

**Crown Managers Partnership  
Hi5 Working Group Meeting  
April 24, 2019  
Meeting Notes**

**PARTICIPANTS:** Jodi Krakowski; Linh Hoang; Brad Jones; Dawn LaFleur; Karl Anderson; Melissa Jenkins; Kurt Wetzstein; Robert Keane; Amy Nicolas; Wonnita Andrus, Rob Sissons; Bill Hodge (Bob Marshall Wilderness Foundation); Kristina Benoit, Andrian Leslie, Elliott Meyer, Austin Rempel; Ellen Jungck, Jenny Burgess; Dianna Tomback; Anna Schoettle, Mary Frances Mahalovich; Jenny Burgess, Ellen Jungck; Tracy Tarves

**Additional Agenda Items**

Reminder of the Annual Meeting – September 12, 2019 in Pablo, MT. Deliberately scheduled same week to promote additional participation from individuals already planning on attending the Whitebark Pine Ecosystem Conference that week.

For logistical reasons, will likely require registration to get an idea of the numbers of individuals that will be attending.

Agenda and registration reminder will be sent out shortly once the agenda is finalized.

**Whitebark Restoration Strategy Update (Melissa Jenkins-High Five Tech Team Coordinator)  
Melissa's PowerPoint (Attached Along With Notes)**

Key Points

Crown of the Continent Ecosystem (CCE) encompasses the middle range of the WBP extent and the Northern range of Limber Pine extent (map shows extent of both ranges). It is noted from the map that the Flathead NF and Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribal Lands have no known Limber Pine sites. Both often grow in the same places. Way to ID is through cone ID – color, WBP fall apart and Limber stay together – Limber opened up by Nutcracker

Within the CCE WBP and Limber Pine are very sick with high infection rates from WP Blister Rust and attacks from Mtn. Pine Beetles. Major reason for decline – WP Blister Rust and Native Mtn Pine Beetle and some of the fire exclusion policies

Limber Pine is on the east side of the Continental divide – once across the border into Canada goes to the west

On Flathead NF & Tribal lands – no Limber Pine

Why is the CCE important for restoration? – due to prevalence – largest concentration of Whitebark located there than anywhere

90% increase in live and healthy trees

CCE trees most unhealthy in BC

Operations of this group now supported by the Crown Managers Partnership (CMP). The first joint meeting held in BC between the Hi5 CCE working group and the CMP focused on development for a formal structure that incorporated both pace and scale for restoration strategies and implementation.

One of the main strategies of the HI 5 Group was to develop a Crown wide Restoration Strategy

Began by asking for volunteers within the CCE to assist with a pilot – resulted in the following participation:

- Glacier National Park
- Flathead National Forest
- Confederated Salish-Kootenai Tribal Lands

The CCE pilot was created from formation of a transboundary multi agency effort and shared partnership with funding being provided by multiple sources:

BLM	\$ 2500.00
USFS	\$15000.00
Parks Canada	\$20000.00
Alberta Environment/Parks	<u>\$ 7500.00</u>
	\$45000.00

RFP sent out in Aug – contract awarded in Oct 2018 to Map Monsters

CCE Pilot Contractor Final Report is due June 1<sup>st</sup> that will document the processes that were used and the data layers that were used along with the final pilot restoration strategy timeline of November 1<sup>st</sup>, 2019? – not sure what this will be called.

\*\*There will be additional work required to complete the report so as writing preamble, restoration strategies, data compilation and assessment

Last step is to prioritize areas for conservation and then a determination for access.

## “Five Main Steps”

### **Step 1.) ID where WBP is capable of existing:**

Map Monsters with recommendations from the technical team evaluated the models and arrived at a map that showed where WBP was existing – also used info from Ian Housman and Sharon Bladdadder. Had potential range – Houseman model and a predicted range

Potential is more inclusive and predicted is more refined

### **Step 2.) Where does WBP provide the highest conservation value?**

With the volunteers in the Pilot each unit has their own thoughts as to what the highest conservation value is – process gone through in every area

*Wildlife Food Source*– one of the major ecosystem values – need to know where WBP are producing cones, where there is rust resistance, where can trees exist in recent climate

*Watershed Protection* (Municipal or at risk)– looked at Bull Trout streams but then got input that WB wouldn't matter but did include municipal watersheds

#### *Scenic Recreation and Educational Values*

Some question whether this value should be included

If all things being equal why not restore WBP where people can see it

Some of the trails where WBP grow have a higher conservation and educational value for their use.

#### *Grizzly Bear Habitat*

Did decide to include, but wasn't weighted high in Conservation Value

#### *Potential Cone Production*

#### *Biophysical Characteristics*

Came up with guidelines as to how to map and cutoffs for elevation that we know where WBP grows

#### *Persistence in Future Climate*

Where will the climate be appropriate for WBP 100 years from now

Wasn't given a high value because of so many unknowns

#### *Rust Resistance*

Amongst all of the areas where do we have the highest conservation values for rust resistance

Buffers larger around trees that came out of the highest in the rust resistance screening i.e. in the top 25 % -within those buffers we will more conservation efforts i.e. reduce mtn pine beetle in those areas etc.

Weighted the Conservation Values

Generally binary (Yes/No)

Maximum weight of 50 i.e. Rust Resistance obtained 50

Relooking at the numbers because there was so many cumulative effects in a particular area – i.e. cone production – it muted some of the other conservation values

Showed the overall Conservation Value for the Flathead Forest

Class 1 – 61,000 acres

Ski Area and Municipal Watershed –Whitefish Mountain Resort Ski Area FNF Class 1 100+ Highest Concentration Value (CV)

Wilderness Value – was rated equally against other values but don't have as much data in that area – but it does have high ratings but

***Step 3.) Identify and quantify the threats and stressors to WBP:***

- White Pine Blister Rust
- Mountain Pine Beetle
- Succession
- Wildfire that burned in WBP range

Did not do a binary – scored

High CV-Low Stressor <> High CV-High Stressor

Low CV-Low Stressor <> Low CV-High Stressor

\*Rate conservation value

\*Rate level of stressor; past impacts & future risks

\*evaluate adequacy of distribution/connectivity of the highest rated CV areas to further prioritize

Succession

Wildfire-Fire Severity`

White Pine Blister Rust – almost throughout the area blister rust occurrence is high

In areas that is really wet – won't get a reduced rating

Mountain Pine Beetle

Once the highest conservation values and threats and stressors have been ID need to determine restoration efforts

National Strategy stresses to make sure the location chosen has strong connectivity

Still trying to figure out the connectivity and distribution question

**Step 4.) Prioritize on where to apply restoration actions:**

Once we decide where the highest priority areas to restore – will decide what actions to use  
Still a work in progress, compiling data & identifying steps most time consuming.

Protection – cone collection

Landscape fuel reduction – i.e. if there is high blister rust could do there

Full suite of restorations activities – high conservation and high threat

**Step 5.) Identify which potential actions to use:**

Once we have id highest priority area – will decide what actions we can due based on land management restrictions/location.

Accessibility an issue in the Flathead, better access in Glacier as the occurrence of WB can be reached via trails

Questions to the Group

What does the group think about the 5 steps, the type of data used and any problems you might envision using that type of data in your respective areas?

Would like to get data that portray similar values for the data

Brad – Recreation and Scenic Values – did that differ a lot between the 3 units?

A: Glacier Park weighted that value higher than the Flathead which weighted it higher than the CSKT lands and they were defined a little differently

Ellen – When you provided the ranking – each agency came up with their own values for those values – will agencies have their own separate rating or will there be consistency

A: Will do both (each unit will have their own and will have a consistent rating across the Crown

Reasons for that – various data sets for specific units/areas may be better quality than other units/areas.

Consistent rating will be completed prior to Map Monster contract ending June 1

There are 3 excellent examples of Restoration Strategies that have been done to date i.e. in the Pacific NW which need to be reviewed

What hasn't been done is seeding – seeding needs to be explored more as an option

## **NEXT STEPS REQUIRED**

- Review the other restoration reports of projects that have been done to date
- Pull together the data/maps
- Write up the background material (description of restoration actions)
- Ground truthing the mapping - Unless people know of crews that they have that could assist with WBP surveys – doesn't think it will be a time consuming thing – i.e. could do as part of cone surveys

### **Est. timeline to complete the report – November 2019**

Require someone with technical expertise to assist with the above

Melissa can continue to participate but needs help

Are there certain sections where your agencies can assist with writing?

Would like to know if there are data layers that have been omitted?

What does the group think about the process?

Amy – Connectivity – will be harder to define - what variables were used to produce the present map  
A – was based on a moving window analysis - Mary Frances provided data outlining what is required to sustain populations need a 1000 individuals - so used that to create a moving window analysis

Rob Sissons – will help where he can and has a staff member who would be helpful in writing some of the sections & outline that can be developed in the fall, Rob will also look to identify people for additional help with the steps

**ACTION: Rob Sissons will create an outline for the document before field season which would be sent to the Tech team first prior to circulating to the wider group**

Need to think about what this document could be used for i.e could it support requests for funding for Phase II?

Design would be the Crown wide Final Document

Could wait until we have the Crown wide restoration complete but could outline now?

Writing could start now (fall and winter)

Could consider having part of the contract include writing

## **Request for Funding**

*Parks Canada* has committed \$15,000

*American Forests* – update – not clear at this time if they will fund – they are having issues with finding funds from the Forest Service - so initial introduction made, discussions are still on-going, not sure of the outcome

*Catalyst Fund* – proposal being submitted for \$25,000 of which \$5 to 6000 will go to WBEF who will be submitting the application

**ACTION: Individuals asked to look internally to your agencies to see if there are pots of funding available within your budgets (money available at the end of fiscal year end)**

### *Overview of Waterton Biosphere Reserve*

Is the fiscal agent for the CMP which allows agencies to contribute via an agreement and can be held until projects are executed. Sits in a bank on the US side but just invoice when needed

### **Data to be compiled outside of the Pilot**

This process has begun. Phil Matson who works for the CMP that is pulling the information together. Actively pursuing data

### **Will the Pilot include WBP or Limber Pine**

Anna – doesn't see any reason why the process couldn't be applied to the Limber Pine – but would probably have less data

Rob indicated we should include it in the final – Waterton has information on Limber Pine

Anna - To include Limber would stimulate what information is required

Jodi – habitat data built for both species – Limber data not as reliable as WB but would suggest that we include

Anna – is your Limber Pine data less reliable why? Can grow over a greater habitat but smaller range – also due the scope and scale of resources available

**AGREED: Limber Pine will be included in next Project**

## **Charter Update and Review of Sub-committees**

Main focus is to build a team to undertake the next steps for the Restoration Project

Activities of all other sub-committees on hold at the present to focus efforts on the above

Replace Appendix 1 With organizations and individuals that Id as part of the membership of the WG – please email us with your contact information

**ACTION: If there are any issues with the Charter regarding revisions please let Brad Jones [brad.jones@gov.ab.ca](mailto:brad.jones@gov.ab.ca) know – will leave the document open for the next 2 weeks and will put out to the group for larger feedback**

### **Update from Working Group Members**

Focus on Actions that you are doing in the field season that may affect the rest of the group

#### **MT**

Dawn – Glacier – focus on the WBP restoration efforts where there was fire. Also providing WBP to Waterton to continue restoration work in their fire areas

Karl - Follow up on Dawns update on the WBP restoration efforts in Waterton. The Flathead NF was able to share and transfer ~2,000 seedlings each between not only Waterton NP, but also the Lolo NF and Salish-Kootenai tribes. Also, the Flathead will be working closely with CSKT in coordinating and implementing planting their allotment of seedlings. This effort of coordination and implementation within the CCE will be demonstrated in a presentation of that process at the Hi 5 Annual Meeting. Sow and Grow will be working with Coeur d’alene Nursery and the CSKT Nursery in Pablo to grow WBP and get on the CCE landscape

#### **AB**

Jodi – Focus to partner with Parks Canada and monitor the monitoring transects that they monitor every 5 years and have seedlings that have to be planted

Rob – will continue their restoration work – thank you for the trees. On a national level – coming up with a implementation of a restoration strategy - last work shop in April – should be able to share more info in fall

Needs at present are volunteers to continue the work on the Restoration Strategy