

**Forsythe II Multiparty Monitoring Group (MMG)
February 19, 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM
Nederland Presbyterian Church
Meeting Summary – FINAL**

ATTENDANCE

Participants: Karen Blakemore, Teagen Blakey, Paul Bosman, Chad Buser, Tania Corvalan, Aurelia DeNasha, Mark Foreman, Angie Gee, Alex Markevich, Mark Mendonca, Yvonne Short, Susan Wagner, and Kevin Zimlinghaus

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace

ACTION ITEMS

Kevin Zimlinghaus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examine the counties included in Zone 1 of the local community definition in the Blue Dot Contract and clarify whether Boulder County can be added to Zone 1. • Prepare and distribute a document to the MMG that responds to the MMG’s comments on the Blue Dot contract. • Check to determine who owns the parcel that Boulder County archives indicate belongs to the State of Colorado. • Identify any available pictures which show a lodgepole pine stand several years following a patchcut to place in the surface fuels presentation.
Angie Gee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Determine whether a Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR) can attend a future MMG meeting to discuss opportunities for post-treatment monitoring and for the MMG to monitor whether there is a USFS representative at the beginning of a new treatment. • Update the MMG on any progress in the pre-work meeting at future meetings. • Contact Karen Gerrity, Nederland town administrator, for updates on the Big Springs egress road.
Tania Corvalan	Send the study about the impacts of chipping on the inoculation of mushroom spores to Samuel Wallace to distribute to the MMG.
Marin Chambers and Samuel Wallace	Identify pictures in the surface fuel presentation that are in Forsythe II and remove pictures not in Forsythe II.
Samuel Wallace	Send a Doodle to schedule meetings for March and the remainder of the year.

DISCUSSION ON BLUE DOT CONTRACT

MMG participants discussed the Blue Dot contract. Their comments are summarized below.

- In the Blue Dot contract, the contractor is paid based on their performance. There are two ways that the contracting officer determines the payment of the contractor if their work is below acceptable quality limits (AQL).
- The first payment method is a tiered version in which the performance level falls into discrete categories (e.g., the first tier is 98% to 100% performance, the second tier is 88% to 97%, etc.). If the contractor achieves a performance level of 98% to 100% then they will receive 100% payment, but if the contractor achieves a performance level between 88% and 97%, then they will receive 80% of the payment. The second payment method is a

direct relationship between the AQL and the payment (e.g., a 90% AQL results in 90% of the payment). The contracting officer can choose which payment method to use if the contractor's work falls below the AQL.

- The contract specifies that if the contractor does not reach the AQL, they are allowed to rework the treatment (if possible) to be in full compliance of the contract and receive full payment. This method incentivizes contractors to achieve the AQL.
- The contract specifies that the final date to complete work is September 2021. Some MMG participants said that this seemed like a long time period to complete work. It is standard practice to give contractors a year to complete work depending on when the contract is awarded. The Blue Dot Contract is 50 acres in size, so the expectation is that the contractor will finish the treatment before the September 2021 date.
- The Blue Dot Contract specifies that any biomass or incidental amounts of slash that is lopped and scattered will not exceed 18 inches. In mechanical units, contractors take the treated vegetation to a landing, which leads to fewer opportunities for debris to be lopped and scattered as there are in manual units.
- Some MMG participants said that the depth of lop-and-scatter should be 14 inches rather than 18 inches because any lop-and-scatter material in the mechanical units will not include boles, which the contractor will place in the landing sites. In mechanical units, there are different requirements for creating opportunities for nutrient cycling and wildlife. Therefore, some slash may need to go up to 18 inches to increase nutrient cycling and wildlife habitat.
- Under the "Benefit to Local Community/Local Workforce" section of the contract, it states that bids will be more competitive if they plan to use local workforce from Zone 1 (specific nearby counties in Colorado and Wyoming) and Zone 2 (any county in Colorado or Wyoming not specifically mentioned in Zone 1) for the project. The zoning allows local businesses to compete for the work. Boulder County was not included in Zone 1, and some MMG participants would like it to be listed. Kevin Zimlinghaus will look at the counties included in Zone 1 and clarify whether Boulder County can be included in Zone 1.
- There is a wetland area on the map of the Blue Dot Contract. US Forest Service (USFS) road engineers are determining what needs to be included in the contract specifications to address wetland concerns inside and outside of the streamside management zones. There will be more language in the contract related to mitigating impacts on that creek crossing.
- Under the contract, there will be a temporary closure of Forest Road 606.1, the road that leads into Units 9 and 10.
- Some MMG participants said that a strategy for wildlife piles in the contract should be for the contractor to construct some specific slash piles as wildlife piles, and the USFS would not burn those piles. In past meetings, the MMG discussed constructing all the piles as burn piles and reconfiguring remaining piles to be usable by wildlife on a shared stewardship day. There needs to be more time to develop specifications on what a wildlife pile would look like and where they should be located, so the contractor has clear directions on how to construct wildlife piles. Some MMG participants said that there may not be a need for wildlife piles if there are areas where the slash is scattered for wildlife. The MMG can discuss wildlife piles and other changes needed to address concerns in different cover types during the surface fuels and design perspective discussions.

DISCUSSION ON THE PHASE 3 CONTRACT

MMG participants discussed other updates on the Phase 3 contract. Their comments are summarized below.

- The Phase 3 contract map shows the treatment area going up to the edge of the private properties of Pine Cliff. There is supposed to be a 300-foot buffer between private land and

the treatment area, but the Pine Cliff residents gave the USFS permission to come up to their private property line.

- In Units 47, 48, and 68, the map indicates that there are lodgepole patchcuts, but the maps do not show the total size of the lodgepole aggregation. This makes it difficult to determine what percentage of the aggregation the USFS plans to patchcut. The patchcuts represent up to 30% of the aggregation, but because the patchcuts are less than an acre in size, the treatment in those units as a whole is still well below the 40% basal area reduction for which the Decision Notice allows.
- In Phase 3, the location of rock outcrops makes it easier to treat parts of Unit 49 at the same time as Unit 48, so the treatment on Unit 48 will extend into parts of Unit 49.
- The plan is to treat the rest of Unit 49 and Unit 73 when the contractors treat Unit 74. If the USFS fire crews can burn the piles in Unit 74 that were created during the first stage of treatment in that unit this winter, then the USFS could reenter Unit 74 during Phases 5 and 6 of Forsythe II and treat Units 49, 73, and 74.
- There is a parcel in the treatment area that may belong to the state according to Boulder County archives. Kevin Zimlinghaus will check to determine who owns that parcel.

DISCUSSION ON TREATMENT MONITORING

MMG participants discussed treatment monitoring opportunities for both during and after treatments. Their comments are summarized below.

- Some MMG participants said that they are interested in knowing when a contractor will begin a treatment so that they can check whether there is USFS staff present with the contractor. There may be an opportunity for USFS staff to email the MMG about when a contractor will begin work and when a USFS representative will be on site so that the MMG can monitor whether there is a COR present at the beginning of a new treatment.
- Some MMG participants stated that they are interested in conducting post-treatment monitoring with the COR. The USFS is still determining how that will work internally because once the contractor notifies the USFS that they have completed the work, the USFS has a set time period to go and inspect the work.
- There is a difference between how CORs inspect post-treatment work for mechanical and manual units. In mechanical units, CORs will inspect the treatments as the contractor goes because there will normally be multiple operators moving through the treatment area. In manual units, CORs may inspect treatments as they go, but it is more common that they do one final inspection.
- A likely structure for post-treatment monitoring is that the USFS staff will send an email to notify the MMG once the contractor reports that a unit is complete to conduct the inspection in the required timeline.
- Angie Gee will determine whether a COR can attend a future MMG meeting to discuss opportunities for post-treatment monitoring and for the MMG to monitor whether there is a USFS representative at the beginning of a new treatment.
- The contracts will be awarded in May at the earliest for Phase 3 and 4 units.
- The MMG has discussed the opportunity to improve the pre-work meeting between the USFS and the contractor. Angie Gee will continue to update the MMG on any progress in the pre-work meeting.

DISCUSSION ON UNITS 1 AND 2

MMG participants discussed Units 1 and 2. Their comments are summarized below.

- Some MMG participants approached the USFS and Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS) to see if they could implement a Good Neighbor Authority (GNA) agreement through the CSFS

to treat Units 1 and 2 for the purpose of community protection. The CSFS said that they are uninterested in treating Units 1 and 2 through a GNA.

- Under a GNA, the USFS would have to conduct a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Some MMG participants said that it seems unlikely that the CSFS will decide to treat Units 1 and 2 under a GNA.
- Part of the reason that the CSFS decided not to treat Units 1 and 2 under a GNA is because an academic paper titled *Defining “Resilient Landscapes” from Multiple Stakeholder Perspectives in a Wildland-Urban Interface (WUI) Area* said that the Forsythe II treatments were an “intractable” conflict. Some MMG participants have been in contact with the authors of the study and said that the authors were looking at the sociological aspect of Forsythe II but did not consider the landscape context or history of the treatment. The authors are making an amendment to the paper. Some MMG participants said that the paper was written before all the work that MMG has accomplished together and that the involvement of each person in the MMG is helping Forsythe II move forward.
- The MMG is responsible for designing a treatment for Units 1 and 2. Some MMG participants said that they should wait to design a treatment until the summer of 2021 because it would give the MMG more time to discuss and plan. There are other reasons to postpone Units 1 and 2 at this time, including that Units 3 and 4 also are being postponed until 2021 and there is going to be a Nederland City Council election in April.
- There is an egress road being proposed to connect Big Springs residents to Magnolia Road that will be somewhere around Units 2 and 3, but the USFS has not received any updates on the plans for that road. The development of the egress road may be another reason to delay designing treatments for Units 1 and 2. Angie will contact Karen Gerrity, Nederland town administrator, for updates on the Big Springs egress road.
- There may be an opportunity for surface fuel treatments in Units 1 and 2 for Phases 5 and 6 and then consider overstory treatments at a later time. Surface fuel treatments would count as one activity under the USFS acreage counting methodology. The treatment would count as two activities if they had to cut any existing surface fuels leaning on trees.
- Some MMG participants said they want to hear more about the fire perspective on proposed surface fuel treatments when considering treatments for Units 1 and 2.
- Some MMG participants said they would like to do less than 30% patchcuts in Units 1 and 2 and to implement a treatment that is similar to what the CSFS would have recommended. Some MMG participants said that it is uncertain how the CSFS would have treated the units.

PRESENTATION ON PILE BURNING AND SCORCHED TREES

Chad Buser, USFS, presented on tree scorching that may occur as a result of pile burning. His comments are summarized below.

- In 2020, the USFS is planning to burn piles in Unit 74 depending on conditions. There will be areas of Unit 74 where the pile burning will likely scorch trees in the lower canopy.
- The piles in Unit 74 are unusual as they are composed primarily of dead fuels on the ground rather than live fuels that were cut during treatment. Unit 74 is also fairly dense, leading it to a higher likelihood of scorching trees.
- The pile burnings will also potentially lead to mortality in susceptible species. For example, ponderosa pine are resilient trees, which will likely not die from being scorched, but Douglas fir are more vulnerable and may die as a result of being scorched.
- The pile burnings may only start a passive fire, which would set one tree on fire. Due to the snow and cold conditions, it is difficult to generate the heat to start a crown fire outside of a passive fire.

- Once the piles are burned, there will be a second vegetation treatment in Unit 74. During the second treatment, there may be an opportunity to remove some of the scorched trees unless they are determined to be good for wildlife.
- The scorching of live trees can mimic a prescribed or natural fire and make the trees more resilient over time. The scorching will raise the crown of the tree.
- For trees that are scorched, there will be aesthetic changes as the trees will experience residual reddening.

Clarifying Questions

Following the presentation, MMG participants asked questions of the presenter. Questions are indicated in italics with corresponding answers in plain text.

How close are piles to live trees?

The contract often specifies for the contractor to place burn piles in openings and away from existing trees. If there are too many piles and not enough openings, some piles will be placed closer to live trees.

How many trees will be killed from the pile burning?

The estimate is that 3% to 10% of the trees will be killed, but it is difficult to estimate due to all the relevant factors. There is an acceptable mortality rate for prescribed burning in the Decision Notice.

If there are piles burnt in aspen stands, do the USFS fire crews try harder to not allow trees to be scorched?

It is not standard practice to burn piles in aspen. Aspen immediately adjacent to burn piles would likely experience radiant heat, and they would not have a good chance of surviving. Since aspen is one organism, it is likely acceptable to kill a couple trees as new aspen will sprout.

Some MMG participant said that they would prefer to burn piles in aspen rather than to lop-and-scatter the slash. Would there be a catastrophic impact from burning piles in an aspen stand?

The expectation is that there would not be a catastrophic impact from burning piles in an aspen stand and that new aspen suckers would begin to grow.

Are there piles near streams for jumping mouse?

In the Forsythe II, there is only a small amount of habitat suitable for jumping mouse. There are buffers in place around streams where there cannot be piles.

What is the likelihood that piles will be burnt this winter so that the MMG can add acres from treating 49, 73, and 74 during Phases 5 and 6?

Because the piles are constructed with dead and down material, the ability of the USFS to burn the piles will largely depend on the construction of the piles. If the piles were constructed incorrectly and there is snow inside of them, the USFS will likely not be able to burn. The piles are on the north aspect, so if the piles are of sound construction, then they will be burn them in the right conditions.

DISCUSSION OF SURFACE FUELS

MMG participants discussed surface fuels by looking at pictures of different forest stands and identifying their perspectives on the surface fuels in the picture. The pictures are included in the summary, and the MMG comments are summarized below.

Picture 1: Aspen – Medium Slash



Wildfire Perspectives

- The dense surface fuels lead to a higher surface fire risk.
- The mat of surface fuels is likely around 18 inches in depth.
- The context of the area matters. There are less fire concerns for these surface fuels because it appears that the surface fuels are an isolated patch.
- If the surface fuels burned, there would be aspen regeneration following the burn.
- There is a low crown fire risk.
- It would be possible to engage fire response crews in this area.

Forest Health Perspectives

- Slash creates a seed bed for conifers to germinate.
- A layer of pine needles will create acidic soils less suitable for other vegetation to grow.
- When there are fewer conifers, sunlight filters in and facilitates aspen growth and there is a reduction in competition in the areas adjacent to the surface fuels.
- Over time, the needles will compact and fall off, leaving only woody surface fuels.
- Some MMG participants said that leftover slash is acceptable, but they prefer a mix of conifer and aspen.

Wildlife Perspectives

- Surface fuels provide good habitat for small mammals.
- These surface fuels represent what a wildlife pile could look like.
- Surface fuels are better for small mammals if they provide openings for mammals to tunnel through.
- The surface fuels over time could provide habitat for ground bird nesting.
- These surface fuels would likely not impede the movement of large mammals; there needs to be about ½ meter to impede the movement of large mammals. Large mammals would move around the pile.

Other Perspectives

There seems to be more lopping and less scattering of the surface fuels.

Picture 2: Lodgepole Pine – Low Natural Fuels



Wildfire Perspectives

- There are some ladder fuels in the picture.
- There are no surface fuel concerns, but there are crown fire concerns.
- Fire response is possible in low intensity fires.

Forest Health Perspectives

- This stand would likely be classified as a 3B or 3C forest.
- There is a lack of diversity in both the spacing and the height of the trees.
- The height and spacing of the trees are a natural state for a lodgepole stand, which grow and die at the same time.
- Over time, there would be more snags and self-thinning in this stand as the lodgepole come to the end of their life cycle.
- If this stand is on a south-facing aspect, it would be more prone to drying.

Wildlife Perspectives

- There is very little coarse woody debris and opportunity for foraging.
- There are not many opportunities for cover for small mammals.
- Elk may move through, but they would not forage.
- If the stand is on a north-facing aspect, it could serve as thermal cover in the winter.

Picture 3: Lodgepole Pine – Low Natural Fuels



Wildfire Perspectives

- There is a high level of surface fuel loading and high fire risk in the background of the picture.
- In the foreground of the picture, there is low surface fuel loading.
- Fire risk would be higher if the stand is on a south-facing aspect than on a north-facing aspect.
- There are a lot of ladder fuels and opportunity for trees to continue to pile and build more ladder fuels.
- Under hot and dry conditions, there is a concern for surface fires to transition to the ladder fuels and into the canopy.

Forest Health Perspectives

- There are many standing dead trees, which should be removed.
- It appears that there is a lot of mistletoe infection.
- The stand is at a stage where it needs wildfire to clear out many of the dead and infected trees.

Wildlife Perspectives

- The dead standing trees are good habitat for woodpeckers and bats, which would roost in the trees. Bats use snags that have a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 3 inches or greater.
- There is good cover for prey to move through the stand.
- The stand may be dense for elk, but they may use the stand for thermal cover and to escape predators. The openings help juveniles move through the stand.
- If the area surrounding the stand is similar to this stand, then the habitat could be important for martens who need a large area of mature habitat (roughly six to ten snags per acre with a 12 to 18-inch DBH).

Picture 4: Lodgepole Pine – Medium Natural Fuels



Wildfire Perspectives

- There are isolated pockets of ladder fuels in the area.
- Fires would move faster through the ground vegetation than if it was covered by lodgepole pine needle litter.
- This area could be an opportunity to engage ground resources in most cases.
- Lop-and-scatter is more of a concern than the surface fuels found in this forest, which appears to be healthy.

Forest Health Perspectives

There is an opportunity for aspen regrowth, particularly for rooting and suckering.

Wildlife Perspectives

- If the ground is wet, then there is an opportunity for fly-catching birds to live in the area.
- This is an area where mammals would disperse and spread out rather than den.
- There is forage available for larger animals.
- Grasses are good for small mammals to move through.
- The coarse woody debris is better for small mammals to hide and cover.
- The stand could also serve as goshawk habitat as there would be prey in the area and the mid-story branches allow for them to watch for prey and take flight.

Picture 5: Lodgepole Pine – High Natural Fuels



Wildfire Perspectives

- Wildfire risk is dependent on the season, but it is high and not preferable.
- This picture demonstrates to some MMG participants moderate fuel loading.
- There is an opportunity for surface and crown fires, so there would be concerns about engaging fire crews in this stand.

Forest Health Perspectives

- This stand is a candidate for old-growth lodgepole pine (a 3.5 management area).
- This stand represents an opportunity to implement existing surface fuel treatments (depending on the total size of the area where there is existing surface fuels).
- The stand is reaching its climax for fire, after which aspen would recapture the area as characterized by a couple of aspen stands that are in the picture.
- The stand is not very dense as trees fall and the area opens up. The skinnier trees tend to fall first, but there are several characteristics that determine which trees fall as the stand reaches the end of its life cycle.

Wildlife Perspectives

There is good habitat for subnivean spaces from the fallen trees and saplings.

Other Perspectives

It is difficult to know what is occurring in this picture. The trees may have fallen from the wind, but the downed trees do not seem to have fallen naturally.

Picture 6: Lodgepole Pine – Medium Natural Fuels



Wildfire Perspectives

- There is moderate fuel loading, and the surface fuels should be addressed.
- The boles are less concerning for wildfire risk.
- There are fewer ladder fuel concerns.
- There is a break in the surface fuel continuity, so there may be opportunities for fire response crews to be on the ground depending on the intensity of the fire.
- If there was a patchcut in the area, there would be opportunities to use aerial assets to fight fires over a period of time.

Forest Health Perspectives

- Patchcuts produce temporary benefits, but there are tradeoffs as the regrowth of the stand would be dense.
- If there was a patchcut in the area, then there would be an opportunity to plant mixed conifers to prepare for future prescribed fires.
- The lodgepole pine stand is closer to the end of its life cycle as determined by the number of dead lodgepole pine stands.

Wildlife Perspectives

- This is a healthy environment for wildlife as there are covers and openings.
- When treating a stand with a patchcut, it is important to know the conditions of the surrounding stands to create a diversity of wildlife habitat.

Other Perspectives

- From an implementation standpoint, this stand is a good area for mechanical treatment as there are large surface fuels and flat area for operators to use equipment.
- If there was a patchcut in this stand, the wind could blow down additional adjacent trees and create more surface fuel concerns.

Picture 7: Lodgepole Pine – High Slash



Wildfire Perspectives

- There are concerns about the continuous layer of surface fuels.
- The amount of surface fuels likely exceeds more than 25 tons/acre.
- There is moderate fuel loading, but the surface fuels are isolated.
- There are ladder fuels that may create an opportunity for fires to transition from the surface to the tree crowns.
- The bushes in the foreground, if juniper, are concerning as juniper burns well.
- The openings create an opportunity for aerial support and hand lines to manage a fire.
- If the conditions of this stand are the same in adjacent areas, there would be an opportunity for the USFS to pile existing surface fuels as a new treatment.

Forest Health Perspectives

- Surface fuels can help suppress the growth of weeds, but the amount of surface fuels in this picture are more than needed to suppress weed growth.
- The health of this stand would be good for decades because of the treatment.
- The thinning seems excessive.
- The treatment goes beyond the natural disturbance objectives set out by the Decision Notice.
- The thinning of the area is meant to create a tree density that is suitable for the implementation of prescribed fire at a future date.
- The opening allows for more sunlight to come in to boost the growth of regeneration.
- The treatment of this lodgepole stand has different objectives than if this was a regeneration thin unit.

Wildlife Perspectives

- The surface fuels may be too thick for small mammals, but the habitat may become more valuable as the surface fuels break down.

- The bushes in the foreground, whether they are juniper or kinnikinnick, provide berries for foraging.
- The branches on the ground would be useful for snowshoe hares in a lynx analysis unit.

Other Perspectives

The slash is likely from 2001 and 2002, which were cut and left, but the slash piles with green vegetation are from Forsythe II regeneration thin.

Picture 8: Lodgepole Pine – High Slash



Wildfire Perspectives

- There is a high fire risk for surface fuels.
- There is concern for crown fires in the trees in the background of the picture.
- If the surface fuels are the same in adjacent areas, then the ground crews could not engage a fire in this stand.
- If the surface fuels are continuous, piling and then pile burning would scorch trees or radiant heat would impact or kill trees.

Forest Health Perspectives

The forest does not appear to look healthy.

Wildlife Perspectives

- There is habitat for winter denning for small mammals.
- The area could provide refuge for mid-sized mammals.
- Elk could move through the area but likely would not.

Other Perspectives

- Windthrow remains a concern, particularly as it relates to patchcuts.
- As treatments are being implemented, it is important to plan for windthrow by either having an action plan to treat windthrow or treating less so there is less windthrow. A plan could include a schedule and system to identify areas to treat windthrow five to ten years after a treatment or at a regular time interval.
- Some MMG participants said they would have a difficult time recreating and walking through this stand.

- Stands should not be treated for prescribed fire if there is not a plan for conducting a prescribed fire in the stand. Some MMG participants said that it is tough to rely on future treatments to justify current treatments if the future treatments are not guaranteed.

NEXT STEPS

- Some MMG participants said that they want to see more pictures from the Forsythe II units in the surface fuels presentation for the March meeting as well as a lodgepole pine stand several years after a patchcut.
- At the next meeting, the MMG can talk about larger topics in lodgepole pine stands, such as size and location of patchcuts and clearcuts, and larger topics in mixed conifer stands, like basal area reduction. The surface fuel presentation will be set up to use as a launching point and reference point for the conversation.
- The MMG identified a new design perspective to discuss at the next meeting, which is prescribed fire as a driver of treatments. This topic will be added to the other six design perspective topics, which include treatment percentages for patchcuts and clearcuts, patchcut/clearcut locations, basal area reduction (i.e., heavy versus light treatments), manual and mechanical treatments, and restoration and resiliency.
- Samuel Wallace will send out a Doodle to schedule meetings for March and the remainder of the 2020 calendar.
- Marking crews are coming in May and may start marking in Units 29, 30, and 31, which the MMG can monitor to understand the plan for those units. MMG participants will determine at the April meeting whether they want to meet inside or on a field trip in May.
- Some MMG participants identified additional resources that may be of interest to the MMG. The FRRT recently released a report on mulching titled, *Mulching: A knowledge summary and guidelines for best practices on Colorado's Front Range*. The report identifies that there are multiple factors that change the impact of mulching on different forest conditions. It also includes a flowchart that guides readers on how to think about incorporating mulching information to inform prescriptions. There was also another study about how the effect that chipping has on the inoculation of mushrooms spores. Tania Corvalan will send a link to Samuel Wallace to distribute the study to the group.
- Other topics for future meetings include:
 - Implementation of community-led design (timeline, unit identification, prioritization, data management, and deliverable)
 - Opportunities to join sales administrator to inspect during and after treatments (COR attend a meeting)
 - Evaluation of USFS internal procedures related to communications during the pre-work meeting
 - Wildlife pile contract specifications
 - Ongoing contract discussions between Denver Water and USFS
 - Treatment of existing surface fuels
 - Process for jointly flagging units/flagging aspen units
 - Shared stewardship day for re-shaping piles for wildlife (how, when, and who)
 - Big Springs egress road
 - Elk collaring study
 - Updates to the master list