

2010

Dinkey Collaborative Landscape  
Restoration Strategy



Dinkey Collaborative Group  
5/14/2010

# History of the Dinkey Creek CFLRP

- Kings River Administrative Study Area 1993
- Kings River Project has a long history of engagement with FS research and researchers, stakeholders and at risk species
- 154,000 ac including,
- 25,000 ac of SoCal Edison and their managers
- 2009 proposal, mostly FS created using older Kings River information

# Strengths include:

- 1) Strong ecology focus (vegetation, fire, wildlife)
- 2) Strong relationships (Sierra Forest Products, FS staff, SoCal Edison, Native American tribal representatives, Conservation Groups, and others)
- 3) Building good monitoring component and adaptive management strategy
- 4) Fisher Marking Guidelines, photo guide, field ID of structures important to fisher, review of treated (occupied) areas, experimental burns at fisher dens
- 5) On-going research on fisher, owl, songbirds, meadows in the Dinkey landscape
- 6) Ownership of necessary work (site visits, monitoring plan, fundraising, landscape assessment, marking guidelines, promoting burning, explaining thinning projects to partners.
- 7) Facilitation support
- 8) Good Understanding of GTR-220 marking in different landscapes
- 9) Trust

# Challenges:

- 1) Desired Conditions for vegetation and fisher don't easily line up.
- 2) Not enough support for burn program, can't use managed fire (120% mechanical accomplished, 20% of burning)
- 3) Very tough air district
- 4) Competition for projects tough and complicated
- 5) Translating research into new approaches takes time
- 6) Developing (setting thresholds, triggers), funding monitoring plan is tough work
- 7) meadows, roads, restoration, access issues
- 8) At risk species
- 9) Hard to scale up, \$\$\$\$

# Opportunities/needs:

- 1) Improved information sharing (internal and external to CFLRPs)
- 2) Advanced GTR-220 marking training (mobile cadre of experts?) Required?
- 3) More support for fire program
- 4) Shared monitoring plans (more uniform plans so we can compare outcomes with N=3 sites)
- 5) Staffed CFLPR coordinator position
- 6) Advanced collaboration training
- 7) More structured experimentation to answer tough questions using planned projects that we work on with researchers
- 8) Build agreements for larger projects
- 9) Improved integration of local communities partners
- 10) Increase options for biomass and small wood utilization

