

RARE PLANT MONITORING GRANT WORKSHOP

NOTES

March 29, 2006

~52 attendees

Keith's intro

Kathryn's talk

Comments:

Q: Were rainfall and/or other environmental factors considered in statistical analysis?

A: No, not available, included as recommendation.

Q: Will work on MSCP be applicable to other (north and east county) HCPs?

A: Yes, it is expected to be useful and applicable.

C: Could be problematic to develop plans for plant conservation for small areas.

Q: What is the number of plants covered by all SD County HCPs?

A: Unknown.

Q: Structure of advisory and technical committee—will they cover all area, or will separate groups be developed for specific species?

A: Core group should be developed who know species and have experience.

C: Exact structure not determined by scientific group b/c local groups should decide.

C: Strong recommendations should be given to make sure things happen.

Q: Sampling models shown that did not work well; do good statistical designs exist for monitoring the species of the MSCP?

A: None currently exist in MSCP; some exist in academic settings; Dr. Pavlik's design at Lake Tahoe will be posted on website; *Dudleya variegata* is the most complete dataset.

BREAK

Ambrosia pumila draft conservation plan example

Q: Why is population structure (# of individuals/population over landscape) not included—plan discusses management units?

A: Regional/complete population structure may be useful; however, the management units were constructed to facilitate on-the-ground management.

C: Some adaptive management (fencing a trail) won't protect species in isolation; for example, a major issue with *A. pumila* is weed competition, which a fence won't fix.

C: All info in conservation plan can be derived through listing package; all threats still the same.

C: That's why management units were used, in order to specify which threats apply to which subpopulations and therefore require differing management actions.