

San Juan Headwaters Forest Health Partnership

Meeting NOTES for Friday, September 20th, 2019

Location: Pagosa Ranger District, Pagosa Springs, Colorado

Time: 9:00 – 11:00

Updates: Project Funding

RMRI

- Is this money authorized for CLFR?
 - o Yes. \$80m in the 2018 Farm Bill
 - o We need to be able to capitalize within 3 years.
 - o Cost and scrutiny/reporting. More overhead.

CLFRP

- Collaborative Landscape Forest Restoration
- Needs to be spent on Federal forested lands
- Cannot be spent on new NEPA, will not fund NEPA
- Will only fund implementation
- Heavy monitoring component
- NFF website shows projects previously selected
 - o All have annual monitoring reports
- Joint Chiefs work well with CLFR. We would need to apply in a very deliberate way with Joint Chiefs
- It has a much broader scale than just forest tx.
- The landscape we want to work in
 - o Jackson
 - o Chimney
 - o Turkey
 - o Brockover
- What are the holes within the existing NEPA
 - o Fisheries, Rec (trails), Blanco (private-public interface)
- Timeline
 - o Tier 1 is done and supported by RO and we can move forward
 - o Tier 2
 - First week in Nov to RO
 - Back to Collaborative a month later
 - Then to WO for review
 - Internal deadline – to RO by first week of Nov
 - Some issue with CR, need to get it done by Thanksgiving
 - Because it a 10-year project; where do we want to go next

2-3-2 is a discreet landscape with a primary objective of watershed reliance (Rio Chama-ABQ).

DISCUSSION:

Tier 1 of CFLR done. RMRI complimentary. We need a plan for both before mid Nov. (MF)

- The San Juan and his staff if built to plan. We have built up social license. (KK)

Little Jackson

- FH Co has a plan within SS
- not a lot of fisheries work, needs more wildlife corridor, what else is out there for community?
- We have miles of illegal trails and the community clearly has a need. We need to continue with Rx post Tx.
- With Turkey all Rx line is maintained by rec use of trails.

Plumtaw

- NRCS; PAWSD infrastructure; Social license built with landowner that was against timber in 2000s and now want it; no NEPA but this would be a good place for RMRI.

Sand Bench

- EA for spruce;
- good fisheries
- Area up with Joint Chiefs
- Other rec interests

RMRI – If we can prove in one place we can carry to others.

- RMRI does not come with defined terms of success. Top down to support grassroots growth

These opportunities give us the opportunity to quickly focus on the next planning efforts. “Where are we going to go next?” We can get the ideas on paper and develop a semblance of strategy to move forward. (KK)

- We can use this to keep us from getting derailed. (JA)
- We all have limitations. If we really want to make a difference, we need to ID and fill. We have expertise that is here how do we include. (KK)
- Strong monitoring component (KK)

To have resiliency, we need to remove/work in veg. We know how traditional industry works. But how do we work with Biomass? We have local industry. We need to support FH Co we perhaps have a solution and scale of biomass here.

How much social license do we really have for in the community? We need to up scale but now we have national attention. What is the scale of license and influence (MF)

- Great test for the collaboratives. Still, do we actually have social license.
- We lost with the 3000 ac of Rx.
- Risk to the health of the collaboratives should we overextend and scale up. This then reduces the license

This will make us have to step up.

- Data reporting
- Outreach
- Education
- AM Frameworks

What does success look like? How are we poised to meet that vision of success? (HG)

- It is required in CLFR.
 - o We can ask for up to \$4m a year but it needs a \$2m match. 50% match; can we bring in via other partners.
- The groups have to define a landscape strategy.
 - o 232 has but others have not.
 - o 232 landscape it has appeal to higherups because of the cross-boundary aspects. If we do not propose the RMRI, someone else will. Bringing together many initiatives on one landscape is a good thing from the WO perspective. (KK)
- Bring it together to work for us and not just for the funding
- We can move with the NA alternative for these, but should we?
- We are ready with private lands (BT)

NRCS, CSFS, AFF – Forester Position for PS: There will be a new CSFS employee in Pagosa who will focus on a targeted area (salary sub by NRCS, AFF). That person should be on by Nov, flown as an internal hire but not sure on interest. External hiring would need a committee. Doing outreach and landowner involvement by mid Nov. Decision would be made local by collaboration. Will the CLFR and RMRI geography be that target area? Target landowners that have not been active or done management on their property. There has to be outreach in the priority zone. This new position does not have Good Neighbor component. (Jerry Archuleta)

- What is the expansion of area with this position? Perhaps double. Increase with EQIP in DRO due to Kyle.

Next meeting: October 18, 2019