

# Forest Health Monitoring Program Review

Annual FHM Workshop

Jan 30, 2007

Steve Patterson

USDA Forest Service, Alaska Region

Assistant Director S&PF,

Forest Health Protection

# Presentation Objectives

## Inform about the Review

- ✓ Process
- ✓ Findings/ Recommendations
- ✓ Next Steps

# Program Review Process

- Directors Recommendation, 12/05
- Team Assembled
- Prework
- FHM Presentations, 10/31/06
- Interviews, 11/01/06
- Initial Team Report Out, 11/02/06
- Final Report, 12/14/06

(view at <http://fhm.fs.fed.us/>)

# Review Team Members

## **Jerry Boughton**

Assist Director, Forest Health & Economics  
Northeastern Area  
USDA Forest Service  
Newtown Square, Pennsylvania

## **Doug Daoust**

Group Leader, Forest Health Protection  
Pacific Northwest Region  
USDA Forest Service  
Portland, Oregon

## **Brent Larson**

Director of Vegetation Management  
Intermountain Region,  
USDA Forest Service  
Ogden, Utah

## **Steve Patterson**

Assistant Director, State and Private Forestry  
Alaska Region  
USDA Forest Service  
Anchorage, Alaska

## **Bruce Jewell**

Assistant Director  
Southern Research Station  
USDA Forest Service  
Asheville, North Carolina

## **Catherine Sparks**

Acting State Forester  
Rhode Island Division of Forest Environment  
North Scituate, Rhode Island

# Participants

<b>Bill Bechtold</b>	Southern Research Station, Research Triangle Park, NC
<b>Jim Brown</b>	FHP Southern Region, Atlanta, GA
<b>Mike Bohne</b>	FHP Pacific Southwest Region, Sacramento, CA
<b>Charlie Burnham</b>	Massachusetts Bureau of Forestry, Amherst, MA
<b>Roger Burnside</b>	Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Anchorage, AK
<b>Barb Conkling</b>	North Carolina State Univ., Research Triangle Park, NC
<b>Tom DeGomez</b>	University of Arizona, Flagstaff, AZ
<b>Jeri Lyn Harris</b>	FHP Rocky Mountain Region, Denver, CO
<b>Dave Heinzen</b>	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Grand Rapids, MN
<b>Mike Kangas</b>	North Dakota Forest Service, Fargo, ND
<b>Doug Powell</b>	NFS Ecosystem Management Coordination, Washington, DC
<b>Rob Mangold</b>	Director of FHP, Arlington, VA
<b>Manfred Mielke</b>	FHP Northeastern Area SPF, St. Paul, MN
<b>Randy Morin</b>	FIA Northern Research Station, Newtown Square, PA
<b>Roger Mech</b>	Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing, MI
<b>Alison Nelson</b>	FHP Pacific Northwest Region, Portland, OR
<b>Greg Reams</b>	R&D National Program Manager for FIA, Arlington, VA
<b>Karen Ripley</b>	Washington Department of Natural Resources, Olympia, WA
<b>Don Rogers</b>	North Carolina Division of Forest Resources, Raleigh, NC
<b>Jim Steinman</b>	FH&E Northeastern Area SPF, Newtown Square, PA
<b>Frank Sapio</b>	Director of FHTET, Fort Collins, CO
<b>Dave Struble</b>	Maine Forest Service, Augusta, ME
<b>Borys Tkacz</b>	National Program Manager for FHM, Arlington, VA

# Commendations

- **Management**
- **Credibility**
- **Futuring**
- **Partnerships**
- **National Insect and Disease Risk Map**
- **SOD Special Survey**
- **Research on Monitoring Techniques**
- **Intensive Site Monitoring**

# Recommendations

## Organization

- Steering Committee meet more frequently and with FHM Management Team
- Keep current FHM Management Team structure, encourage others participation
- FHM primary survey and monitoring component of FHP
- North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas under the Northeastern mega-region, 2 federal reps & 2 state reps on FHM Mangmt Team
- Expand model of state and federal collaboration to all of FHP

# Recommendations

## Evaluation Monitoring

- Synthesize the EM projects
- Enhance utility of EM using search engine
- Improve ties to strategic needs; know when to shift investments to another topic

# Recommendations

## Intensive Site Monitoring

- ISM element be maintained as a **placeholder** within FHM until compelling need/funding
- Any new ISM undertakings should link to sites where other ecological process data is being collected

# Recommendations

## Partnerships

- Expand to fill data gaps, develop standardized surveillance protocols for invasives in areas that are not currently monitored
- Critical review and timely feedback of all resolutions submitted at the annual FHM Workgroup meeting is needed

# Recommendations

## Detection and Monitoring Methods Research and Development

- Convene a meeting and better coordination of the Threat Assessment Centers, FHTET, and FHP Directors
- FHM should work with R&D and the APHIS to develop survey methods for emerald ash borer and *Sirex*, and other new invaders
- Develop a clearly articulated research program (base funding) for FHM detection and evaluation methods with realistic funding expectations
- Coordinated relationship between the FHP Aerial Survey Working Group (ASWG) and FHM needed

# Recommendations

## Reporting

- Use the annual State Highlight reports to accomplish the FHP Program's requirement for annual forest health reporting to Congress.
- FHTET should continue to develop the data portal concept
- Annual detection information should be made geospatially available to clients in a real-time manner (ARC-GIS ready)
- Directors to secure analysis capacity (analysts)
- Direction and examples needed to improve regional reports.
- North Dakota, South Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas should submit reporting through the NorthCentral FHM Coordinator

# Opportunities

- Expand citizens monitoring
- Use risk map and remote sensing imagery to guide where aerial survey detection should and shouldn't be applied
- Expand involvement in the collaborative preparation of special issue-oriented reports at the regional and national scale

# Next Steps

- Develop response and action plan at the next FHM Management Team Meeting (May, 2007)
- Implement and monitor progress