



Forsythe II Multiparty Monitoring Group Kick Off Meeting

Wild Bear Nature Center, Nederland, CO

9/20/17

Attendees: additional attendees may not have signed in or filled out questionnaire

| Name | Affiliation |
|---------------------|---|
| Alex Markevich | Magnolia Forest Group |
| Allen Owen | CSFS Boulder |
| Brett Wolk | Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, CSU |
| Chad Julian | Resource Solutions; Little Thompson Watershed Coalition |
| Collin Rankin | |
| George Blakey | Magnolia Forest Group |
| Irene Shonle | Gilpin County Extension Service |
| Jim Cowart | |
| Jody Jahn | CU Professor of Communications |
| Julie Naster | |
| Kat Morici | Colorado Forest Restoration Institute |
| Kate Ellenbaum | |
| Kevin Zimlinghaus | US Forest Service |
| Lisa Mayhew Hynek | Big Springs Resident |
| Lisa Zucker | Big Springs Resident |
| Marin Chambers | Colorado Forest Restoration Institute |
| Mark Foreman | |
| Monte Williams | US Forest Service |
| Paul McCarthy | Magnolia Forest Group |
| Randy Lee | |
| Robert Frey | |
| Rudi Rankin | |
| Rudy Rankin | |
| Sheila Ranegar | Resident |
| Stefan Reinold | Boulder County Parks and Open Space |
| Stephen Whinston | |
| Susan Wagner | |
| Suzanne P. Macaulay | Magnolia Forest Group |
| Sylvia Clarke | US Forest Service |
| Teagen Blakey | |
| Tim Schuett | |
| Tony Cheng | Colorado Forest Restoration Institute |

| | |
|--------------|------------------------|
| Wes Isenhart | Gilpin County Resident |
| Yvonne Short | |

Agenda

- 6:30 Sign In, welcome, and introductions – Tony Cheng
- 6:45 What is multi-party monitoring – Tony Cheng and Marin Chambers
- Purposes
 - Expectations
 - Models/examples
- 7:00 Discussion: Sharing ideas and expectations
- 7:30 Next steps
- 8:00 Adjourn

Meeting Notes:

Introduction to Multiparty Monitoring – presentation by Tony Cheng (Colorado Forest Restoration Institute, CSU, hereafter CFRI) Detailed multiparty monitoring purposes, expectations, models and examples. Tony and CFRI provided several handouts for attendees that included handbooks on multiparty monitoring, examples of monitoring plans and monitoring results that CFRI is involved with, and multiparty monitoring (hereafter MPM) guidance for USFS Forsythe II Environmental Assessment (EA) and Final Decision. Tony also briefly discussed the CFLRP (Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program) which requires multiparty monitoring, how citizens and homeowners may engage in monitoring, and opened the dialogue to discuss expectations on what multiparty monitoring is and what the groups desired outcomes are. Other highlights from Tony’s introduction to MPM:

Multiparty monitoring components:

- Compliance/Implementation: Did USFS do what they say they would do? Was it legal?
- Effectiveness: Are we effectively accomplishing goals and objectives?
- Validation: Is there a better way to accomplish goals and objectives?

Balance of involvement and capacity of public citizens/groups, agency, and leadership.

Discussion: Sharing ideas and expectations about MPM:

CFRI Questionnaire: designed to get a sense of what level of involvement, hopes, concerns, and main monitoring questions or concerns are. Group members filled the questionnaire out and left with CFRI

Attendee comment: Final decision for Forsythe II contains several points on public participation in project design, some points about how monitoring will be conducted, and how results will be communicated. Emphasized public participation in tactical design phase that is stated in the Final Decision.

Attendee comment: How can the group strengthen community capacity? Engaged community members were not informed of meeting, consider publicizing this process beyond list of people who commented on planning phase.

Attendee comment: It may be difficult to include adaptive management in this project because NEPA has been written narrowly. Specifically, there is a maximum percentage of tree removal that can occur stated in the Final Decision; if monitoring results illustrate a need for increased removal of trees from project areas to achieve project goals (e.g. restore stands towards a composition, structure and spatial pattern to increase resilience to future natural disturbances such as wildfire), applying these results to the adaptive management process will be constrained due to the parameters stated in NEPA documentation.

Attendee comment: CWPP egress routes need to be cut out, may be able to remove more in to accomplish both objectives

Attendees' comments: This group wants the opportunity to provide design input for treatments. The group would like the US Forest Service to hear community input, learn from community members' intimate knowledge of the area, and take that input into the application of design criteria in the project layout phase. Members of the community are happy to work with the US Forest Service to make sure that they are successful in getting the project going and to get it right.

Silvia Clarke (USFS): This project will take many years. Each group of units can inform the next group in following years. More immediately, the USFS must treat 250-500 acres in fiscal year 2018 (FY starts in October). Due to new contracting guidelines, the timeframe to get contracts out for this first set of treatments is compressed. Timeline:

- Now- USFS needs to create a "crosswalk" of design criteria that were included in the EA and the Final Decision so they make sure to do all that they stated they would do in the documentation
- Mid-October- layout
- Mid-November- prep (painting)
- Late December- cruising
- February (possibly extending into March)- contract package must be out

Priorities have not been set in stone for the first round of treatments. Looking at getting the vegetation treatments done in planned broadcast burn area.

Attendee comment: The community would like to see local contractors get the opportunity to do the on the ground work – they are a part of this community and know and love this place and will be motivated to implement design as drafted by MPM and US Forest Service

Kevin Zimlinghaus (USFS): Small contracts have a more flexible advertising date (April). Have put out small contracts before in this area, no bids received, but can try again.

Monte Williams (USFS): Contractors working with the federal government have to indemnify the US Forest Service from liability, and thus need to have proper insurance requirements; this can lead to serious hurdles for small contractors to work with any government agency, including the USFS. If there

is a local contractor interested in implementing these or future projects, the USFS can have contracting representatives put on a seminar for local small contractors on how to meet federal contracting requirements and to see if they are interested in participating.

Attendee comment: Need to give feedback to USFS immediately before layout/contracting occurs in order for public to have input.

Silvia Clarke (USFS): This first round is on a very compressed timeline, future years will allow for more time and involvement. The MPM group can participate now, but the timeline is very constrained.

Attendee comment: The group wants the crosswalk document that Kevin and Sylvia will be working on to look over. How can it be distributed efficiently? Could it be funneled through CFRI website?

Tony Cheng (CFRI): This document and other documents can be kept on CFRI's website under the Forsythe II Project for the time being. In the long run, the group will need to decide if CFRI is the place where they would like to keep all documentation, data, and other resources

Attendee comment: The USFS needs to know how they will incorporate public input in this process.

Monte Williams (USFS): First step- define units, Second step- crosswalk. Can get public input into crosswalk

Attendee Question: Are units set in stone?

USFS: Not yet, but must consider equipment and contracting operational constraints

**After meeting, attendees had opportunity to share with Kevin Zimlinghaus the units that they would like to have the most input on

Next Steps:

Questions for future consideration:

Who are the parties in MPM?

How is this group going to be organized?

Where will documents be posted? Eventually, CFRI website, in a project folder with shapefiles, calendar, etc. Until then, email.

Comment- email is the best way to reach most people.

Communication: CFRI will send an email to all that RSVP'd to invitation or those that expressed interest in MPM group with meeting notes and documents provided. CFRI will also confirm people on the MPM group sign up list, findings from questionnaire Marin's draft matrix of objection letter concerns to potential monitoring questions.

USFS will create cross-walk and determine time(s) for a field trip to project sites

Next meeting: field trip to look at a flagged demonstration area to get community input

Questions or comments? Please contact Marin Chambers, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute @
marin.chambers@colostate.edu