

Outcomes & Recommendations
Desert Managers Group
Science and Monitoring Workshop

The intent is to: 1) report back on the session and 2) make recommendations on how the workshop information may be made more useful for coordinating and implementing interagency monitoring efforts. (An abstract is being prepared.)

Recommendations

A. Adopt the following as the General Principles for cooperative monitoring efforts among DMG members:

1. Monitoring is a tool to accumulate useful information for making decisions.
2. Cooperative monitoring efforts will start at a small scale (limited number of achievable goals or limited geography).
3. A framework is needed to tie the multiple agency efforts together across desert ecosystems. (The NPS will present a potential model, to be available in Draft by summer.)
4. Standardization in protocols is needed and should be tied to research results where available.
5. We will cooperate where it helps us be more efficient.

B. Adopt/maintain the following as the project emphasis for cooperative monitoring:

1. Desert tortoise
2. Meteorology: weather, particulates, heavy metals
3. Development of an interagency component to the overall framework.(by Jan. 2003)

General Session Description

Purpose: Review of applied science and monitoring in California Desert environments.

Methods: Presentations of papers, Discussion, Field tour.

Length: Two and a half days with a 2 hour wrap up session (small group)

Session Overview

Two general world views were evident in presentations. One suggested problem solving was needed in reaction to the inconsistencies and inadequacies of data, especially when viewed at larger scales. This view included concerns over inconsistent techniques and data, inadequate or

uneven data, and, in some cases, data that was collected but is not useful. The second view addresses the same concerns but from emphasizes the need for a unifying, long term goal, purpose or vision.

Sample of Concepts form Workshop Presentations and Discussions

Successes and Opportunities	Barriers and Areas of Concern
Produce a written desert-wide Monitoring Strategy.	Inadequate funding.
Larger scale interagency plans that share costs and data.	Bureaucracy: differences in processes, standards and requirements.
Need to do reporting of what is going well.	Turf. Agencies and people generally want their own data or their own method.
Return to prior monitoring and data collection efforts (often useful for longer term comparisons).	Uneven data. Data gaps and differences.
Overlapping old and new techniques can calibrate historical data to data collected with new techniques.	Uneasiness about change and the “pain” it may cause.
Increased analysis power with common or comparable data.	Uneasiness about how the data may be used.

Process Steps

1. Agreement on general principles.
2. Agreement on areas for present emphasis:
 - a. 3 recommended areas
 - b. Others (Some kind of weed management goal?)
3. How
 - a. Leadership (team or individual; who?)
 - b. Next steps: (how? when?)
4. Any smaller scale efforts may be attempted by adjacent DMG partners? (weeds?)
 - who, what, when, where, how