



**National Park Service
Fire Ecology Annual Report
Calendar Year 2013**

**SOUTH CASCADES NETWORK
Lava Beds NM
Crater Lake NP
Lassen Volcanic NP**

A. Summary

Much of 2013 was spent dealing with the 2012 Reading Fire in LAVO. This involved much post-fire monitoring and assessment. This included water quality monitoring, FMH, research with Penn St, field trips and presentations, continuation of post-fire browse research with exclosures, accuracy assessment of mapping, and developing several fire risk and hazard assessment models to address issues post-fire reviews.

Additional work included maintenance of FMH protocols within network parks, finalizing pre-project monitoring networks for the pilot Northwest Gateway silviculture project, and active involvement in several ongoing research projects in the network with collaborators. There was no fire effects crew in 2013 so the FEMO had to work with a variety of ancillary personnel from network and PWR parks.

We supported several incidents in 2013, including the Rim Fire (onsite and from afar), dozens of suppression fires in the network, and three US Forest Service fires. We served in varying roles ranging from Resource Adviser to firefighter to engine members to WFDSS planning and analysis. In addition, we worked closely with resource management staff from the network to help plan and monitor vegetation and fire related projects.

Table 1. Fire Effects Plot Workload (2013) and Total Plots Installed*

Park	Monitoring Unit	Plot Type (FMH Forest/Brush/Grass plot, photo point, Rapid Assessment, CBI, etc.)	Pre-burn 2013	Immed. Post 2013	Postburn (1-20 yrs) 2013	Annual Total (2013)	Total Plots
Lava Beds	Sagebrush Steppe	FMH Brush plot	-	-	14	14	90
Lava Beds	Perennial Bunchgrass	FMH Brush plot	-	-	9	9	24
Lava Beds	Ponderosa Pine	FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	18
Lava Beds	Juniper	FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	9
Lava Beds	Aspen	Modified FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	1
Lava Beds	Mahogany tree girdle	Individual tree assessment	-	-	1	1	1
Lava Beds	Jack Fire	Photo point	-	-	-	-	7
Crater Lake	Lodgepole Pine	FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	9
Crater Lake	Mixed Conifer (White Fir)	FMH Forest plot	-	-	4	4	24
Crater Lake	Ponderosa Pine	FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	14
Crater Lake	Mountain Hemlock	Modified FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	18
Crater Lake	Lodgepole Pine	Modified FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	4
Crater Lake	Mixed Pine	Fixed radius forest plot	-	-	-	-	21

Crater Lake	Whitebark Pine	Modified FMH transect	-	-	-	-	16
Crater Lake	Red Cone Fire	Photo Point	-	-	-	-	6
Lassen Volcanic	Mixed Conifer (White Fir)	FMH Forest plot	-	-	9	9	36
Lassen Volcanic	Lodgepole Pine	FMH Forest plot	-	-	3	3	3
Lassen Volcanic	Jeffrey Pine	FMH Forest plot	-	-	2	2	2
Lassen Volcanic	Red Fir	FMH Forest plot	-	-	3	3	9
Lassen Volcanic	Ponderosa Pine	FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	5
Lassen Volcanic	Greenleaf Manzanita	FMH Brush plot	-	-	-	-	17
Lassen Volcanic	Mixed Meadow	FMH Grass plot	-	-	-	-	4
Lassen Volcanic	Aspen	Modified FMH Forest plot	-	-	13	13	63
Lassen Volcanic	Aspen deer enclosure		-	10	-	10	10
Lassen Volcanic	Mixed Conifer	Modified FMH Forest plot	-	-	-	-	39
Lassen Volcanic	Riparian Meadow	Modified FMH Forest plot	30	-	-	30	30
Lassen Volcanic	Campground thinning monitoring	FMH Brush plot	-	-	-	-	24
Total			30	10	58	98	504

*Note: This does not include FMH and other plots read in WHIS and REDW, which is included in the Klamath Network annual report.

Table 2. Fire Ecology Staffing 2013

Ecologist and Monitors	Starting Date	Ending Date	# of Pay Periods	READ Qualified (Yes or No)	Training and Development
Calvin Farris	n/a	n/a	n/a	Yes	Participated in the sequestration and learned several new fly fishing techniques.
Todd Erdody	1/28/12	12/6/13	22	Yes	RXB3 taskbook completed, ENGB taskbook opened, READ qualified

Table 3. 2013 Management Objectives and Monitoring Results

Crater Lake NP programmatic FMH monitoring results, through 2013. All results shown are 80% confidence intervals of the mean. . For percent-change objectives, CIs were calculated using bootstrapping of the Ratio of Means Statistics, except for spatially-paired plots in mtn hemlock which were from the Mean of Ratios Statistic. Other CIs were derived from distributions of individual values (unless reported as SE).

Monitoring Unit	Resource Management Objective (Restoration)	Monitoring Results (sample sizes)	Objective Achieved?	Year Analysis Completed (Range of Data [Yrs] Included in Analysis)
Interior Ponderosa Pine	Reduce surface fuel load to 60-90% of existing load	Total fuel reduction = +11% *increase* (CI _{80%} : -5% to +20%) (n=16 plots, 10 yrs)	NO (but actual loadings are close to maintenance objective ranges)	2014 (2002-2012 years)
	20-50 trees/acre > 12" dbh*	98 trees/ac > 12" (SE +/- 11.4)	NO	
	< 400 trees/acre 2-6" dbh	366 trees/ac 2-6" (SE 104) (n=16 plots)	YES	
	Limit post-fire mortality of <i>Pinus</i> >18" (45 cm) dbh to <25% within 2-years post-treatment	2-year mortality = 4% (CI _{80%} : 2% to 7%) (Note: 10 year mortality = 11%, CI _{80%} : 3-24%) (n=16 plots)	YES	
	Increase low-mixed severity burn occurrence to MFRI of 9-15 years	Unable to calculate MFRI ^a NFR ₍₁₉₃₃₋₂₀₁₃₎ = 66-85 yrs ^b NFR ₍₁₉₇₈₋₂₀₁₃₎ = 33-42 yrs ^b	N/A NO	
Lodgepole Pine	Reduce surface fuel load to 35-55% of existing load	Total fuel reduction = 54% (CI _{80%} : 43.2 to 64.7%) (n=30 plots, 4 fires, 5 years)	YES	2014 (2006-2013)
	Total tree density = no metric	Tree/acre =993 (SE +/- 364) Note: tree density reduction was 48% (CI _{80%} 35%-61%)	N/A	
	Composition 80-90% pine, 0-10% fir, 0-10% hemlock	$\bar{x}$ = 94% pine (SE +/-9%) $\bar{x}$ = 1% fir $\bar{x}$ = 9% hemlock	YES	
	Increase occurrence of low/mixed severity burns to MFRI 60-80 yrs	NFR ₍₁₉₃₃₋₂₀₁₃₎ = 912 yrs ^b NFR ₍₁₉₇₈₋₂₀₁₃₎ = 457 yrs ^b	N/A NO	
Mixed Conifer	Reduce 60-90% of existing dead & down fuels	Total fuel reduction 79% (CI _{80%} :75% to 86%) (n = 4 plots, 2 fires, 3 years)	YES , but insufficient sample size	2014 (2003-2013)
	30-80 trees/acre > 12" dbh < 600 trees/acre 2-12" dbh	94 trees/ac >12" (SD +/-27) 128 trees /ac (SE +/-56)	YES , but insufficient sample size	

Monitoring Unit	Resource Management Objective (Restoration)	Monitoring Results (sample sizes)	Objective Achieved?	Year Analysis Completed (Range of Data [Yrs] Included in Analysis)
	Composition: 40-80% fir 15-40% pine, 0-20% other	$\bar{x}$ = 97% fir $\bar{x}$ = 12% pine $\bar{x}$ = 1% other	NO , but insufficient sample size	
	Constraint: Limit post-fire mortality of <i>Pinus</i> >18” (45 cm) dbh to <25% within 2-years post-treatment	2-year mortality = 14% (CI _{80%} : 0% to 43%)	YES , but insufficient sample size	
Mountain Hemlock	Reduce 35-55% of existing dead & down fuels	Total fuel reduction = 43% (CI _{80%} : 26 to 54.7%) (<i>n</i> = 14 plots, 1 fire, 5 years)	YES	2014 (2006-2011 years)
	Composition (15-60% hemlock, 0-40% fir, 0-10% pine)	$\bar{x}$ = 77% hemlock $\bar{x}$ = 32% fir $\bar{x}$ = 13% pine	YES (if CI intervals are included)	
Red Fir	Insufficient data available for stand metrics (patch data currently being analyzed from dNBR)			2014
	Increase occurrence of fires to a MFRI of 40-65 years	NFR ₍₁₉₃₃₋₂₀₁₃₎ = 725 yrs ^b NFR ₍₁₉₇₈₋₂₀₁₃₎ = 387 yrs ^b	N/A NO	
Whitebark Pine	No monitored fires			

^a The MFRI in the FMP is described as the mean interval for all pine sites. This can't be calculated with the relatively short time frame and lack of overlapping fires unless it is as a composite, but the NFR serves as an approximation (time required to burn area of PIPO in park for a given time period, equating roughly to a mean interval for each pixel).

^b Dates in parentheses indicate the time period used for the calculation to determine the average. The period of data availability is 1933-2013; the period 1978-2013 spans the fire management era when restoration burns began. For PIPO, the low range given includes all acreage in 1980 Sharp Peak polygon, and the high range includes only 10% of it (most of this huge Rx polygon never burned, but records are lacking to determine exactly how much did).

Crater Lake NP programmatic FMH monitoring results, through 2013. All results shown are 80% confidence intervals of the mean. . For percent-change objectives, CIs were calculated using bootstrapping of the Ratio of Means Statistics, except for spatially-paired plots in mtn hemlock which were from the Mean of Ratios Statistic. Other CIs were derived from distributions of individual values (unless reported as SE).

Monitoring Unit	Resource Management Objective (Restoration)	Monitoring Results (sample sizes)	Objective Achieved?	Year Analysis Completed (Range of Data [Yrs] Included in Analysis)
Ponderosa / Jeffrey Pine	Fuel Load: Reduce surface fuel load to 30-80% of existing load	Total reduction = 52% decrease (CI _{80%} : 32% to 99%) (n=7 plots)	YES	2014 (1995-2011)
	Tree density: 40-250 trees/ha all sizes 10-80 trees/ha >80 cm dbh	131 trees/ha (CI _{80%} : 82 to 181) Note: reduction from pre-fire was 60% (CI _{80%} : 45-81%) 16 trees/ha (CI _{80%} : 10 to 27) Note: reduction from pre-fire was 33% (CI _{80%} : 10-74%) (n=7 plot,)	YES	
	Composition: 60-90% Jeffrey pine 10-30% Other Species	$\bar{x}$ = 70% Jeffrey pine (CI _{80%} : 51 to 90) $\bar{x}$ = 30% Other spec. (CI _{80%} : 10 to 48) (n=7 plots)	YES	
Lodgepole Pine	Fuel Load: Reduce surface fuel load to 35-55% of existing load	1X Fires Total fuel reduction = 35% (CI _{80%} : 30 to 47%) (n=3 plots, 11 years) 2X Fires (includes Reading) Total fuel reduction = 78% (CI _{80%} : 58 to 89%) (n=3 plots)	Insufficient Sample Size	2014 (2002-2013)
	Tree density (all sizes): No target specified for Trees per Hectare	General Information Unburned: $\bar{x}$ = 1143 (575-1711) Burned 1X: $\bar{x}$ = 993 (127-339) Burned 2X: $\bar{x}$ <10 TPH (0-9) (n=3 plots)	Insufficient Sample Size	
	Composition: 80-90% lodgepole 0-10% fir, 0-10% hemlock	$\bar{x}$ = 97% PICO (CI _{80%} : 92-100%) $\bar{x}$ = 3% Fir $\bar{x}$ = <1% Hemlock (n=3 plots)	Insufficient Sample Size	

Monitoring Unit	Resource Management Objective (Restoration)	Monitoring Results (sample sizes)	Objective Achieved?	Year Analysis Completed (Range of Data [Yrs] Included in Analysis)
Mixed Conifer	Fuel Load: Reduce 60-75% of existing dead & down fuels	30% reduction (CI _{80%} : 19% to 41%) (<i>n</i> = 34 plots)	NO (fuels accumulate quickly in MC)	2014 (1994-2012)
	Tree Density: 50-300 trees/hectare all sizes	406 trees/ha (CI _{80%} : 338 to 475) Note: reduction from pre-fire was 60% (CI _{80%} 56%-65%) (<i>n</i> = 34 plots).	NO (but much closer after burning)	
	< 10-80 trees/hectare >80 cm dbh	16 trees/ha (CI _{80%} : 12 to 19) Note: reduction from pre-fire was 9% (CI _{80%} 0%-19%) ^c (<i>n</i> = 34 plots)	YES	
	Composition: 40-60% fir 15-40% pine, 0-20% other	$\bar{x}$ = 80% fir (CI _{80%} : 76-84%) $\bar{x}$ = 18% pine (CI _{80%} : 14-22%) $\bar{x}$ = 2% other (CI _{80%} : 0.5-3%) (<i>n</i> = 34 plots)	NO , (but much closer after burning)	
Mountain Hemlock and	Fuel Load: Reduce 35-55% of existing dead & down fuels	No Data at LAVO (see CRLA for data from this type)	N/A	N/A
	Composition 15-60% hemlock, 0-40% fir, 0-10% pine (inc. PILA)	No Data at LAVO (see CRLA for data from this type)	N/A	
Red Fir / White Pine	Fuel Load: Reduce 60-75% of existing dead & down fuels	40% reduction (CI _{80%} : 10% to 66%) (<i>n</i> = 5 plots, 2 years)	YES small sample size	2014 (2004-2012)
	Tree Density: 60-350 trees/ha all sizes	248 trees/ha (CI _{80%} : 84 to 411) Note: reduction from pre-fire was 76% (CI _{80%} : 34-85%)	YES small sample size	
	10-100 trees/ha $\geq$ 80 cm dbh	48 trees/ha (CI _{80%} : 26 to 69) Note: reduction from pre-fire was 14% (CI _{80%} : 7-29%)		
	Composition: 30-70% fir 20-50% <i>Pinus</i> 0-20% other	$\bar{x}$ = 78% fir (CI _{80%} : 69-88%) $\bar{x}$ = 21% pine (CI _{80%} : 12-31%) $\bar{x}$ = ~1% other (<i>n</i> = 5 plots)	YES small sample size	

NOTE: The table for Lava Beds is currently being worked on but was not ready by the report deadline. It will be completed in 2014.

B. Fire ecologist accomplishments and areas of focus

Table 4. Fire Ecologist 2013 Accomplishments/Focus Areas

<i>Category</i>	<i>Percent Time</i>	<i>Accomplishments and/or areas of activities</i>
<i>Planning and support</i>	35%	• Landscape fire risk assessment and other analyses for LAVO to address Reading Fire FLA recommendations. • NW Gateway project, LAVO (finished Rx and unit layouts); stand projections. • Fuels Treatment and project scoping plans at network parks, including meetings • Vegetation management plans (integrating fire with resource management objectives (LBE)) • Assist resource management with vegetation and fire related project planning and assessments
<i>Research</i>	30%	• Proposal research and preparation: three proposals for NPS in 2013 • Manuscript preparation and revisions: submitted four new papers in 2013 (3 accepted); several more currently in preparation. • Completed analysis for joint NPS-USFS wilderness fire project • Field work, decadal-scale climate variability (network wide, UMN) • Calibration and accuracy assessment of spatial remote sensing layers at LBE) • Aspen exclosure study in Reading Fire in LAVO • Demography and Ribbon Forest (CRLA); continued field work
<i>Fire Assignments</i>	2%	• Provided WFDSS support for a lightning complex on the Modoc NF. Only fire assignment in 2013 due to health constraints.
<i>Teaching/Training</i>	0%	• Career is regressing rapidly into a deep abyss; no training can help
<i>Presentations and Workshops and Field Trips</i>	5%	• CA Fire Science Consortium Field Trip & Presentation (& prep) • PSW Reading Fire (plus field trip) • Northwest Gateway presentation and tour for external agencies and parks
<i>Fire Fx Monitoring Field Work and Analysis</i>	20%	• Summarized data for CRLA 10 year reads • NWS pre-treatment, and Reading Fire post-fire (LAVO) • Beta testing Paired Analysis Stats Tools with Ken Gerow.
<i>Administrative/Supervisory, Meetings, Misc</i>	8%	• Misc paperwork and reporting, etc.; Budget and Administrative • Supervision duties for lead monitor and volunteer • Mandatory trainings

C. Fire effects crew accomplishments and areas of focus

Table 5. Fire Effects Crew 2013 Accomplishments/Focus Areas

Category	Percent Time	Notes
FMH plots	30	
WUI plots	0	
CBI plots	0	
Other plot work	5	USGS demography plots in REDW. Soil moisture sensor installation in CRLA and LAVO. Individual tree assessments in LABE.
Wildfire assignments	10	Lead was on multiple wildfires in CRLA and a READ assignment to the Rim fire.
Prescribed fire projects	2	Lead was RXB3 trainee for pile burning in ORCA, RXB3 for pile burning in CRLA and assisted the Modoc NF on a Rx burn.
Non-fire fuels projects	10	Lead was FALA on a hazard fuels project in CRLA
Travel out-of-park for plot or project work	5	5 trips to LAVO, 1 trip to WHIS, 2 trips to REDW, 3 trips to ORCA, 1 trip to YOSE and many day trips to LABE and CRLA.
Data entry	20	All data entry for 2013 complete.
Data analysis	1	
Supervision/Admin	5	Misc travel and time paperwork through two different parks.
Training	1	Refresher
Miscellaneous	11	

D. Additional Program Information

Please complete the tables below which contain additional information that we feel is valuable to compile on an annual basis to help assess the fire ecology program workload. Everglades National Park is used as a fictitious example in the tables.

Table 6. Planning - 2013

Park	Does Park have written DFCs? (yes or no)	Date Park-level Monitoring Plan completed (or revised)	Total # of Project- or Community-level Monitoring Plans (not just 2013)	Assisted with how many BAER plans in 2013?
Lassen Volcanic	yes	2007	3	1
Lava Beds	Yes	2006	1	0
Crater Lake	Yes	2006	2	0

Table 7. Monitoring - 2013

Park	% 2013 Data Entered	% 2013 Data Quality Checked	# Prescribed Fires Monitored*	# Non-fire Fuels Treatments Monitored*	# Wildfires Monitored*	# BAER Treatments Monitored*
Lassen Volcanic	100%	75%	0	3	0	0
Lava Beds	100%	100%	0	1	0	0
Crater Lake	100%	100%	0	1	0	0

* Number of treatment units with treatment effects monitoring conducted. Include pre-burn and post-burn monitoring but not burn-day monitoring.

Table 8. Communicating Results - 2013

Park	# of Project Monitoring Reports completed in 2013	# of Annual meeting(s) with Park staff	# of Formal presentations of results	Do you use Minitab?*
Lassen Volcanic	0	Dozens	3	No
Lava Beds	0	2	1	No
Crater Lake	0	5	0	No

* This information will help to assess Minitab multi-user license needs.

Table 9. Research - 2013

Park	Are research needs identified in FMP or Monitoring Plan? (yes or no)	# of Proposals Submitted in 2013	# of Proposals Funded in 2013	# of Research Projects Supported in 2013*	Additional Comments
Lassen Volcanic	yes	1	0	4	
Lava Beds	yes	0	0	3	
Crater Lake	yes	1	0	4	

*Number of funded research projects, new or ongoing, supported by the fire ecology program including logistical info or support, staffing, etc.

Reserve Fund Research: If your park(s) received Reserve Fund Research funding or completed a previously-funded project in the last year, please provide the following:

Projects Completed:

- *Use of random forests for modeling and mapping forest canopy fuels for fire behavior analysis in Lassen Volcanic National Park, California, USA.* (with Penn St University). LINK: <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0378112712002654>
- *Demography of a Lodgepole Pine-Ponderosa Pine Forest in Crater Lake National Park* with the University of Minnesota. Project completed, revisions on final report pending (to be submitted in Feb).
- Two journal articles from past projects are in peer review (fire effects in small aspen groves in Lassen, and *fire-environment interactions along fanalysis of shrub-steppe vegetation* in Lava Beds)

E. 2014 Direction

This is an ongoing discussion. We expect to have 0 to 1 person left in the greater Klamath Network in 2016. The focus will continue to shift away from intensive field monitoring to broader-scale landscape monitoring using imagery, spatial analysis, and cooperative research to assess and predict the effects of wildland fires. No prescribed burning is expected, so more work is occurring on assessing risk and outcomes of wildfires. We'll have to collaborate more with resource management staff to facilitate vegetation management projects in the absence of Rx burning. (such as silviculture projects in LAVO, and planned at CRLA). Despite the challenges, maintaining the existing FMH plot and data network is a high priority due to the immense resources invested in the program over time and the usefulness of the data (which will increase in the future). This will require much cooperation with staff across the entire region since we'll lack the capacity ourselves. Finally, this being one of the worst drought years in history, we anticipate a lot of incident support.

F. Optional Information

Thomas E. "Shanty" Hogan, Arizona Wildcats, 1948. This image says it all.



G. Metadata and FFI Database Update on NPS Data Store

As you know, long-term monitoring data are highly valuable! We are glad to have almost all of the NPS FFI databases centrally located on the NPS Data Store. This central data storage option allows us to have an additional secure data location other than those in the parks' or regional offices. It also allows NPS users and others to view the metadata and contact data stewards for access to monitoring data for research or educational purposes. In addition, Landfire staff will be able to download the needed FFI databases directly from the Data Store for Landfire model validation purposes, eliminating the need for NPS staff to respond to another, separate data call.

Once this season's FFI data entry and quality checking are complete, please follow these instructions to update your park(s) metadata ("references") and upload the updated FFI databases to the NPS Data Store.

- 1) Backup the FFI database(s) in FFI (note backup file date for metadata).
- 2) Zip backup file(s) - this step is critical to reduce file size, upload time and server storage space utilized. PLEASE use the following naming convention for your zip files: **"FFI_2013_XXXX"**, where XXXX is the 4 letter code for the park, or for the lead park in a network if more than one parks' data are included in the database.
- 3) Access the Data Store at: <https://irma.nps.gov/App/Reference/Welcome>
- 4) Select **Manage**, then **Manage My References** and click on the **Search** button (don't need to enter any search criteria to display all references for which you are an owner).
- 5) Select the reference (metadata record) you wish to update from the list displayed to open the Reference Profile where you can make edits to update the reference.
- 6) Expand "Version History", to view and select the **Manage Versions** option. You will then select **Clone this Reference to Create a New Version** to create a new Reference for this year's update while preserving past metadata and databases as archives.

- 7) Once you **Save** the new, cloned reference, you can make any changes necessary to update the reference with this year's information. Most likely, the edits will be to the "Date of Issue/Release", which is the date of the new FFI backup file, and the "Content End Date", if you have collected new data this year that was added to the FFI database. Select **Edit Details** from the menu at the top of the profile to make these changes. If anything else has changed (e.g. new protocols established, old protocols abandoned, etc.), you can make these edits to the text fields (e.g. Abstract) as well. Once changes are complete, you must select the "Save and set to" **Active** button at the bottom of the window.
- 8) Finally, upload the new zipped FFI database backup file by selecting **Add Digital File** from the menu at the top of the reference profile (or Add Holding from the Holdings section). Click on **Select Files** and then browse to your zipped FFI database backup file to select it, and then select **Upload**. You must also add additional owners here who have permission to edit the holdings if necessary (we recommend at least one person besides yourself; I (MB) am happy to serve as an additional owner to assist with Data Store if you'd like, but not required!). Remember to Save as **Active** once you have completed any changes.
- 9) Repeat the above steps for each of your FFI databases.

Please feel free to contact MB if you have any questions at all about the process of updating the metadata and FFI databases on the Data Store. This is the first year of adding this aspect to our annual reporting process, therefore, we expect questions may arise about the Data Store, so don't be shy!

INSTRUCTIONS FOR UPLOADING 2013 ANNUAL REPORT TO SHAREPOINT

1. Save your report as a PDF file using the following file naming convention "2013 *Park/Network Name* Annual Report.pdf".
2. Go to the NPS Fire Ecology Sharepoint site (<http://famshare.inside.nps.gov/wildlandfire/firescience/fireecology/default.aspx>). In Fire Ecology Documents, upload your report to the 2013 Park and Network Fire Ecology Program Annual Reports folder.
3. Please e-mail your regional ecologist, Nate Benson, and MaryBeth Keifer to let us know when you get your report uploaded.

Call MaryBeth Keifer (603-795-2333) or Nate Benson (208-387-5219) if you have any questions or problems.