



San Juan Headwaters

FOREST HEALTH PARTNERSHIP

San Juan Headwaters Forest Health Partnership Virtual Meeting NOTES for Friday, April 23, 2021

Location: Virtual Zoom Meeting

Regular Meeting: 9:00 AM – 11:00 AM

In attendance: Dana Hayward (MSI), Aaron Kimple (MSI), Mike Remke (MSI), Doug Secrist (SJWCD), Emily Swindell (MSI), Bill Trimarco (WAP), Matt Tuten (SJNF), Marin Chambers (CFRI), Emily Hohman (TNC), Caleb Stotts (CPLA), Steve Hartvigsen (volunteer), Luke Dittrich (CSFS), Bob Milford (San Juan Outdoor Club), Coby Robertson (NRCS), Shaan Bliss (NRCS), Ed Millard (SW Basin Roundtable), Matt Ford (Clean Forest Energy)

VIRTUAL MEETING NOTES

9:00 – 9:15 Welcome and Introductions

9:15 – 10:00 Science in Practice

- Spring Science Forum overview and next steps
 - Day 1 Summary (March)
 - Monitoring opportunities and impacts
 - Breakout discussions where participants brought questions and concerns forward
 - How do we address specific questions via scientific methods? (Ecological, Social, Economic)
 - Day 2 Summary (April)
 - Themes of questions and concerns from day 1
 - What is a good thought model to address these
 - Where on the landscape or in our community can we begin to investigate and/or address?
 - What tools/answers do we already have?
 - Science Forum Feedback
 - Temporal scale missing from concerns and questions
 - How long do treatments take and how quickly can the landscape recover from disturbance
 - Landscape can look “rough” it can look after timber harvest, but also after insect, disease, and fire events
 - Treatment geography and influence is often relatively small, especially around Pagosa with roadless, wilderness, slopes (operability)
 - Study areas are very small compared to the full landscape

- If public better understands scale and impacts, and if land managers consider the intensity of Tx and “why” behind it, we can all learn more about forest dynamics together
 - Start with a study area, then expand concepts learned
- What is the San Juan doing to manage forests?
 - Active vs non-active management
 - Actively managing only ~20% of landscape, due primarily to operability
 - Opportunity to try a lot on a small portion of the forest
 - Timescale missing from dialogue
 - When will we return to managed areas, why?
 - Tx lifespan, product production, habitat
 - Communicate what to expect to the community and explore whether that aligns with their perceptions/expectations and other resource areas
 - Easier to focus on doing rather than long-term context
 - What is the long-term vision and how do we communicate that to the public?
 - What is the long-term vision, what do we want to see done in what places and why? How do we communicate that?
 - Some are pro Tx, others con Tx
 - Operating somewhere in the middle
 - Important that management actions have clearly defined goals and objectives with measurable outcomes designed through collaboration
 - Consider time and spatial scale to ensure we’re achieving goals/objectives and moving in the right direction
 - Metrics of success
 - Project scale, broader scale
- Doughnut modeling for the Headwaters geography
 - Want to move the needle on the social aspects of where we work, understand ecological components, and building a relationship between where we work in the forest and social/economic wellbeing
 - Transformational Change: Alignment of Values
 - Ecological Forestry, Economic Forestry, Social Forestry
 - Identify desired conditions in all these realms and measure our success against those
 - Not every project will hit in the middle of the Venn diagram
 - Aggregate of projects that altogether hit the social, ecological, and economic needs

- Think about more integrated resilience (Donut Economics Kate Raworth) beyond the Venn diagram
 - What does it take to live within our means, support community health, and be resilient? Building economics into ecological and community health
 - More about overall impact vs. where we do the work and how
 - <https://www.kateraworth.com/doughnut/>
- How do we build donut model for our community?
 - Science Forum could help us build a doughnut that thinks through social, economic, and ecological components locally
 - What will it take for our community to stay healthy and maintain a healthy ecosystem?
- Science Forum outputs
 - Take questions and concerns and apply to a doughnut model
 - Begin to define resilient what a resilient Pagosa, living within the parameters of a healthy ecosystem looks like
 - Include social and economic components
 - Think through monitoring
 - How do we want to live within broader landscape, and what does success mean?
 - Distill to <5 concepts in each bin
 - Amsterdam doughnut e.g. <https://www.kateraworth.com/2020/04/08/amsterdam-city-doughnut/>
 - In the doughnut, you can have too much or too little of anything measurable (fire, wood products)
 - Define a desired condition and consider shortfalls and overshoots
 - Use doughnut to gauge measurable outcomes, or using measurable outcomes to build the doughnut
 - Do we want to use the doughnut vs. Venn diagram?
 - Workshop to define what doughnut would look like, what are the relevant measurable outcomes
 - One way to look at things comprehensively
 - Understanding of place
 - What makes it special, the same or different from another place
 - Certain places are extremely important for specific doughnut factors, and others are less so
 - Aesthetics very important in Turkey Springs
 - Where are values critical and appropriate? Venn diagram puts things on certain parts of the landscape
 - Talk through the where and the why, then think about metrics of success
- 2 main objectives/applications

- How to identify how we communicate to the community
 - Justify and articulate our work
- Look backwards at what we are trying to do
- What is outcome from this exercise?
 - Help think through and refine what's important to our community and what we want to measure to understand our level of success
 - Monitor, measure and demonstrate where we are achieving success and where we are not
 - A mechanism to:
 - Identify outcomes
 - Monitor and measure outcomes and their collective impact
 - Relate outcomes and outputs
 - Understand how outcomes impact efforts beyond their interest/geography
 - Relate outcomes to resiliency and future security
 - How do projects with defined goals fit into broader vision of what we want to get done for the community and landscape as a whole?
 - How do we capture temporal scale in this thought model?
 - Is it predictive? Descriptive?
- Get to the point of broad and shared understanding in a community of what actions fit where and why (community pride – we understand what's going on and why and we're ok with that)
 - Take what we know now and get the community on board
- Is this a thought exercise for us to understand ourselves and our community better, will there be an actionable product?
 - This is a challenging thing to apply to a decision
 - Look at decisions and use diagram to evaluate whether those decisions fit within a desired paradigm
 - Is this a tool that can help us actively make decisions?
 - Product will help us define desired conditions for identified values, create a monitoring program to help assess if achieving desired conditions, and visualize accomplishments
 - Public engagement, education, and understanding
 - Objective definitions, assessment of we're reaching objectives, and how do we educate the public
- Need a plan with deadlines to communicate to everyone when this will be done, how it's funded, update as needed
 - What is everyone's role
- Day 1 sci forum raw data

- Some questions and concerns were broad scale, and some are much more specific and place-based
 - Potential visibility of Tx from Piedra Road
 - Slash Piles
 - Are we reducing Spruce Bud Worm?
 - WUI and harvest areas
 - How and where do we start?
 - Go through questions and concerns and map to specific project areas that can address them
 - Also eliminate geographies not relevant to specific questions and concerns (e.g., Turkey Springs is PP dominant, so we won't get much info about SBW from that area)
 - Map to spatial information
 - Then can track planning docs, Tx docs, and monitoring if available
 - Do we measure up to what we said we were going to do, or not?
 - Some of what we're talking about is hard to measure! (e.g., variability across the landscape is subjective)
 - Next Step: get project managers and planners together to go over questions and concerns, identify projects on the landscape and fit those together where appropriate
 - Existing or future opportunities to address questions and concerns
 - Where are different components are happening on the landscape and to what extent
- San Juan Science Network proposal
 - Charter for San Juan Mtn Sci Network
 - Ask from Kara Chadwick
 - A more direct way to engage science collaborators on the SJNF
 - Ask from SJNF, but ensure it was built from collaboratives to give all of us space and tools to engage with scientists to:
 - Fill knowledge gaps
 - Assess monitoring
 - Assist in interpretation of results
 - Bring in expert knowledge when appropriate
 - Cross-collaborative meeting with Headwaters, 4Rivers, and DWRP in 2020
 - Partners wanted to see a revised concept
 - Reworked science network concept and bringing back to collaboratives

- More fully formed idea of how this would play out for collaborative groups
 - How is this of mutual benefit to collaboratives and scientists participating in the network
 - IS this the right mechanism for collaboratives to engage with scientists and experts that may not be consistently involved in these groups
- Draft proposal and feedback
 - Intention is for the network to benefit all collaborative groups and serve as a cross collab support tool in Southwest CO
 - Headwaters to consider and evaluate utility of this network to this group
 - Can it help us seek data and get closer to answering and evaluating the questions we're asking?
 - Brings academic and research portions to our landscape that can help this group address questions and concerns
 - How and where does Headwaters see benefit from involvement in this network
 - What specific feedback about the nuts and bolts of functionality do we have? (Does the document serve the group and network scientists?)
 - Questions/Comments and Feedback
 - How do people decide whether they're on/part of the science network? Who decides? (Marin Chambers)
 - Point people that are considered "on" the science network team who then work out to a broader network?
 - Anyone else doing this? Is there a committee or network elsewhere that works well that we could emulate?
 - Tony Chang (CFRI) has helped develop similar networks for Front Range collaboratives, participated in a similar advisory network for the GMUG Spruce-Fire Working Group (Spruce Beetle Epidemic and Aspen Decline Management Response), helped with the Uncompaghre CFLR, and helped with this draft proposal
 - Based some principles on science advisory network that Deschutes CFLRP
 - Gathered lots of info from lots of diff places and also recognize specifics of our situation
 - Academic institution ties are strong on the Front Range and on the Deschutes
 - Everyone wants to work in SW CO, but no one has the capacity
 - Learn from challenges of other groups and adapt what works to our space

- Challenges faced by others
 - Vocal engaged scientists that dominated conversation
 - We want to have scientists that are open to collaborative dialogue and processes so ideas are balanced and communicated in useful ways
- Big project, how will this work? (Capacity concerns)
 - Not under umbrella of Headwaters or any specific collaborative, broader and cross-collaborative
 - Ensure Headwaters receives attention from network, benefits from it and contributes to it
 - Cross-boundary management in greater San Juan mountain geography
 - Bring academics to collaborative spaces through meeting participation and offer opportunities to listen to stakeholders
 - Bridge management and implementation concerns to academic partnerships
 - Address place-based concerns through scientific processes
 - Network to be informed by and benefit collaborative partners (useful and actionable).
 - Important remains rooted in and driven by collaborative efforts.
 - Network participation help Headwaters live the principle of rooting our conversations, recommendations, and decisions in the best available science
- Incentive to partners and scientists to participate?
 - Ask academic partners to assign a partner? Request specific participants? Compensation?
 - San Juans are geographically and ecologically unique, so people want to work here
 - Addressing knowledge gaps that inform management is a desirable problem for scientists to work on
 - Poised to leverage Headwater's efforts to pursue funding and support for broader research already being pursued (local application)
 - Funding leverage from CFLRP and RMRI
 - Land manager – scientist partnerships for management driven perspectives and work
- What funding supports other science networks?
 - Variable

- Some affiliated with CFLRPs have designated coordinated paid through CFLRP
- Others free form, leveraging of grants to support efforts, volunteers
- Always good to connect science and management through a forum where the connections can take place
 - What is the general geographic scope and relationship to the SW CP and Rio Chama CFLRs?
 - Open ended geographic scope, looking for landscape connectivity and commonalities
 - More of a hub for a broader network (vs. a specific committee) to serve a complex landscape
 - E.g., curious about how forest structure and silvicultural strategies influence water availability and snow retention (application of Dave Moeser modeling in Jemez to South San Juans, better coordination between researchers)
- Social engagement and economic measures
 - Pines Project research effort on Dolores District and economics work
 - Hope to include scientists involved in economics and social science
 - Agency partners are often strong on environmental end and weak on social and economic end
 - Science network could bring these other dimensions
- This is still in process!
 - Ongoing conversation, a topic for May
 - Written feedback is welcome

10:00 – 10:50 Updates

- Weminuche Audubon
 - 2020 Bird monitoring program to launch May 15th with field orientation
 - Field season will be May 22-July 11
 - It would be great to get Headwaters partners out in the field with these teams this summer
 - The SJH-WAS partnership is impactful, unique, and important (community science associating wildlife values with forest management)
 - Potential tour of monitoring site(s)
- Legislative Updates
 - Outdoor Restoration Partnership Act
 - Introduced bill April 20, 2021, positive outlook
 - Broad support from a diversity of stakeholders: NWF, National Association State Foresters, TNC, NWTF, American Forests, Audubon, Family Farm Alliance, TU, State of CO DNR, Denver Water, Club 20 and others

- Thank you for letting Headwaters provide feedback!
 - Shaped additional focus on WUI
 - Clarity that bill isn't to augment traditional FS logging programs but rather to focus on funding ecological restoration work
 - Reflection of local values, collaboration, coordination
 - Forest management through lens of community centers outward
- Along with house rep Jason Crow (CO), house rep Mike Simpson (ID), support from senator Ron Widen
 - Intended to respond to scope and scale needed for forest restoration because we currently lack capacity and funding to do the work
 - \$60 billion total fund (supplemental on top of existing)
 - \$40 billion: regular federal channels
 - \$20 billion: local, state governments, tribes, etc.
 - Here is where Headwaters can directly apply for funding by making case to council
- Biden Build Back Better Plan
 - Marker for 50 billion for similar fund and mentions ORPA bill by name
 - Biden wants infrastructure plan passed by July 4, challenging because of the size
 - Could be passed in regular route or via budget reconciliation (not subject to filibuster, more complex process and would require re-structuring of funding allocation because it has to be based on existing statute)
 - If had to do this, would push for more CFLRP money
 - On same page as administration for securing funding
 - Long way to go through legislative process
 - Bill assigned to Senate Ag committee
 - Bennet chairs forestry subcommittee
 - Percentages for allocation could change through this process
- Appreciation for focus on precise definitions
 - Different types of work in different places with varied audiences who apply it
- Senator Wyden initiatives to combine PILT and SRS
 - If this is re-written, would help rural communities if counties receiving it must put a portion into Title 3 for work on the ground
 - Many rural counties put this funding into Title 1 for schools and roads only

- SRS landscape is unclear, Wyden got some funding from infrastructure bill via budget reconciliation and put ~2b toward public land counties (same that get SRS and PILT)
 - No new law in budget reconciliation
 - Treasury department discretion about spending funds (how will funds go out and application is unclear)
 - Intent was not to supplant SRS
 - Senator Bennet working to reauthorize SRS in the short term with Senator Wyden
 - Radical restructuring of SRS is unlikely to be successful
 - May be an uphill battle just to reauthorize
 - Appropriation committee may say got \$ in American Rescue Plan
 - What can we do with supplemental funding from American Rescue Plan? Pay attention here, look for draft from treasury
 - National Association of Counties
- Joint Chiefs
 - Helps us work across fence lines at landscape scale
 - Bill would permanently set up the program in statute (not just an administrative initiative)
 - Funding at 100M annually with 40% for FS and 40% to NRCS with 20% swing funds
 - No larger programmatic changes, just change to regular appropriations
- Wyden bill to broaden use of fire as a tool
 - Bennet likely to co-sponsor, hearing last congress, unknown if has been introduced this congress yet
- Connecting with new SW staffers
 - Future field trip opportunities (Turkey Springs or Williams Creek to show interplay of different treatments, maintenance, and community)
 - Turkey Springs tour (cycling or hike), to highlight data, WUI, well managed Ponderosa Pine forest through a multi-generational effort
- Climate Adaptation Science Center Proposal (USGS)
 - Proposal aimed to address nexus between forest management and water quantity
 - Forest influence on snow accumulation, melt, and soil moisture
 - Mike Remke, Keith Musselman, Scott Roberts, Mike Battaglia proposal leads, engage SJHFHP also
 - Not invited for full proposal
 - Look for other avenues
 - Ed Millard could consider CO Water Plan funding and will read Mike's proposal in more detail to see about funding opportunities
 - Set up presentation/workshop with Dave Moeser and Ryan Webb in the future (Caleb to make the connection with Ed Millard)

- Funding for research is critical, path to action is the sell
 - Becky Mitchell (UCRC, heads CWCB), tell the story of the good work we're doing here state-wide
- TNC and SJNF
 - Signed another funding agreement to support TREX and cooperative burning
 - Application and times still TBD
 - Hoping for 2021 work
- Upcoming events and opportunities
 - Cross-collaborative CFLR working group
 - Funding for a 3rd party facilitator to navigate CFLR
 - RFQ being created
 - If interested in contributing, reach out to Dana
 - CO Water Plan seeking forest health outreach
 - Contact Dana if interested in providing feedback
 - CFLRP key indicator feedback (R2 and R3)
 - How do we monitor success for our CFLR projects?
 - Feedback format and opportunity forthcoming
 - Pagosa Earth Day event tomorrow, April 24
 - Dana and Bill sharing a booth on river walk
 - Need to work with Ed and Outreach committee about summer activities
 - FRWRM project successful, working out details
 - Funding Request to be submitted to ToPS
 - Finance committee to meet 2nd week of May for Q1 review
 - Turkey/Devil Creek Draft EA out and open for comment until May 15
 - Dana and Bill provided input to LUDC with ToPS consultant

10:50 – 11:00 Closing, Next Steps, Other Business

- WAP putting together a FRWRM proposal
 - Defensible space work on cost share basis on private lands in Hwy 84 corridor, LOS needed
 - Headwaters support for work in this area
- Potential Phase 2 proposal for 4mile area, Bill and Dana to coordinate
 - Caleb Stotts also looking at this for CPLA together with LSR proposal
 - Bill, Dana, and Caleb to coordinate

Meeting End 11:10am