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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- The Interagency Science and Research Team provided a review of its overall progress to the SNAP Board at a meeting on January 25, 2008.
- A meeting was held with an ad hoc SNAP Land Use Team to request members’ assistance in the development of the science strategy. These individuals reviewed the draft SNAP Science and Research Strategy sub-goal related to land use and then developed priority science questions and associated contributing questions. Assistance was provided to the Cultural Resources Team and the Recreation Team with the selection and prioritization of their science questions.
- External and management peer reviews were conducted for five SNPLMA Round 9 proposals that were identified as science proposals requiring peer review. Recommendations from these reviews were provided to the SNAP Board for their consideration. Summaries of key comments also are being provided to proposal submitters.
- Proceedings of the natural resources management workshop held on September 13, 2007 were reviewed by the Interagency Science and Research Team. A final draft of the report has been completed and will be sent to workshop participants in early April.
- A graphic summary sheet explaining the components of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy has been prepared.

SUMMARY OF ATTACHMENTS

- Team meeting agenda and notes.
- Science and Research Team summary sheet.

PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

SCIENCE TEAM FACILITATION

Two regular team meetings were held during this quarter on January 8 and March 7, 2008. Prior to each of the meetings, 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) at www.grovesite.com.
The Interagency Science and Research Team was invited to attend the SNAP Board meeting on January 25; it provided an overview of progress on development of the science strategy. Program Manager Craig Palmer (UNLV), assisted by team members, delivered information using PowerPoint slides and handouts for the SNAP Board.

A special team meeting also was held on February 5 to synthesize the results of the peer reviews for the SNAP Board.

Science Steering Committee

The Interagency Science and Research Team continues to address the need for and the mission of a Science and Research Steering Committee. The selection of external peer reviewers for the Round 9 science proposals offered an opportunity to identify some candidate members of this committee. The first task for the steering committee will be the review of the science strategy in June 2008.

Partnerships

Several meetings were held this quarter to request assistance from other SNAP teams in the development of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. On January 31, Dr. Palmer met with the Cultural Resources team to review progress with the selection and prioritization of science questions. On March 24, Drs. Palmer and Jennell M. Miller (UNLV), and Carrie Ronning (BLM) represented the Science team in a meeting with the ad hoc Land Use team. At that meeting, Dr. Palmer explained the overall science strategy and discussed the importance of identifying land use research needs for the SNAP agencies. A draft set of interagency goals, sub-goals, and associated science questions related to land use were prepared at this meeting and will be reviewed by the Science and Research Team at their next meeting. Drs. Palmer and Miller also met with the Deborah Reardon from the Recreation Team to assist her with efforts to identify the science needs of the Recreation Team.

The Science and Research Team met with staff from the Clark County MSHCP program to discuss cooperation in the development of science strategies. Team members were invited to attend an Ecosystem Modeling Workshop held at the Desert Research Institute from Jan. 29-31, 2008. The objective of this workshop was to develop first iteration conceptual models for 11 ecosystems of interest to the Clark County Multi-Species Habitat Conservation Plan (MSHCP) program. Several members of the Interagency Science and Research Team participated in sessions of this workshop as time permitted.

Phase I Strategy

This project provides coordination for the peer review of science proposals that had been submitted for funding as SNPLMA Conservation Initiatives (Clark County only). Five SNPLMA Round 9 proposals were identified as science proposals requiring peer review. Two external peer reviewers were selected to review each of these proposals and provide their comments and rankings. This information was combined with management reviews to develop overall recommendations to the SNAP Board for each proposal at a meeting of the Science and Research team on February 5. A draft of final recommendations was sent to team members for review and comment the following week. A report was prepared and submitted to the SNAP Executive Director on February 14.

Summaries with key comments from the reviews are being prepared to assist submitters with the implementation of their projects (if funded) or the submission of revised proposals for future SNPLMA Rounds.
Phase II Strategy

During the previous quarter, proceedings of the natural resources management workshop held on September 13 were submitted for review by the Science and Research Team and the SNAP Executive Director. During this quarter, comments were received and incorporated into a final draft of the report. This report will be sent to workshop participants in early April 2008.

A focus of the March team meeting was the refinement of Goal 3 of the Science and Research Strategy. After considerable discussion, this goal and associated sub-goals were revised and adopted by the team.

Dr. Miller presented a draft chapter to the team detailing a proposed review process for SNPLMA proposals. Based on the comments of team members and experience gained through the review of Round 9 science proposals, this chapter is being revised and will be incorporated into the overall science strategy.

At the request of the SNAP Board, a one-page graphical representation of the overall strategy of the Science and Research Team was prepared. A draft of this summary sheet was reviewed at the March 7 team meeting and has been revised according to their comments (see attached).

Submitted by:

Margaret N. Rees,
Principal Investigator

Date

April 1, 2008
Attachments
AGENDA
Science & Research Team Meeting
Interagency Building, 4701 N. Torrey Pines Drive

Date: Friday, January 18, 2008
Time: 9:00 a.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Attendees: S&R Team members and guests: Don Sada, Judith Lancaster, and Susan Wainscott

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00 – 9:45</td>
<td>Topic: Clark County MSHCP Science Advisor Ecosystem Health Planning</td>
<td>Don Sada</td>
<td>Team will be updated on the MSHCP Ecosystem Health Workshop on Jan 29-31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:45 – 9:50</td>
<td>Topic: Round 9 External Peer Reviews for Science Proposals</td>
<td>Jennell Miller</td>
<td>Team will receive a status update for external peer reviews of Round 9 science proposals. Timeline will be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:50 – 10:00</td>
<td>Topic: Round 9 Management Reviews for Science Proposals</td>
<td>Kent Turner</td>
<td>Team members will provide their management reviews to Jennell for tallying. Timeline will be reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:45</td>
<td>Topic: S&amp;R Team Presentation to SNAP Board (Jan. 25)</td>
<td>Kent Turner</td>
<td>Team will develop an outline for their presentation to the SNAP Board on January 25. Key topics will be identified and discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:45 – 1:00</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00 – 2:00</td>
<td>Topic: S&amp;R Team Presentation to SNAP Board (Jan. 25) cont’d</td>
<td>Kent Turner</td>
<td>Team will prepare a presentation for the SNAP Board based on morning discussions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00 – 2:15</td>
<td>Topic: Proceedings of S&amp;R Team Natural Resources Management Workshop</td>
<td>Jennell Miller</td>
<td>Team will provide Jennell with review comments. Process for finalizing the report will be discussed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:15 – 2:45</td>
<td>Topic: Update on Science Strategy Development</td>
<td>Craig Palmer</td>
<td>Team will review overall progress of the science strategy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:45 – 3:00</td>
<td>Topic: Wrap-up</td>
<td>Kent Turner</td>
<td>Confirm next meeting date. Review assignments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Interagency Science and Research Team Meeting

January 18, 2008
8:00am to 3:00 pm
Interagency Building
Fish and Wildlife Service
Conference Room
4701 N. Torrey Pines Drive
Las Vegas Nevada 89130

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

Natural Resources Team
  Amy Nichols, USFS
  Patrick Putnam, BLM

Guests
  Don Sada, Desert Research Institute
  Judith Lancaster, Desert Research Institute
  Sue Wainscott, Clark County MSHCP

Upcoming Meetings

Interagency Science and Research Team Meetings:
  February 8, 2008 | 9 am to 2 pm | Interagency Building

Science and Research Team Action Items

- Craig and Jennell will develop a draft PowerPoint from today’s notes for presentation to the SNAP Board on January 25. The S&R Team will review the PowerPoint immediately prior to the presentation and suggest changes/edits.
- Jennell will prepare a background information packet to distribute to the SNAP Board on January 25.
- Team members will provide their management reviews of Round 9 proposals to Jennell by February 1, 2008.
- Jennell will e-mail the team with a combined technical and management review scores package by February 5, 2008.

Meeting Summary

1. Clark County MSHCP Science Advisor Ecosystem Health Planning
   Guests Don Sada (Desert Research Institute, DRI), Judith Lancaster (DRI), and Sue Wainscott (Clark County) provided an update on the MSHCP Ecosystem Health Workshop that will take place January 29-31, 2008. Don Sada explained that Clark County has contracted with DRI to conduct three one-day workshops with MSHCP-Implementing-Agreement signatory agencies and others to prepare first-iteration conceptual models.
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of 11 ecosystems. Questions to be considered in this process include: What constitutes the ecological characteristics of each system? What are the management issues? How do we approach these issues? What are indicators of ecosystem health in the future? These conceptual models will investigate topics such as, invasive species, and other major components in the ecological health of these systems. “Potential Indicators” will be studied, but thresholds will not be part of the workshop discussion or final product. The team was invited to attend and participate in model development.

The 11 ecosystems identified within the MSHCP, which will be the focus of this workshop, and for which the conceptual models will be created are:

- Alpine
- Bristlecone Pine
- Mixed Conifer
- Pinyon-Juniper
- Sagebrush
- Blackbrush
- Salt Desert Scrub
- Mojave Desert Scrub
- Mesquite/Catclaw
- Desert Riparian/Aquatic
- Springs

Sue Wainstock added that the Clark County MSHCP includes an adaptive management plan (AMP). The first six years of the MSHCP have focused on implementation. An AMP needs foundational information to determine what to fund next. DRI is helping Clark County figure out what ecosystems would look like in a perfect world... what makes ecosystems tick and what makes them healthy. The conceptual models will be a compilation of the current understanding of ecosystem health; it is an opportunity to update and bring knowledge together in a broad document. The county is looking for a concise understanding of how the ecosystems work; and it is important that they get agency participation. They want the input of those who have seen the impacts, know what restoration techniques work, have created mental hypotheses, and know where the data exist and where there are gaps. Once the County has an understanding of ecosystems within a human context, they can ask who should be doing what and whether MSHCP should be tracking things differently.

Don added that this process will result in 5-6-page documents that include narrative, charts, and metrics that can tell us where we are on the scale of unhealthy to healthy. The workshops will be extremely focused with quick discussions. They will not get into the details of data and data collection.

Craig asked Don the following question: MSHCP focuses on the conservation of species. The Interagency Science and Research Team has been focusing on the development of science questions related to ecosystems. This group has identified a number of questions in broad categories... How will your process bring in the broader questions, such as how might fire act differently in the different ecosystems?

Don replied: This will come out of the conceptual models. MSHCP talks about different species but balances this with ecosystem health. If systems are not healthy, species are not going to do well. We will avoid talking about individual species in the workshop and focus on the broader issue of ecosystem health.

Carrie asked: NPS has invested $300,000 - $400,000 on models of ecosystem health for the Mojave network of parks. How will you build upon those?

Don replied: Well, the NPS models do not address each of the 11 ecosystems. The two projects take two different slants. Our models will not be duplicative of the NPS models.
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Craig asked: Have you been able to take one of the ecosystems and take it through the process as a sample?

Don replied: Yes, I’ve done a sample conceptual model for springs; it is based on 15 years of research. He decided not to unveil the springs model until after the workshop because it’s difficult to lead people through the project in a way that they don’t get tied up in minutiae.

Don provided the team with a copy of the springs conceptual model but asked that they not share it with others until after the workshop.

Patrick asked: How will the conceptual models relate back to management and management decisions? Say we have a perfect Blackbrush community... are you looking at acceptable uses, which are different from BLM to NFS?

Don replied: The aspect of the models that would pertain to management would be a “Satisfy Human Needs” section. Of course, if people don’t like this, we can modify it. But, it is important to note that the intent of the conceptual model is not to tell agencies how to conduct their management activities... rather these documents should be seen as a tool to evaluate systems and judge health. This is not to tell agencies what to do. For example, if a conceptual model shows that community structures are important for Blackbrush... now agencies can write an RFP to study thresholds of community structures.

Kent asked: When do you anticipate having final products?

Don replied: A report with 11 chapters will be put together by the end of June. Experts who are unavailable to participate in the workshops will review the chapters before they are finalized.

Craig asked: How do these conceptual models fit into national models?

Don replied: We are looking to agency participants to help us with that. Those with such experience should bring in that information.

Randy suggested that DRI consider a follow-up workshop to entice more interest.

Judith noted that an alternative futures project is being conducted by DRI for the greater Las Vegas area. The project is funded by the Office of the Secretary of Defense through the Construction Engineering Research Laboratory of the Army Engineer Research and Development Center. Dave Mouat is the DRI contact for this project. Judith provided a project summary handout entitled “Alternative Futures for the Southwestern United States” and invited the team to participate in the process. The guests then excused themselves to attend other meetings.

2. Round 9 External Peer Reviews for Science Proposals

Jennell provided a status update on the external peer reviews of Round 9 proposals. Two peer reviewers were identified for each of the projects; all reviews were underway and on track to be submitted in time for Jennell to provide the team with tailored results by February 5, 2008.

The SNAP nomination timeline was also reviewed with the team. It was noted that there was a bit of a breakdown that should be smoothed out for the next round. Item 4 of the document entitled, “ROUND 9
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NOMINATION REVIEW PROCESS AND TENTATIVE SCHEDULE FOR INTERAGENCY (SNAP) PROJECTS IN CLARK COUNTY* reads as follows:

A copy of any science-related nominations in Clark County (single and interagency) must be provided to Jennifer Haley on or before Thursday, December 20, 2007, for the Science and Research team peer review.

Jennifer Haley will distribute copies of the nominations to the Science and Research team.

When the S&R Team had not received the proposals by January 3, 2008, Jennell e-mailed Jennifer asking how to obtain them. Jennifer e-mailed Tami Lucero asking Tami to provide the proposals to Jennell. Tami provided the titles of all the submitted projects, and Jennell selected from among the titles (Kent reviewed and approved the selection). Tami then uploaded the selected files to Grovesite. Randy noted that the issue has been with deciding which projects will be considered "science projects."

3. S&R Presentation to the SNAP Board (January 25, 9:30am in the Interagency Building)

The team discussed the components they would like to have included in their presentation to the SNAP Board on January 25, 2008.

Members of the S&R Team have been approached by Nancy Christ to clarify the meaning of the "Requests for Proposals (RFP)" described within the team’s Round 9 nomination. The S&R Team describes the RFPs as a needs assessment intended to be distributed at the time of the call for proposals; a statement of the issues and elements identified in science strategy that would be available for each round. The S&R Team feels that one way to accomplish this is by providing language with the call for nominations package; science providers with the agencies would be encouraged to meet these needs. On the other hand, there might be time in May to send out something from this group soliciting concepts based upon needs identified within the science strategy. Staff could then take forward and flesh out the concepts that the S&R Team selects. There could be decision by SNPLMA managers (executive committee) to make the decision to narrow the focus.

It was noted that the SNAP Science Strategy document must demonstrate the relationship between the science and research strategy and the rest of the SNPLMA process.

PowerPoint components, which Craig and Jennell will develop into a PowerPoint are as follows:

- SNAP Science and Research Strategy Goals
  - Provide background information on how the goals, sub-goals, questions, and tasks were derived (diagram)
  - Goals 1-3; the team will ask for concurrence with the wording of the three goals.
  - A series of animated slides will take them through the levels of the science strategy for one goal, sub-goal, tasks, and questions.
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- Progress on sub-goals, questions, and tasks
  - A slide on Goal 2 will show the progress the S&R Team and Craig have made to date in meeting with other appropriate SNAP teams. The Team will ask the SNAP Board whether ad hoc groups can be formed for “Land Uses” and “Public Outreach” and if so, to provide the names of individuals to serve on the groups.
  - A slide on Goal 3 will state the corresponding sub-goals. The Team will ask the SNAP Board how they would like to participate in the development of Goal 3.

- Next steps – Round 9 Proposal from the S&R Team
  - Implementing the strategy; components of the S&R Team Round 9 proposal
  - Peer Review Process
  - SNPLMA Decision Process (where does the S&R Team reviews fit?)
  - Graphics of peer review worksheets and a pertinent quote to be taken from the Round 7 pilot peer reviews.
  - Synthesis Reports – Have 2 to 3 slides demonstrating the process for creating a synthesis report. Have 1 slide showing how the synthesis reports meet the S&R Team’s charter goals.

- Review of current Round 9 science proposals
  - Projects under review
  - Peer review timeline

- Planning for Round 10
- Discussion

Jennell will create a packet that includes:
- “Arriving at Strategy Goals” diagram
- Agency goals packet with newest DOI and FS goals (Google to find and download)
- Printout of SNAP Science and Research Strategy Goal 1, sub-goals, tasks, and questions
- Appendix A from Round 9 (showing how all the CIs fit under the goals)
- Complete copies of the draft proceedings
- Questions from ecological health workshops that will be used to form Goal 2, sub-goals, questions, and tasks

4. Proceedings of the S&R Team Natural Resources Workshop
On December 5, 2007, Jennell met with Jennifer Haley as part of a Conservation Initiatives Program Manager’s meeting that occurs regularly between Jennifer and Public Lands Institute staff. At that meeting, Jennell provided Jennifer with a hard copy of the draft Proceedings of the Natural Resources Workshop. Jennifer asked that the proceedings not be distributed until the wording of the Goals could be approved by the SNAP Board.

Kent met with Jennifer, who explained that the SNAP Board was concerned about the wording of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy Goals because it does not explain how Goals relate to agency missions. The team considered this information and decided that the...
new text, “Within the context of agency missions:” will be added above the listing as the
goals as follows:

**Within the Context of Agency Missions:**

**GOAL 1**
Restore, sustain, and enhance southern Nevada ecosystems

**GOAL 2**
Provide for responsible use of southern Nevada lands in a manner that preserves the heritage
resources and promotes an understanding of human interaction with the landscape

**GOAL 3**
Promote integrated approaches to ensure effective and efficient management activities

5. **Update on Science Strategy Development**
Jennell provided the team with a hard copy of a rough draft of the chapter on the peer-review process. The
team can discuss the chapter contents and the next meeting, but Jennell has certain changes and additions in
mind to make to this version.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 pm.
# AGENDA

**Science & Research Team Meeting**  
Interagency Building, 4701 N. Torrey Pines Drive

**Date:**  Friday, March 7, 2008  
**Time:**  9:00 a.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
**Attendees:** S&R Team members, Jennifer Haley

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Desired Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9:00 – 11:00 | **Topic: Goal 3 of Science Strategy**  
Presenter: Kent Turner and Jennifer Haley  
Desired Outcome: Team will review and edit Goal 3 of the science strategy with the assistance of Jennifer Haley (representing the SNAP Board). | | |
| 11:00 – 11:15 | **Topic: Follow up to S&R Team Presentation to SNAP Board (Jan. 25)**  
Presenter: Jennell Miller  
Desired Outcome: Team will review S&R Strategy summary sheet for use by the SNAP Board. | | |
| 11:15 – 11:30 | **Topic: Proceedings of S&R Team Natural Resources Management Workshop**  
Presenter: Jennell Miller  
Desired Outcome: Team will decide on how to present the “tasks” section of the goals in this report. | | |
| 11:30 – 11:45 | **Topic: Update on Science Strategy Development**  
Presenter: Craig Palmer  
Desired Outcome: Team will review overall progress of the science strategy including updates of Goal 2 topics and chapter development. | | |
| 11:45 – 1:00 | **Lunch** | | |
| 1:00 – 1:30 | **Topic: Synthesis documents**  
Presenter: Craig Palmer  
Desired Outcome: Team will begin planning the preparation of synthesis documents using “invasives” as an example topic. Team will discuss approaches to data gathering and synthesis. | | |
| 1:30 – 1:45 | **Topic: Lists of T&E Species**  
Presenter: Kent Turner  
Desired Outcome: Team will discuss the development of a common list of T&E species of interest across agencies. | | |
| 1:45 – 2:00 | **Topic: Wrap-up**  
Presenters: Kent Turner  
Desired Outcome: Confirm next meeting date. Review assignments. | | |
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Interagency Science and Research Team Meeting

March 7, 2008
9:00am to 2:30 pm
Interagency Building
Conference Room A
4701 N. Torrey Pines Drive
Las Vegas Nevada 89130

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

Guest(s)
  Jennifer Haley, Southern Nevada Agency Partnership

Upcoming Meetings

Interagency Science and Research Team Meetings:
  April 16, 2008  |  9 am to 2 pm  |  Interagency Building

Science and Research Team Action Items

Hold down control and click on the links below to go directly to the pertinent section within the document.

- Jennell will e-mail team the newly revised Goal 3 Sub-goals, which team members will review. Members are also asked to insert task ideas for discussion at the next meeting. (Topic 1)
- Jennell will update the draft one-page graphic summary sheet. (Topic 2)
- Jennell will revise Natural Resources Management Workshop Proceedings based on today’s discussion and e-mail it to break-out session participants. She will also have hard copies spiral bound for each team member. (Topic 3)
- Jennell will prepare recommendation summaries for submitters of Round 9 science and research strategy-relevant proposals. (Topic 5)
- Team members will provide their T&E Species lists to Jennell via e-mail. (Topic 7)
- Amy will e-mail the team the scope of work for development of the 11 ecosystem conceptual models by DRI. Members will then look at all projects occurring or recently completed within their agencies that overlap or could overlap with these models (by the next meeting). (Wrap-up Discussion)

Meeting Summary

1. Goal 3 of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy

The Interagency Science and Research Team (S&R Team) reviewed and edited Goal 3 of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy with the assistance of Jennifer Haley. The results of this activity are as follows (next page):
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Previous 3.1 Develop and maintain a science strategy to guide and facilitate SNAP resource management decisions to achieve SNAP partnership goals. (2007)

Revised 3.1 Develop and maintain a science strategy to guide and facilitate Southern Nevada resource management decisions to achieve SNAP Science and Research Goals 1 and 2. (3/07/2008)

Notes: The previous version of this sub-goal indicates a larger scope than the team is tasked with planning for in the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. There is definitely value in integrating a scientific process into a larger interagency strategies and operations, and the SNAP Board may very well wish to do so. However, for the purposes of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy Goal 3 should be limited to how the strategy will operate.

Previous 3.2 Establish and maintain a process for interagency and interdisciplinary analysis and assessment of SNAP science and research proposals, projects, and products. (2007)

Revised 3.2 Establish a transparent process for interagency and interdisciplinary analysis and assessment of SNAP science and research proposals, projects, and products. (3/07/2008)

Notes: Team members considered other verbs to replace “establish,” such as “promote” and “develop.” Ultimately, the Team decided to retain the word “establish” because it is a strong word that indicates results will occur. The team decided to remove the word “maintain.” Members also agreed to add the adjective “transparent” before “process” to reflect that the express purpose of including an interdisciplinary review of proposals, projects, and products is to add an important measure of impartiality in decision-making; related decisions should withstand internal or external inspection.

Previous 3.3 Define, develop, and maintain effective linkages between SNAP teams to share data, database management systems, staff, and resources. (2007)

Revised 3.3 Ensure effective linkages among SNAP agencies, its teams, and partners for the dissemination of knowledge and sharing of data, results, data collection and management systems, staff, and resources. (3/07/2008)

- Standards (consider a “task” beneath this sub-goal that speaks to identifying and promoting the use of standard methods, data-collection processes, and other research standards.)

Notes: The team refined this sub-goal with more detail and provided an idea for a task falling under this sub-goal.

New 3.4 Engage the broader scientific community through outreach and partnership participation by seeking their input and resources to meet priority research needs. (new sub-goal 3/07/2008)

Notes: Since the original creation of draft Goal 3 Sub-goals, the S&R Team has identified a new objective (engagement of the broader scientific community) that would benefit SNAP science and research activities and, therefore, has decided to make it a formal sub-goal. By reaching out and engaging the broader scientific community in SNAP science and research needs, both parties benefit. External entities benefit by having a defined set of needed research activities on the public lands.
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around which to build research projects and programs while the agencies benefit from data, results, and knowledge obtained.

Previous 3.5 Provide mechanisms for the synthesis of findings to yield implications for applying adaptive management techniques to SNAP conservation actions and for application in other SNAP activities

Previous 3.6 Identify an improved set of indicators of measurable success and conduct effectiveness monitoring

New 3.5 Implement an adaptive management process to synthesize Southern Nevada science and research findings that inform and improve future management decisions and actions (3/10/2008)
  • Fill gaps.
  • Identify measurable indicators of success.

Notes: The S&R Team rolled the concepts identified in previous Sub-goals 3.5 and 3.6 into a new Sub-goal 3.5 and have provided ideas for “tasks” falling under this sub-goal.

2. Follow up to S&R Team Presentation to SNAP Board (January 25)

In response to Bill Dickinson’s request during the S&R Team update to the SNAP Board on January 25, 2008, Jennell has been working on the development of a single-page, graphic summary sheet, which she presented to the S&R Team at the last meeting. She distributed today, a new version, which has been revised based on the Team’s suggestions. The Team used the updated summary sheet as they discussed Goal 3 (described above). Jennell will further refine the summary sheet to ensure alignment with the newly revised Goal 3 sub-goals.


Jennell has updated the Proceedings of the Interagency Natural Resources Management Workshop based on S&R Team suggestions and SNAP Board requests. One additional matter remains regarding language: When the Interagency Science and Research Team met with the SNAP Board, a comment was made about the word “tasks” and whether these items (falling under science questions) should be called tasks since they are really questions, grammatically speaking. The team considered the following options:

  • Replace the word “Task” with:
    o Sub-questions
    o Exploratory Sub-questions
    o Task-level questions
    o Questions Addressing Data Gaps
    o Contributing Questions
    o Defining Questions

  • Have Jennell re-phrases current task questions so that they become statements, followed by team review.

  • Make no changes at this time.

March 7, 2008 | 3
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After discussion, the Team decided that the word “Task” should be replaced with “Contributing Questions” in the Natural Resources Management Workshop Proceedings and in the development of the Strategy.

Jennifer also noted that the S&R Team uses the term “SNAP Lands,” on occasion. This term should be revised to read “Southern Nevada lands managed by BLM, NPS, FS, and FWS” because SNAP is a partnership. SNAP does not have a land management function, although the individual entities that SNAP comprises do.

Jennifer will make the above adjustments to the Proceedings document and distribute it to session participants via e-mail. She will also arrange to have four spiral-bound copies made for each agency as well as copies for UNLV reporting purposes. Jennifer also requested that the proceedings be placed on GroveSite within the final report section.

4. Update on Science Strategy Development
Craig provided a handout that he is planning to distribute at the upcoming Land Use Ad Hoc Group; the handout listed questions from the DRI Health Assessment Workshop that would be related to this sub-goal. He asked the team which questions to keep and which to strike. They concluded that questions 5, 6, 7, 10, 13, and 15 should be moved under the Recreation Sub-goal. Regarding question 17, the term “recreation activities” should be removed. For question 19, the team asked, “What are the important ecological components and where are they located?” The team suggested that Craig not distribute the handout at the beginning of the meeting, he should only use it if the group seems stuck. The resource management staff, who contributed these questions did so within the context of the DRI workshop activities and have a different perspective than the members of the Land Use Ad Hoc Group will have.

Carrie recommended that the group be approached as follows: “One purpose of the SNAP Science and Research strategy is to inform folks of program data gaps.” What are the things that make you think: “If only I knew ‘X’, I would be able to better plan for ‘Y’.” Many new questions may arise as projects are being designed for wind farms, solar farms, etc.

Amy emphasized that it is important to recognize that Land use questions may arise (e.g., urban development, urban planning, etc) that are outside of the scope of the SNAP Science and Research Strategy. The S&R Team must ensure that questions falling under strategy sub-goals are confined to the scope of the strategy.

Kent noted that the S&R Team will likely want to add broader science questions under the Authorized Land Use sub-goal following review of the contributions of the Land Use Ad Hoc Group. He anticipates that the S&R Team will add questions from a science strategy perspective related to long-term conservation goals, most effective mitigation actions for a right-away project to minimize impact, the rate of activities being monitored over time, etc. It will be important to identify projected needs for the various land uses.

It was also noted that within this sub-goal, the term “SNAP Land Uses” should be replaced with “Manage authorized BLM, NPS, FS, FWS land uses in Southern Nevada.”

Craig also announced that he has spoken with Laurie Perry from the Interagency Cultural Resources Team and she has promised revised sub-goals, science questions, and contributing questions (previously called “tasks”) related to cultural resources and historic context by March 31, 2008.
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5. Peer-Review Process
Jennifer noted that the Recommendation Report prepared by the S&R Team regarding Round 9 Conservation Initiatives proposals relevant to the SNAP Science and Research Strategy was sent to the SNAP Board. The SNAP Board was pleased with the report and found it very helpful. Steve Tryon is going to talk to the subgroup and see how they would like to use the report and whether other (outside of Clark County) science and research proposals should be reviewed according to the same process and facilitated by the S&R Team.

Jennifer will prepare recommendation summaries for submitters; she will remove numeric point ratings and scores and summarize key concepts that might be helpful to the authors.

6. Synthesis Reports
Craig invited the S&R Team to begin planning the preparation of synthesis documents using “invasives” as an example topic. Craig distributed a handout listing the previously SNPLMA projects with an invasive species component and their dollar amounts. Kent noted that projects related to burros and wild horses should be removed from the list. Craig asked for the team’s advice on how to approach gathering information related to invasive species that has been generated. The team provided the following recommendations:

Invasive Plants: We have SNRT, which doesn’t handle all aspects of invasives species (such as quagga mussels) but could address a lot of them. SNRT and weed Conservation Initiatives have contributed to the Weed-Sentry Program, so findings from that would be a place to start.

- Review “Weed Sentry” and Exotic Plant Management Team (EPMT) deliverables and products (e.g., annual reports, project closeout reports to MSHCP, and other reports) already provided
- Rewrite report contents to better inform management
- Curt Deuser and Scott Abella have submitted an article to the Journal of Environmental Management, which has been accepted. This article contains important, relevant tables of survey results
- Talk to the Southern Nevada Restoration Team (SNRT); engage the appropriate teams, ask teams for reports and results; interview them for lessons learned
- Check with Stan Smith, Matt Brooks, and Leslie DeFalco to determine the status of their ongoing project with our staffs
- Identify what information we are collecting through these projects
- Concentrate on documented results not opinions
- Know that effectiveness monitoring is occurring, but that effectiveness monitoring isn’t being done in some cases (e.g., tamarisk treatment; effectiveness monitoring doesn’t occur in the treatment of this species)
- Summarize what groups are doing
- Incorporate text to guide the way reports are done.
- Track source of information
- Teams are going to enter their metrics into GroveSite, this might be helpful.

Carrie asked whether the synthesis reports will utilize information generated by projects funded through SNPLMA’s MSHCP category. The scope of the reports and described in the Round 9 proposal is limited to SNPLMA-funded projects, but not necessarily conservation initiatives. Kent recommended that if it’s not too daunting, we should examine everything the treatment crew has done on the SNAP lands since Round 4, including MSHCP projects. It was also noted that SNPLMA MSHCP results and “Section 10” MSHCP efforts are worth looking at because they are reported on in a succinct format.
7. Threatened and Endangered Species Lists
The Team discussed the development of a common, cross-agency list of T&E species/species of interest for inclusion within the SNAP Science and Research Strategy.

It was noted that the next round of MSHCP Section 10 funding will be awarded specifically to projects concerning species directly impacted by development in the valley. Interagency species monitoring might be necessary to replace what had been done for the past eight years by MSHCP, due to permit laws.

To form a common list of priority species for the SNAP Science and Research Strategy, consider the SNAP goal to prevent extinction of species on any of our collective lands. Species that might be in danger of becoming extirpated should move to the top of the list, even if it’s endemic and limited to only one agency’s land. The team suggested that a table or matrix be devised that organizes species of interest by level of rarityness and threats. Species at the top of list are really rare and have a high degree of threat, no matter where they are located. The table or matrix would be maintained over time and expected to change over time. For example, 5 points would be awarded to a species that was endangered of extinction globally, 4 points if it was in danger locally, and “x” number of points if it had some other local managerial significance (e.g., Management Indicator Species, MIS).

Randy suggested that the priority species list be part of the “Science Needs and Priorities” section of the strategy. T&E species should be part of the strategy and part of the annual needs assessment and used as a guiding principal for submitted proposals. This list would really let people know up front what the agencies are interested in researching at a given time.

Team members agreed to provide their inclusive lists to Jennell via e-mail.

The following item should be added to the next meeting’s agenda: The S&R Team will look at ranking the species and determine whether they are comfortable with using the ranking system that they devise or whether they should identify specialist(s) to determine the ranking.

8. Wrap Up
Kent announced that the S&R Team is requested by the SNAP Board to assess the 11 conceptual ecosystem models that are currently being prepared by DRI (Don Sada, Judith Lancaster, and Dave Mouat). One question is, “How can SNAP agencies incorporate these models?” Amy agreed to e-mail the scope of work for this project for the S&R Team’s review. Members should look at all projects occurring or recently completed within their agency that overlap or could overlap with these models (by the next meeting). Perhaps the Team should have a couple of meetings or series of meetings with DRI to continue to coordinate efforts.

Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.
**Goal 1: Natural Resources**

- **Fire**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Invasive Species**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Watersheds & Landscapes**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Biodiversity**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions

**Goal 2: Human Interaction**

- **Cultural Resources**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Historic Context**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Recreation**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Land Use**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions
- **Education**
  - Science Questions ▶ Contributing Questions

**Goal 3: Approach**

**Adaptive Management**
Develop and maintain a strategy to guide and facilitate Southern Nevada resource management decisions to achieve SNAP Science and Research Goals 1 and 2.

**Broad Perspectives & Transparent Processes**
Establish processes to assess SNAP science and research proposals, projects, and products. Conduct management reviews and coordinate external peer reviews to augment and enhance proposals and study designs.

**Effective Linkages**
Ensure connections for agencies, teams, and partners to disseminate knowledge and share data-collection and management systems, data, results, staff, and resources.

**Information Synthesis**
Gather, evaluate, and integrate information to inform and improve agency management and to apprise SNAP teams and research entities of findings.

**Strategic Proposal Solicitation**
Circulate annual needs assessment and encourage submission of SNLMA or other proposals to meet science and research needs identified within the strategy.

**Engagement of the Broader Scientific Community**
Develop outreach, workshops, and other partnership activities to help researchers understand, provide input about, and meet agency research needs.

Draft 3/27/2008