
- What key conservation measures maintain or enhance resources or species viability?
- How does the composition (e.g., size, shape, etc.) of conservation areas influence the persistence of species and habitats of concern?
- What is the optimum or effective size of corridors such that fragmented habitats and ecological systems function properly?
- Are the benefits gained for sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems worth the cost of implementation of specific management actions?
- What could be done differently under existing management actions to improve or more effectively benefit sensitive species, habitats of concern, and ecological systems?
- How do we monitor management actions to determine whether they are effective?
c. What are the life history and ecology of sensitive species and the ecology of habitats of concern?

- What are the key habitat requirements and important habitat areas for sensitive species?
- What is the population structure, genetics and dynamics of sensitive species?
- What is the current and historical distribution of sensitive species populations and habitats of concern?
- What is the status and trend of sensitive species and habitats of concern?
- What are the important resources or ecological characteristics associated with habitats of concern?
- What is the current and historical distribution of habitats of concern?
- What abiotic processes drive ecosystem function and plant, animal, and community viability?

Further Discussion:

In conclusion, Kent suggested that a small meeting be held with the purpose of infusing science-advisory-level insight into the strategy; this would be a good opportunity for review and comment on the strategy by Angie Evenden (NPS CESU Coordinator), Nora DeVoe (BLM State Office Science Advisor), and other agency resource advisors.

Review of Rebecca Gravenmier’s Recommendations

The S&R Team reviewed Rebecca Gravenmier’s September 19, 2007 comments “Considerations for Development of SNAP Science and Research Strategy” (see attached). The S&R Team agreed that it will be important to review these comments as the strategy progresses, and felt that it might be wise to continue to engage Becky in the process.

Becky’s first recommendation is to obtain the managers’ perspective on priorities and information needs for SNAP. The S&R Team decided to present a clean copy of the new version of GOAL 1, including its sub-goals and tasks to the SNAP Board. This meeting will serve as a status check with the SNAP Board. It is important to determine whether the board is comfortable with this work as a model, before proceeding along the same lines with the other sub-goals. Kent will set an appointment with the SNAP Board with Jennifer to set up the meeting, at which Kent and Craig will present Goal 1 and obtain the SNAP Board’s opinion. It was also suggested that a full commenting period be allotted to line supervisors or anyone who can sign for the agencies.

Another consideration dealt with the need for the strategy to be flexible in nature. It will be important to note in the strategy in the introductory and adaptive management sections how the priorities shown in the strategy could change over time. Furthermore, the S&R Team noted that some of the sub-goals’ tasks are listed in order of priority (1.1 - 1.3), while others are not in order of priority (1.4); it will also be important to show this in the strategy.
Glossary
Agency staff and the S&R Team identified the need to define terms used in the strategy. Craig and Jennell will put together a preliminary list of terms and definitions to begin this part of the document.

Species and Habitat List
The S&R Team felt it would be worthwhile to put together a species and habitat (e.g., riparian, bristle cone pine, forest meadows, etc.) lists that would be a “top ten” or “dirty dozen” type list (not prioritized) to demonstrate which species and habitats are impacted by the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. The Team will submit their agency lists, including definitions, to each other and to Craig and Jennell via e-mail to look for areas of overlap. The team will decide later whether to lump species (e.g., migratory birds, Virgin River fish, etc) or to keep individual species separate.

Potentially, in future funding rounds, nominations for funds to work in support of these species and habitats could be assigned additional points. Such lists, if possible to create, could also help minimize submission of unsolicited proposals.

2. Engaging Science Providers
Kent presented his ideas for engaging science providers from Federal research organizations, universities, and others in implementation of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. Such organizations would include, U.S.G.S., the Rocky Mountain Research Station, DRI, UNLV, U.C. Riverside, Zyzyx Desert Studies Research Consortium. The strategy would be presented to high-level individuals (e.g., the Vice President for Research). The purpose of the presentation and initial engagement would be to find out what capabilities the entity has and how the entity could and would like to participate as a consortium partner. The S&R Team needs these entities’ interest and availability. Craig noted that he has already researched and documented Federal agency capabilities.

A plan will be developed for engaging these organizations so that the S&R Team approaches them in such a way that they will want to use their capabilities to answer the SNAP S&R Strategy questions. When developing the approach, the S&R Team will make sure that no impression is given of guarantee of sole-source funding or anything of that nature. The S&R Team decided that the best time to engage science delivery community will be after the peer review of the S&R Strategy is complete.

A question arose about how, down the road, work completed by these entities can be re-infused into the SNAP Science and Research Strategy for adaptive management processes and purposes. One way is to create reports wherein a summary of work done is provided for each question. To get this information, staff must conduct interviews, complete literature searches, and hold symposia. In the best case scenario, this activity would be completed every year. A 10-year product could be a more detailed interpretive report. However, this type of reporting is labor intensive, which brings up Round 10. The S&R Team considered whether they should identify a process for reporting and get commitment from the SNAP Board to sustain the reporting and synthesis process. This is the only way to get the return of useful information from all the work that is going into creating the strategy. Continued implementation and functioning of the strategy is going to take staff and money.
3. **Peer Review Process**
The S&R Team has been given a Round 9 Review Process and tentative schedule, which includes notice that states that science-related nominations will be distributed by the S&R Team to put through the review process. Completed peer reviews are tentatively due on February 15, 2008.

Jennell distributed copies of the first completed peer review for the Round 8 FS/FWS Spring Mountains Butterfly and Life History and Autecology Studies nomination. Currently, the worksheet given to peer reviewers is appropriate for typical investigator proposals but needs to be modified to address proposals that are in a pre-proposal format (requesting funds to address a science need that will be used to solicit detailed investigator proposals). The team agreed that Jennell should develop a draft “Pre-proposal” or “Design-build” version of the worksheet for their review via e-mail that could be used, as appropriate, during the Round 9 review process.

4. **Coordination with Other SNAP Teams (Craig Palmer)**
Craig will meet with the Cultural Resources Team in Boulder City at the Bureau of Reclamation Building located at the end of Buchanan St., past the Veteran’s Memorial Cemetery. Carrie will also attend this meeting. This meeting will be held on October 31, from 9:30 am to 12 noon.

Craig will meet with the Recreation Team at the Forest Service Annex on Oct. 17. Carrie will also attend this meeting.

5. **Next Meeting**
The next meeting will be held at the Interagency Center from 9-2 on November 14. Craig will prepare a detailed update on the progress with each chapter of the Science and Research Strategy.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.
Considerations for Development of SNAP
Science & Research Strategy

Rebecca Gravenmier, Science Coordinator
US Forest Service, PNW Research Station

Key Recommendations

1. Ask managers perspective on priorities and information needs for SNAP
   - Perspective will be different from scientists and technical specialists
   - Have SNAP BOD review wording of goals and rank across subgoals and the research questions within subgoals
   - Develop decision criteria for SNAP Board ranking of subgoals and questions. Examples to consider:
     - What are you going to do with the information once you get an answer to question?
     - Are you going to do anything differently once you have the answer?
     - What level of confidence is needed in order to make decisions on management actions?

2. Use Priority Questions to collaborate on key research topics across agencies
   - Periodic involvement of researchers from USGS, FWS, NPS, FS RM Station, and Universities with the development of key components of the Science & Research Strategy
     - Current team members may not have sufficient insight or understanding of research processes for the research organizations

3. Use Priority Questions to promote effective & efficient data collection & monitoring investments across agencies
   - Identify joint data needs & regional monitoring needs

4. Be flexible!
   - May need to change priority questions over time to adapt to emerging issues (e.g. barred owl)

6. Formalize an adaptive management framework for SNAP to assist with learning from interagency research findings
   - Sharing research information
   - Develop reporting mechanism for interagency accomplishments
     - Reports for SNAP funded research projects – Annual / 5Yr
   - Periodic discussion of management implications
   - Identify joint action items resulting from periodic review of new science

Other Considerations:
   - Develop process for rectifying workshop editing of goals, subgoals and questions and sharing information back with workshop participants
- Review wording of biodiversity and viability subgoal to ensure compatibility with each agency's mandates
- Science strategy should include a process for determining what science information already exists for priority questions before issuing an RFP for new research
AGENDA
Science & Research Team Meeting
Interagency Building, 4701 N. Torrey Pines Drive

Date: Thursday, Nov. 15, 2007
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Attendees: S&R Team members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:15</td>
<td><strong>Topic: SAR Request Update</strong></td>
<td>Kent Turner</td>
<td>Team will be updated on status of SAR request for additional funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 11:30</td>
<td><strong>Topic: Round 9 Proposal from S&amp;R Team</strong></td>
<td>Kent Turner &amp; Craig Palmer</td>
<td>Team will agree on objectives for a Round 9 proposal from the S&amp;R team. Budget implications of these objectives will be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:30 – 12:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30 – 1:15</td>
<td><strong>Topic: Round 9 Proposal from S&amp;R Team (cont’d)</strong></td>
<td>Kent Turner and Craig Palmer</td>
<td>Team will determine a strategy for completing a pre-proposal by Nov. 27 due date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:15 – 1:45</td>
<td><strong>Topic: Update on Science Strategy Development</strong></td>
<td>Craig Palmer</td>
<td>Team will be updated on results of meetings with the Recreation Team and the Cultural Resources Team. Team will review overall progress of the science strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:45 – 2:00</td>
<td><strong>Topic: Wrap-up</strong></td>
<td>Kent Turner</td>
<td>Confirm next meeting date. Review assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interagency Science and Research Team Meeting

Participants

Interagency Science and Research Team:
  Kent Turner, NPS (Team Lead)
  Carrie Ronning, BLM
  Amy LaVoie, USFWS
  Randy Sharp, USFS
  Craig Palmer, UNLV PLI (Project Manager)
  Jennell Miller, UNLV PLI

Upcoming Meetings

Interagency Science and Research Team Meetings:
  November 21, 2007  |  10 am  |  Conference Call (number tbd)
  December 10, 2007 |  10 am  |  Conference Call (number tbd)
  February 8, 2007  |  9am to 4pm | Interagency Building FWS Conference Room

Science and Research Team Action Items

Please note: For organization due to the large number of action items required in the up-coming weeks, actions are listed after each discussion topic of the meeting.

Meeting Summary

1. SAR Request (Kent)
   Kent updated team on the status of the SAR request for additional funding (available left-over money from Round 7). The Executive Committee has approved the team’s SAR request of $244,000 for 2008 and 2009. The funding is not yet available for transfer. These funds, split three ways (NPS, USFS, and USFWS), will provide two years plus a few months of funding.

   Kent will ask Tami for a timeframe for funding availability and e-mail it to the team.

2. Round 9 Peer Review Process (Jennell Miller)
   Jennell reviewed the peer review process with the team, including the SNAP document titled, “Round 9 Nomination Review Process and Tentative Schedule for Interagency (SNAP) Projects in Clark County.” Jennell distributed copies of the most current versions of the Peer Reviewer’s Worksheets. These worksheets will be used for the Round 9 Peer Review.

   Below is the schedule for the peer review:
ASAP to December 10: S&R Team will e-mail Jennell with nomination topics so she can begin to identify and secure appropriate reviewers.

December 20: Jennifer Haley provides the SNAP Team with copies of the science nominations.

December 20/21: Jennell will distribute nomination to external scientific peer reviewers; S&R team will commence management reviews.

January 18: Management peer reviews are due to Jennell, who will begin to tally results.

January 22: External scientific peer reviews are due to Jennell, who will begin to tally results.

ASAP or by February 5: Jennell distributes tallied results for all reviews to team.

February 8: Team meets from 9-4 at the Interagency Office / FWS Conference Room to discuss results and prepare findings report for the SNAP Board.

February 15: Findings report due to the SNAP Board.

► The S&R Team will carry out the Round 9 Peer Review as described above.

3. Workshop Proceedings (Jennell)

Jennell provided draft copies of the September Natural Resources Staff workshop proceedings.

► Jennell will finish incorporating breakout group comments and distribute electronically; team members will review and provide comments.

4. Round 9 Interagency Science and Research Strategy CI Nomination (Kent and Craig)

Kent talked to Jennifer regarding a Round 9 nomination for implementation of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. Jennifer emphasized project continuity. The Round 4 project ends in August 2008. The team feels that there is currently a lot of momentum in strategy development and it is important to continue with the project by proposing a Round 9 “bridge” project. Round 10 funding would not be available until June 2010, under the best-case scenario.

Considerations for the Round 9 Proposal

The Round 9 project should implement the S&R Strategy. Completion of strategy should lead into the implementation process. Science and Research RFPs for Round 10 should be
based on the strategy. The engagement of other partners is a big part of continuing the program. Once science, research, and monitoring questions and needs are articulated, management can begin to solicit proposals and engage other partners.

**Ideas for Components of the Round 9 Proposal**

1) **Strategy Implementation and Promotion**
   - Put out RFPs and review proposals
   - have an RFP for each of the 8 goal areas (however they are bundled) and glossy brochures.
   - Identify number of researchers working on topics related to the S&R Strategy and monitor how that changes over time (need baseline)

2) **Outreach and Education -- Gathering more information (working groups / small group meetings) and engage the broader scientific community; prepare a report documenting the results of the process. This would be a solicitation/glossy brochure asking groups what they can do to help SNAP answer S&R questions. Perhaps this could result in leveraging Clark County’s science advisory office and others to produce certain analysis reports and implement the strategy…a cost savings in the long run.**

3) **Reporting accomplishment – create synthesis reports and memorialize results**

**Proposal**

- Continue funding of coordination staff
- Develop RFP
- Continue Peer Review (for any science proposal)
- One synthesis report (science information from Rounds 4-6 funded CIs and Land Acquisitions …synthesizing all that came in from those deliverables; organized by sub-goals but maintaining a miscellaneous category; Establishing an AMP process, bringing together people to find out what we know/don’t know. (this is a continuation of the existing project moving toward the final Phase II AMP process.

   1. Synthesize existing final reports (which were created independently); working groups will be utilized depending on the topic.
   2. What is available for each area depends on the team/topic
   3. Outreach process; workshops/groups to further science and research strategy

- Make some progress in each of the sub-goals (i.e., What knowledge have we gained during this time to inform management?)
- SNAP ➔ Subcommittee ➔ Working Group; all audiences need to see value.

Use synthesis report as the product to drive the process to achieve goal areas. At a minimum, UNLV can put together the results of what we produced since Round 4 using
reports (including MSHCP reports) and synthesize what we accomplished. The existing SNAP glossy print summaries have been inadequate in informing management. Our summaries need to emphasize what we learned from the projects? We don’t have to use the teams, we can ask them questions but we don’t have to rely on them. This is an opportunity to look at our whole program (including base dollars?) focused on science and research. The most important thing is getting people together to measure the effectiveness of their activities. A professional opinion on how things have gotten better over time.

It would be helpful to have a synopsis of what has been accomplished and where the data gaps are to date in each goal area. A brief synthesis of existing, on-going work would provide a platform for jumping off into the RFP. Perhaps a summary of what’s currently being done could be created by adding to the summaries provided in the DRI workshop proceedings.

Craig agreed to take on the first 1 or 2 in a prioritized list and see what it takes.

- What prompts us to say: This question is important. We’ve used expert opinion and workshops so far. We have not conducted a thorough literature review to examine a science question. This comes in once a question is settled upon. Getting focused around a question on existing data, literature, and information from experts.
- Choose a sub-goal and think about how you move the science along.
- One product per topic that justifies the questions we’re going after.

Carrie emphasized that it is important to remember that the strategy is not just for SNPLMA; it is about focusing all of our work, even informing our agency base dollar expenditures. We need to sweep more broadly than just talking about SNPLMA. The strategy is important for all types of grant proposals and challenge cost share, in addition, managers could use peer-review process for any type of projects.

Kent requested that the science strategy include an appendix explaining the S&R Strategy history and how it built upon itself over time.

**Budget Considerations**

**Phase I ($620,000)**
- Peer Review
- RFPs (SNPLMA and Glossy) / Science needs catalog
- Outreach – working groups / engaging scientific community
- CI/MSHCP/Land Acquisition synthesis report organized by sub-goal (workshop)

**Phase II ($ ?)**
• Full blown synthesis report with implications to management

Deadline
To Jennifer by: Nov. 26 – Concept. Craig will put together by Monday or Tuesday and everybody respond to Craig as they are available.

Dec. 20th: Full nomination

Jennifer is going to take a 1-2 page concept proposal for Nov. 26th. Make sure Craig has all the questions answered in the handout.

► Team will participate in a conference call on Nov. 21 conference around 10:00 am to review concept sheet; Kent will provide call-in number.
► Team will participate in a conference call on December 13 at 10am to finalize nomination; Kent will provide call-in number.

5. Update on Science Strategy Development
Craig provided summary of meeting with Cultural Resources and Recreation Teams. Mark Boatwright will do a first cut of synthesizing workshop content to create sub-goals, questions, and tasks. Recreation Team members were not all present.
► Kent will talk to Jim Holland (Rec Team) and ask him when he’s going to have the sub-goals, questions, and tasks.
► Sub-goal 2.4 – one of the managers said that the phrase “ecosystem sustainability” might need to be changed/wordsmith. Kent will check on that.

Ad Hoc land use meeting (approx. 10 people). Do we want them all together? Pull out certain people. Carrie will select a couple of dates and provide to the group.

• Mike Boyles (NPS)
• Jim Holland (NPS)
• Erick Walker (FS)
• Kevin DesRoberts (FWS)
• Mark Chatterton (BLM)

Science team will draft Goal 3 sub-goals and then present to the SNAP Board. Craig and Jennell will meet with the Education CI strategy program managers Allison and Daphne

The team asked that Craig e-mail chapters to the team as drafts are completed.

Meeting adjourned at 2:00 pm