



# San Juan Headwaters

## FOREST HEALTH PARTNERSHIP

### San Juan Headwaters Forest Health Partnership Virtual Meeting NOTES for Friday, Nov 20, 2020

**Location:** Virtual Zoom Meeting

**Regular Meeting:** 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

**In Attendance:** Dana Hayward (MSI), Aaron Kimple (MSI), Mike Remke (MSI), Herb Grover (Weminuche Audubon), Matt Ford (Clean Forest Energy), Matt Tuten (SJNF), Doug Secrist (SJWCD), Lo Williams (SJNF), Robin Young (CSU extension), Bill Trimarco (WAP), Mercedes Siegle-Gaither (NRCS/CSFS), Tim Haarmann (Banded Peak Ranch), Dave Lasky (Forest Stewards Guild), Keith Bruno (Audubon Rockies), Steve Hartvigsen (vounteer), Roger Jensen (retired), Caleb Stotts (CPLA), Ed Millard (Montezuma County, SW Basin Round Table), Jerry Archuleta (NRCS), John Whitney (Senator Michael Bennet Four Corners Regional Director)

#### VIRTUAL MEETING NOTES

**9:00 – 9:10** Welcome and Introductions

**9:10 – 9:45** Updates

- Joint Chiefs legislation drafting
  - Will wait until Spring 2021 to introduce
  - John Whitney
    - Headwaters group
      - Meaningful visit with Senator Bennet in September
        - Compared Res Hill site to a cathedral
      - Biggest recipient of Joint Chiefs funding in Colorado and made an impact with those funds
      - Group has the right balance of science, communication, community involvement, and people to do the work
    - Congressional authorization of joint chiefs
      - Up to this point, the program has mostly involved USFS and NRCS leadership
        - Want to work with on the ground expert partners to develop the bill (empower)
        - Ability to work on both sides of the fence in the RM West
      - Working on several other forestry bills to be launched after new congress is in (with larger groups of western senators)
        - will work to keep SJH up to speed on these including drafts and summaries
        - Ground truthing info with people on the front lines of the work

- Better chance for program to compete for funding and priorities in the long term is authorized as statute
- Currently working on turning the draft outline (sent to everyone) into congressional language in next ~3wks
  - Feedback through end of 2020
  - Planning to introduce sometime in Jan/Feb with new congress
  - Republican senator as co-lead on bill
  - Ideally another member of the Agriculture committee in senate as co-lead on bill
  - Bill likely to be assigned to Agriculture Committee, on which Sen. Bennet is a senior member from Democratic party on forestry sub committee
- Overview of draft
  - Grounds joint chiefs program in statute
  - Formally authorized by congress with dedicated funding and specific priorities
  - 2 chiefs of NRCS and USFS will jointly administer
  - 3-5 years of funding for longer-term projects
  - Eligible project types:
    - Those that aim to reduce wildfire threat, protect wildlife habitat and water resources (quality/quantity), help forest workforce, operate under existing law e.g., NEPA, comes through a collaborative process, leverage existing authorities e.g., GNA, stewardship contracting
    - Application must include some private landowners (cross boundary)
    - Nonfederal funding NOT a matching requirement, BUT want to allow applicants to show commitments of outside funding
    - Agency planning and implementation capacity to be described in application
    - History of collaboration and NEPA-ready public lands
  - Projects selected jointly picked by 2 chiefs
    - Reports to congress for accountability annually
  - Figuring out funding
    - \$80mil/year for 10 years, an increase from existing program with more stable financial footing
- Would like feedback on draft when ready
  - Email John if have input; group can also assemble a formal letter or email including input.
  - Get something in writing or get on phone with group in Dec. (including legislative staff from DC)
  - Set aside subcommittee to review and offer input on that document → Jerry Archuleta, Matt Tuten, Bill Trimarco,

Matt Ford, and JR (Roger Jensen also interested)

- Another bill to consider
  - Bennet interested in cosponsoring bill with Senator Wyden of OR to ramp up Rx burning
    - Thoughts and/or input on that bill/legislation draft are welcome
    - Dave Lasky, others
  - *Q: NRCS, what are your thoughts?*
    - *Joint chiefs has been a beneficial and successful project. Increased resources would enable more collaboration on public and private lands into the future. There are many willing landowners, some adjacent to USFS land. Lots of opportunity to make a bigger impact on landscape with more funding.*
  - *If approved, would like to see wording or mechanism to integrate smaller landowners/sections in subdivisions, get more NGOs doing smaller parcel work involved.*
    - *Intentional trickle down to those working on smaller private lands parcels at risk*
    - *Q: Has it been challenging to get subdivisions signed up for programs?*
      - *Challenges include trying to sell a program that may/may not be available to smaller, individual landowners. Important to identify community leaders and get their support, e.g., in HOAs, that have sway with individual landowners. It's also easier to get people to sign-on when money is available.*
      - *Easier to demonstrate commitment from a full subdivision than get individual commitments. AND its easier to go knocking on doors for involvement after you have the funding secured.*
      - *Can be a mixed bag: Target areas where you have interest first, then outreach to more folks after additional funding is acquired. Since people must own land to participate, it could make it easier to target HOAs rather than landowners, if allowed in legislation.*
      - *Collaboratives are where these relationships are constructed and maintained!*
    - *Q: How does Joint Chiefs work now, do all landowners have to be signed up and committed before you go for funding?*
      - *Not with Pagosa project. Went through prioritization process and considered watersheds. The group targeted Fourmile and Dutton ditch with Joint Chiefs funds because of cross boundary opportunity. JR ford able to work with landowners to think through their investment and involvement.*
- CFLRPs: General Updates
  - General Information
    - Funding and timeline
      - Approved for FY 2022, funding likely to come after October 2021

- Funding timing is unclear because of congressional allocation
      - Still outstanding CFLRPs requesting extension funds for ongoing projects
      - Could receive funding later, into 2022
  - Initial Cross-Collaborative CFLRP Meeting was Friday, Nov. 13
    - Will work across SJNF
      - Integration of all collaboratives, considering how to structure relationships among collaboratives and with the USFS
      - Governance, prioritization, required monitoring
    - Obligations
      - Integrate all collaboratives on landscape
      - Prioritization processes
      - Multi-party monitoring
    - Outcomes from CFLRP meeting
      - Thank you to Bill Trimarco and Lo Williams for attending and contributing to discussion
      - Next steps
        - Get a 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator
        - Facilitator to help stakeholders and participants think through governance and support set up of subcommittees around prioritization and monitoring
- RMRI
  - Public meeting ~2 weeks ago
    - Steering and advisory committees in place
    - Must think through prioritization and how it connects to CFLRP and collaboratives across SJNF
    - Using PODS process
      - Looking at operational delineations on landscape for prioritization according to fire
      - Core Values
        - Community/WUI, Recreation, Wildlife, and Water
        - Identifying where these values exist within PODS and how that informs priorities
      - Likely to come to Headwaters landscape when looking at CFLRP priorities
        - Want monitoring and priority maps to speak to each other across the forest and large initiatives
    - *Q: Do RMRI committees have a 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator? Will the CFLRP facilitator be facilitating just the collaboratives or all involved parties including federal, state, and private interests? Suggestion: find 1 representative for each group to reduce too many decision-makers.*
      - *A: RMRI isn't at this stop yet. 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator discussed above will facilitate all parties and help to figure out how everyone works together (Initial development of governance).*
        - *SJHFHP, 4Rivers, DWRP, USJWEP, ARC Forum, Mancos Resiliency, USFS, BLM, S. Ute, UMU and others*
      - *Suggestion for 3<sup>rd</sup> party facilitator came from Courtney Shultz'*

*research with other CFLRPs, best practice.*

- *MSI may not be ideally positioned to serve this role as it contracts to coordinate/facilitate collaborative groups locally, is involved in monitoring contracts, and operates under additional agreements with the USFS.*
  - *After governance and structure is set up, we may or may not continue with a facilitator.*
  - *Have discussed having 2 representatives per group to have backup in dialogues.*
- Southwest Basin Roundtable (CWCB) presentation Thursday, Nov. 19
  - San Juan Basin Roundtable forest health workshop
  - Representation from WEP (Mandy Eskelson, Amanda Kuenzi, Scott Roberts)
  - Idea and concept
    - Increased consideration of forest management and health objectives in revision to state water plan
    - Consider overlap with WEP locally, where priorities and initiatives align and compliment
    - Talked about how local collaboratives work in their geographies and together across the forest
      - Stacy Beaugh facilitated
      - Stephanie Kamph (CSU) gave a presentation of issues
      - Chuck Rhoads gave a science presentation with linked resources
      - Hope to make video available to public soon
      - Survey to be distributed regarding the role of the roundtable in forest health and the role of forest collaboratives in exploring and managing the forest-water nexus
      - Modeling, literature reviews at this point
  - Resources
    - [Video Recording of the SW Roundtable Forest Health Workshop](#)
    - [All resources Dropbox link](#)
  - SJHFHP
    - Consider how we work with the forest-water nexus
    - Water quantity and quality has always been a part of the discussion with Headwaters partners
    - Similar questions and work to Rio Grande headwaters
      - David Moser uses LiDAR to understand dynamics
    - Forest Restoration industry is an interested participant in these conversations and has a lot to offer
    - Concerns
      - How to tie Headwaters work to water *quantity* + forest treatment
        - Headwaters did not take on SMP earlier on, now we have WEP working on a watershed management plan
- 2-3-2 Full partnership meeting Wednesday, Nov. 18

- Notes to be available next month
- Morning session
  - Land managers gave presentations about CO and NM Forest Action Plans
  - Partners discussed planned work across four national forests: San Juan, Rio Grande, Carson, and Santa Fe
  - Shared Stewardship
- Afternoon
  - Discussion about *focal areas* and how to bring local priorities to the forefront
  - A lot of federal work is already planned but members stated that it was important to enable local collaboratives to include their place-based projects moving forward
- WEP Letter of Support
  - Letter of support signed on behalf of SJHFHP for WEP Ph III proposal
  - SJHFHP Education and outreach written in to grant
  - Logistics
    - SW Basin Roundtable approved WEP PhIII Grant request
      - Other approvals: MSI 416 pollution monitoring and Forests to Faucets ed program
    - Will know whether funded ~March 2021 (from State and CWCB)
  - Feedback
    - Would like to see more focus and work in mountains near Dolores and San Juan counties
- Rio Grande Water Fund membership
  - Headwaters group is now a member of Rio Grande Water fund due to alignment of goals

**9:45 – 10:15** Turkey and Devil Creek Project Scoping Preview (Matt Tuten)

- Scoping effort/process (this presentation is in anticipation of formal scoping)
  - Timeline
    - Formal scoping to begin mid-Dec (Dec 17) and run for 45d, through Feb 1 2021 (public input)
      - Matt to send access to scoping letter to partnership
    - Comments, then proposal adjustment
    - Draft EA to come out March/April 2021
    - Then formal comments on draft EA
    - Proceed from there
    - Engage with SJHFHP again in late winter/spring re: feedback received during formal comment period, how can we change proposal to address concerns, and add to specific monitoring objectives
  - Implement 2013 SJNF forest plan desired conditions
  - Some road improvement and maintenance
  - Maintenance of fuels and forest growth, structure and composition in a socially important landscape

- Avoid trail impacts and restrict winter operations due to recreation use
- Map
  - General area = middle mountain to devil mountain, up to Pagosa Lakes and large ranches on north and Aspen Springs on the south
  - Area 1: East of yellow line; Area 2: West of yellow line
  - 3 components: Yellow = TS, Red = minimal forest product component, Green = proposing more intensive harvest
    - Yellow – mechanized maintenance work including hand thinning, mowing etc. To facilitate use of fire and reduce fuel density and continuity
    - Red – proposed areas with some component of forest product outputs in east landscape
    - Green – more intensive harvest, identified for forest product outputs in forest plan
- Draft purpose and need
  - Manage fuels on landscape for safe and effective wildland fire management
  - Manage forests for resilience to future expected disturbances including wildfire and drought (structure and composition)
  - Promote long-term wildlife habitat sustainability
  - Wood products for commercial and non-commercial
  - Hope to facilitate use of Rx fire
- History and maintenance
  - Several projects and EAs on this landscape since the 1990s
    - Evolution/refresh of 2005 Turkey EA and 1998 Devil Cr. Goals EA
    - Trying to facilitate Rx fire on landscape under EA completed a few years ago
- Understanding Management Areas
  - Area 1: TS trail system (east, ~ 14,000 ac)
    - PP, Gamble oak
    - Adjacent to Pagosa Lakes homes
    - Flat and accessible including many trails
    - Lower intensity, mostly maintenance work with scattered tree removal
      - Large Tx area proposed, Tx will happen in small scattered areas
      - No significant forest product goals beyond those in service to ecological goals
    - Forest products (wood “byproducts”)
      - Proposed removal on ~30-40% of area (4200-5600ac)
      - Where second growth/Blackjack PP trees form a continuous canopy layer
      - Promote wildlife habitat values, reduce potential for crown fire, beetle outbreaks and drought impacts
  - Area 2: West (~9400ac)
    - PP, Gamble oak, WD mixed conifer and CM mixed conifer in far NW area, Aspen in patches

- Further from community, fewer trails and rec use
- Variable topography, Devil Cr. is largest drainage, top of Chris Mtn, flanks of Devil Mtn
- More intensive Tx and management, focused tree harvests in areas identified for forest product outputs in forest plan
- Forest Products (outputs as long-term management objective)
  - Proposed forest product removal on ~80-90% (7500-8500ac)
  - PP: STS or improvement cutting in dense, even-aged, contiguous
    - Promote wildlife habitat values, reduce potential for crown fire and beetle outbreaks
    - Move forest closer to HRV – scattered old, lg diameter trees with openings 0.25-1.5ac and establish new PP cohort
  - Mixed Conifer: mixed improvement cutting, single/group/patch selection in dense and contiguous stands
    - Maintain and promote complexity in addition to resistance and resilience to disturbance
    - Open stands of fire-adapted species, young aspen patches 2-10ac on up to ¼ total harvest area, retain ~20% unharvested areas within harvest areas
    - Englemann spruce and Douglas fir recent beetle kill to be recovered along with selection harvest. Harvest residual live overstory Englemann spruce in areas of high spruce mortality. (NW corner, near E Monument road)
    - Retain small diameter conifer/aspen and/or mature Douglas-fir
  - PP management: Spatial pattern objectives (structure, groups, openings)
    - Specify spatial structure targets in PP and dry mixed conifer
      - Groups 1/10<sup>th</sup> to 1.5 ac (interlocking crowns)
      - Openings 1/4<sup>th</sup> to 1.5 ac
      - Retention of broad range of densities and patterns – complexity!
      - Retain old pre-settlement trees (pre-1880)
    - Important Northern Goshawk habitat, true to forest evolution over past several millennia, so thinning to average spacing doesn't get to desired conditions as well.
  - Non-commercial Tx
    - Dry forest types, PP, WD mixed conifer and shrub sites
    - Use natural breaks as Tx unit boundaries and fuel breaks (e.g., Roads, trails)
    - Proximity to private land or other specific values important for wildfire management
    - Implementation: hand thinning, mowing, mastication chipping, thinning, pre-commercial thinning
    - Who does the work: service contracts, integrated resource contracts,



- small product permits (firewood, post and pole)
  - Provide feedback! What do you like, do you notice any red flags, what would you like to see changed or further discussed?
- SJHFHP input and feedback
  - Thank you for bringing this to the collaborative to discuss before moving forward, truly collaborative
  - *Q: Road access to landscape?*
    - *Turkey Springs for the whole project: lower turkey/Chris mountain, upper turkey. Only a couple of road access points. Devil creek trail system access motorized*
  - *Q: Is there an inclusion of snags and cavity nesters in prescription?*
    - *Have a protocol in place including specific objectives and criteria to maintain snags especially in mixed conifer*
    - *Don't always have in place in PP, but will maintain any that exist*
  - *Q: What are challenges of leaving clumps on landscapes?*
    - *Traditionally in forestry, spacing trees makes sense for harvest and fire reduction/management (clustered trees won't grow as fast and may set each other on fire). Tradeoffs to clumping trees in management and Tx.*
    - *Leaving clumps is harder to do: must have goals and assess whether pattern goals are being met. Also, forests are not traditionally measured spatially. To assess spatial patterns, we need to look at maps of trees (locations, imagery)*
      - *Current tools aren't the best for analysis of spatial goals.*
      - *Imagery after harvest can be collected quickly, and we can map tree locations to assess patterns, so our methods and tools are improving*
      - *Biological and ecological evidence that many species need these kinds of conditions and that this is how our forest has evolved over time*
    - *From an industry perspective, must have repeated/maintainable contracts and industry must adapt to landscape needs.*
      - *Equipment constraints: moving around landscape. Clumps make skidding operations more difficult and can create longer skidding roads*
      - *Industry inertia constraints: clumps are not a part of regular operations, so getting employees to understand protocol can be difficult and it's harder to ensure compliance.*
      - *Results: more difficult to monitor/see how you did.*
  - *Q: Clumping and spatial patterns were pointed out as a priority in PP Partnership Tx of late 90s with comments that marking trees a big challenge to achieving desired conditions (Found Park). Will there be primarily marking or Designation by Prescription (DxP – contract has specific guide about how to remove trees from landscape)?*
    - *Some of both*
    - *In areas closer to Pagosa Lakes, want to be more specific about outcomes*

- *Areas further out that aren't as public-facing and in need more intensive Tx looking to use DxP.*
- *Currently DxP associated with Brockover area and Long-term Stewardship Project task orders, good results, also at Echo Canyon where DxP was used*
- *No evidence that loggers do better/worse than a timber marking crew. Just have more time to adjust if marking vs DxP.*
- *Resources to look at spatial patterns from other projects, which may help with implementation of the Turkey/Devil Cr. Project down the road*
  - *Something to talk about with this group, important objective with all of pine management*
- *Q: Opinion on total price/acre when marking vs DxP?*
  - *It all depends. Overall, DxP is less expensive, but also less precise and cost transfers to administration of contracts, requiring more capacity so it's not a huge cost savings. Projects can be contracted faster without marking when using DxP, but there's a transfer to administration needs which often becomes a bottleneck.*
  - *DxP increases capacity. Better off to increase capacity for contract administration if doing DxP, but also must realize industry participants are likely to "mess up" because of learning curve and iterative learning process involved. Monitoring is also more difficult.*
- *Q: Water quantity implications of treatments?*
  - *Landscape is dry overall. No perennial streams and runoff is short and in the early spring. Historically south-facing slopes are mostly open. Not as much focus on water quantity because it's a lower-elevation, warm landscape and snow doesn't stick around (compared to higher elevation forests). Water objectives more focused on creating resilience to drought. More focus on fuels reduction and fire severity mitigation.*
- *Q: Gambel oak management?*
  - *Not using herbicide. Mowing, especially in dense areas up to 70-80% with retention of higher density patches. Will then allow the Forest Service to use fire to maintain continuity and height to mitigate ladder fuels for potential fire ~every 5-15-20 years. Maintaining height and pattern, but not getting rid of it.*
  - *Some already done in TX, Fourmile, Fawn Gulch, Buckles Lake*
- *Are there any other forest types we might use this spatial patterning in (besides PP)?*
  - *PP forests have had the most research done on them, and the focus on clumps groups is based in that forest type. In wetter mixed-conifer forests, there are some fine-scaled clumped patterns, but higher elevation patterns become more random. Looking for bigger patch sizes at higher elevations, larger scale patches (e.g.: 10-100-acre patches rather than 1/4-1 acre)*
  - *Not a ton of spatial pattern research about SW CO Mixed Conifer*
    - *Kyle Rodman Mogillon rim research*

- *Think about the processes that create and maintain these spatial patterns. In PP its frequent fire. In high elevation mixed conifer forests, there is a mixed-fire severity regime, so larger groups of multi-species creating both larger clumps and openings with more complexity in canopy structure. Diseases, rather than fire, becomes a driving force for spatial patterns at higher elevations.*
- *Q: Historic conditions of Gambel oak in Ponderosa pine areas?*
  - *Really variable based on historical photos and accounts*
    - *Durango West large clumps of shrub oak, Dolores and Pagosa clumped oak with single large stems*
  - *One hypothesis: fires group Gambel oak into fewer, larger stems, rather than sprawling shrub-form. Historically, fires happened in dry months when Gambel oak was more receptive to burning, resulting in tree-like oak in small groups. Today, we see different oak responses when putting Rx fire on the ground in wetter months. Sprouting shrub response occurs because we're burning when oak isn't as receptive to burning; repeat burning can be used to reduce carbohydrate storage and encourage it to clump. Oak has always been present in our geography and is a key component of it (owls, bird diversity). Important to maintain, but also consider how to shape its spatial and structural patterns to meet management goals.*
  - *This project is an opportunity to monitor spatial patterns and a chance for implementors to ensure those desired conditions are created. With CFLRP funding, it's an important opportunity for Headwaters to engage with the nuance of what restoration and forest resilience mean. A time for us to think creatively about monitoring. It's a chance for our geography and group to be on the leading edge of efforts across the forest. This inquiry will also help support and inform industry in making these prescriptions a regular practice.*

#### **10:15 – 10:45 Financials**

- Finance committee working on 2021 draft budget
- Successful Q4 Fundraising
  - ~16,000 total fundraising for the year, will need to ramp up in 2021, still a win!
    - Need to improve small donations
  - Winter fundraising campaign to start in Dec
    - Support the partnership if you can
    - Considering unique fundraising environment this year
    - Ed & Outreach fundraising and priorities
  - Pagosa Area Water and Sanitation district to support in 2021: \$7,500
  - Doug Secrist with San Juan Water Conservancy District to support in 2020 and increase support in 2021: \$1,500 (2020), \$2,500 (2021)
  - Alpine cascade ranch: \$1,000
  - Banded Peak Ranch: \$6,000 (Q3)
  - Presentation with MT to Audubon last month, may pursue joint fundraising opportunities
    - Because funds not used in – ending year \$24,000 in unrestricted

- access (cash NOT grant-related)
    - Good news: increasing funds, bringing total raised amount to \$60,000 BUT will need to ramp up in 2021
    - Need to improve small donations
- SJHFHP/MSI Agreement and Rates
  - 2021 Agreement with MSI to be updated
  - New federal indirect rate for 2020: little bit over 26% (federal)
    - SJH unrestricted funds and state funds (e.g.: CAFA) charged indirect at a non-federal 17% rate
  - Finance committee to review and decide whether to continue relationship with MSI in 2021, offer feedback to Matt Ford
- Winter 2020 fundraising
  - To start in December
  - Support the partnership if you can
  - Fundraising environment unique in 2020
  - Ed & Outreach fundraising opportunities
    - Finance committee to look that over and decide if groups want to continue that relationship with MSI into 2021 – please offer feedback to Matt Ford
- QUARTER 3 Financials
  - Review budget vs actual for expense categories quarterly
    - Actuals
      - Been an odd year, changes to coordinator and subcontractor work
      - Generally, on track with goals of this year
  - If anyone have questions on budget/wrap-up please reach out to committee members: Matt Ford, Doug Secrist, Aaron Kimple, Matt Tuten, Dana Hayward, or Steve Hartvigsen
- Q4 Projection and future
  - Q4 projections: to end year with ~24,000 in unrestricted account (didn't spend as much on in person meetings and supplies)
  - Preliminary estimated hold of ~\$22,000 of unrestricted funds
    - ~60% coordinator for ½ of year, time to look for additional funding
    - Covers in case of government shutdown
  - Have substantial list of action priorities but not enough funds for it all → Think about mechanisms to raise funds and support activities
  - Cohesive Strategy dollars expire July 31 2021
    - Sizeable part of budget (mod 1) has been through this
    - Pacing the use of funds was successful
    - ~\$50,000 left in 2021, only through July 31
      - Expend by July 31
      - ~\$25,000 for CFRI evaluation (subcontractor)
      - ~\$30,000 for Education/Evaluation/Planning components
      - Aggressive fundraising to support the latter part of 2021
- Priorities feedback for 2021 financial plan
  - 2021 Budget Action Priority List DRAFT
    - Orange column items are “must do,” assigning dollar amounts
    - Green column items are things we'd like to do; we need to assign

- dollar amounts to these and consider how to fundraise to accomplish them, or be ok with letting them go in the short term (but keeping them in mind for the long term)
    - Please take even 20 minutes to review and provide feedback, anything missing? Should we move actions and projects
  - Membership concept
    - “Friend-raising” intended to have community feel engaged in the group
    - Benefits: would get newsletter, invited to events, etc. Support our fundraising initiatives
    - Is this worth pursuing, what would it look like? Can we create a draft budget for creating a membership program, a proposal?
  - Education and Outreach Participation
- CAFA Success
  - Success story of mitigating lands in low-income communities
  - Funds
    - ~\$66,000 on the ground subcontractor expenditure (1ac lots in aspen springs area)
    - About used all money and came close to original estimated acres treated and properties protected over 3-year life of grant
    - CSFS approved expansion of geography, allowing us to use all the funds, and a time extension for use of funds, big thanks to Daniel Beveridge at CSFS
      - Holiday Acres, Lower Blanco (expansion beyond Stollsteimer Cr. Area only)
  - 2020
    - 48-acres treated, many 1-acre lots in Aspen springs
  - Spring 2021
    - 12.5-acres ~½ complete (too muddy to finish in 2020)
      - 5-acres on north side of hill to be completed
    - May be able to complete 1 more project depending on costs
  - Future
    - Takes a while to build momentum when explaining mitigation to communities not familiar with fire mitigation processes and importance → something to build into future grants and budgeting
      - 1<sup>st</sup> year some landowners (early adopters)
      - 2<sup>nd</sup> Year: more landowners
      - 3<sup>rd</sup> Year: broader adoption
- ~~CPLA matching funds support discussion~~ (not discussed at meeting)

**10:45 – 11:00** Closing, Next Steps, Other Business

- Weminuche Audubon Society Updates
  - Rocky Mountain Community Science Conference (U WY Biodiversity Institute)
    - Proposal accepted, will present Dec 4 (all day, but can drop in and out \$10 to sign up)
      - <http://www.wyobiodiversity.org/index.php/community-science/rocky-mountain-community-science-conference>

- Shout out to Headwaters – thank you!
- Highlights
  - Adapted sampling methods for pandemic
  - Participant engagement
  - Ed/Outreach about fire ecology, forest health principles
  - Research objectives
- 2020 Bird Monitoring Data
  - 2<sup>nd</sup> year report – quick summary:
    - Participation is up
    - More than 800 hours that will increase by 100, more than double than 2019
    - Turkey Springs is recovering and data is more like Fawn Gulch than last year.
    - More bird species recorded at Jackson Mountain, which likely reflects improved birding skills of teams
    - Participant enthusiasm remains high
    - Looking to extend into 2021 and/or expand efforts into ASCC monitoring area
- Membership
  - Can sign up on the Weminuche Audubon website (will have to send in a check for membership)
  - Access to bird identification webinars leading up to holiday bird count
- Upcoming events
  - Christmas bird count on Dec 19
    - <http://www.weminucheaudubon.org/event/november-chapter-meeting-winter-birds-101/>
- Annual review survey to be distributed in December, please respond!
  - Will look at the End Year Review survey results and report at January Meeting
- Transition plan for local USFS changes, Kevin Khung
  - Please think through how we can thank Kevin for all his work with the partnership
  - Dana will make personal phone calls to ask for feedback

Meeting End 10:18am

**Zoom Information:**

Topic: SJHFHP Meeting Friday November 20

Time: Nov 20, 2020 09:00 AM Mountain Time (US and Canada)

**Join Zoom Meeting**

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85047400811?pwd=dzdzL3Z3ZUNXRkFPNytGcnErcUIVZz09>

Meeting ID: 850 4740 0811

Passcode: 339422

One tap mobile

+13462487799,,85047400811#,,,,,0#,,339422# US (Houston)

+16699009128,,85047400811#,,,,,0#,,339422# US (San Jose)

Dial by your location

+1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

+1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

+1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

+1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

+1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

+1 301 715 8592 US (Washington D.C)

Meeting ID: 850 4740 0811

Passcode: 339422

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85047400811?pwd=dzdzL3Z3ZUNXRkFPNytGcnErcUIVZz09>