Forsythe II Multiparty Monitoring Group (MMG)
May 13, 5:00 PM to 8:00 PM
Virtual Meeting
Meeting Summary – FINAL

ATTENDANCE

Participants: Karen Blakemore, Teagen Blakey, Chad Buser, Tania Corvalan, Marin Chambers, Aurelia DeNasha, Mark Foreman, Angie Gee, May Jarril, Alex Markevich, Paul McCarthy, Mark Mendonca, Adam Mitchell, Susan Wagner, and Kevin Zimlinghaus

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Samuel Wallace

ACTION ITEMS

Kevin Zimlinghaus	• Clarify the plan for Unit 48 after reviewing the contract map for the unit. • Inform the MMG if any areas are being considered for old-growth.
MMG Participants	• Inform the US Forest Service if they find stands that they want the USFS to evaluate for old-growth characteristics. • Send an email to Angie Gee or Kevin Zimlinghaus if there are any units among Units 29, 30, 31, and 61 in which they can accept the prescription for the marking crews to focus their initial efforts.
Angie Gee	• Provide a map of the patchcuts and other treatments in Units 29, 30, 31, and 61. • Send a draft document of treatment considerations to the MMG. • Work with Marin Chambers to update the Forsythe II December 6, 2018 map with the patchcuts in Units 29, 30, 31, and 61 and other updated treatments once they have access to the appropriate files.
Samuel Wallace	Distribute a Doodle for a virtual meeting during the first week of June.

FORSYTHE II UPDATES

Meeting participants provided updates on Forsythe II projects. Their comments are summarized below.

- The US Forest Service (USFS) is working with Xcel Energy to identify places to bury a new gas pipeline and locate a new regulator station. Xcel Energy has had to change its original proposal because of groundwater issues. They have developed a new proposal to place the gas pipeline alongside Magnolia Road and place the regulator station on state highway 119. The USFS and Xcel Energy have not made a final decision regarding the proposal.
- The plan for Units 29, 30, and 31 is to treat Unit 29 mechanically and likely treat Units 30 and 31 manually.
- The patchcuts in Unit 76 are representative of how much woody materials will be left on the ground for a manual unit. The amount of woody materials left on the ground following a mechanical patchcut will be less than the amount left following a manual patchcut. The USFS should consider leaving the same amount of material from mechanically treated patchcuts as the amount of material left from manually treated patchcuts to help maintain soil nutrients.
- In Unit 48, there are two treatments that have been marked for "take" and "leave." Having trees marked for "take" with blue ribbons and having trees marked for "leave" with orange ribbons in the same unit has led to miscommunications in the past and improperly cut units. The differences in flagging may confuse contractors, and so, the contract administrators

should be prepared to be more hands-on with contractors to avoid any miscommunications. Kevin Zimlinghaus will clarify the plan for Unit 48 after he has reviewed the contract map for the unit.

- In the areas where trees have been marked for "leave" with orange ribbons, there should be a reasonable amount of woody material left on the ground for moisture retention and weed prevention. The majority of woody material will be piled, but there will be some woody material that is retained on the ground. In the orange leave units, limbs and needles will continue to fall from the overstory and can help with nutrient cycling. The contract cannot be changed at this point. Unit 48 will resemble other manually treated units.

SURFACE FUEL EXERCISE

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: Mixed Conifer – Unit 45

Wildfire Perspectives

- There is low to moderate surface fuel loading. The surface fuels that are present are larger, so there are fewer concerns with it burning quickly.
- There are fewer fire concerns because the stand is not dense and is primarily composed of Douglas fir and ponderosa pine trees.
- Some ladder fuels in the photo would transition a fire from the surface to the canopy.
- The density of the canopy is concerning. There is a moderate potential for group torching or a crown run in the right conditions. Opening up the canopy would help reduce risks. The surface fuels alone are not a concern, but in combination with the canopy density, there are some concerns.

Forest Health Perspectives

- Uva Ursi is growing in the underbrush. The Uva Ursi grows on the downed woody material and will help prevent cheatgrass from taking over.
- There is a lack of structural diversity in the stand. The resiliency of this stand to insects and disease may be low because the trees are the same size.
- The overstory is too dense for any ponderosa pine to regenerate.
- This stand looks like a representative mixed conifer stand in the area.

Wildlife Perspectives

- The area has different forbs and berries for wildlife.
- Different ungulate species would use this area as a travel corridor

Other Perspectives

The spacing of the trees looks good. No further treatment is needed.

Picture 2: Mixed Conifer – Unit 45

Background

- The picture of the stand is from before the stand was treated.
- The objective of treating this stand was to reduce the canopy density on the left side of the picture, reduce fire hazards, and reduce the risk of transitioning fires from the surface to the canopy. This goal can either be met by removing smaller trees that act as ladder fuels or removing the larger trees above the smaller ones.

Wildfire Perspectives

- The jackpot of surface fuels in the foreground is less of a fire risk because there is minimal canopy cover above it.
- The ladder fuels in the higher density of trees in the background could easily transfer fire to the overstory. Given the density of trees in the background, the stand overall has a moderate to a high potential for fire suppression issues.

Forest Health Perspectives

- This stand is structurally diverse due to the opening at the right of the picture. The opening creates an opportunity for ponderosa pine trees to regenerate. On the left side of the picture, there are fewer opportunities for ponderosa pine trees to regenerate.
- This stand resembles a forest management strategy in which foresters create smaller openings across the landscape. The purpose of creating a greater number of smaller openings across the landscape is to provide sunlight for ponderosa pine regeneration and cover and shade for wildlife.
- The ground in the clearing appears to be healthy, which reduces the risk of invasive species.

Wildlife Perspectives

- If this is a south-facing slope, then elk would use it at the end of winter to find berries as the snow melts.

- Ungulate species would use the higher density of trees in the background as potential escape cover as they forage.

Other Perspectives
The stand looks good. No treatment is needed in the stand.

Picture 3: Mixed Conifer – Unit 45

Background
- This stand may be on a north-facing aspect based on its density and tree species composition. There are Douglas firs in the picture, which prefer wetter and cooler conditions.
- The stand also has the characteristics of on an east- or northeast-facing aspect.
- The appropriateness of a treatment depends on the aspect of the stand.
- Some of the trees have been marked with blue flags, so this stand was treated.

Wildfire Perspectives
- There are some ladder fuels in this picture that represent a fire risk.
- The surface fuels pose less of a risk. The amount of surface fuels does not seem to be close to the 10 to 15 tons per acre that the literature suggests as an upper limit for surface fuels.
- The number of surface fuels, in combination with the number of ladder fuels and the density of the overstory, represents serious fire risks.
- If this stand was on a south-facing aspect and near homes, it would represent a greater wildfire risk.
- On north-facing aspects, there is still a risk of fire during prolonged dry spells.
- There are multiple ways to evaluate fire risk. One way is to evaluate the risk of fire ignition in a stand; another way is to evaluate the impact of a fire if it passed through a stand. If a fire passed through this stand, many of the trees would be completely burned, including older ponderosa pine trees.

Forest Health Perspectives
- This stand is not necessarily an old-growth stand, but it has some old-growth characteristics. There are also younger trees in the understory and openings. This stand may be in a transition stage between old-growth and younger trees.
- The understory of this stand could be treated with prescribed fire after reducing ladder fuels. Prescribed fire may ultimately take out more trees than a thinning. A prescribed fire could help maintain the old-growth characteristics of the forest while making the forest

more resistant to wildfires. There is a balance when treating to maintain old-growth characteristics in a stand. If too much is treated, then the stand loses its old-growth characteristics, but the stand may lose its old-growth characteristics if it is not treated enough.

- There is a difference between a stand with old-growth characteristics and a stand labeled as old-growth. There is also a distinction between old-growth mixed conifer stands and old-growth lodgepole stands. The USFS cannot treat old-growth stands in Management Area 3.5.
- There is an old-growth stand in the Twin Sisters area. Unit 29 may also have an old-growth lodgepole pine stand.
- There is a map with the location of identified old-growth stands, but the map contains older information. There may be pockets of old-growth forests that have not been marked yet, but the USFS does not have any extra insight at this time on which areas are potentially old-growth. USFS staff are discussing the procedure for characterizing and identifying old-growth forests. In the past, the USFS has placed wildlife islands on stands that have old-growth characteristics. If any new areas are being considered for old-growth, the USFS should let the MMG know. As MMG participants are walking through units, they can contact USFS staff to evaluate whether or not the stand can be classified as old-growth.

Wildlife Perspectives

- Animals could use this stand for potential cover. The low-hanging branches may represent a potential tradeoff between reducing wildfire risk and maintaining wildlife habitat.
- If the stand is on a north-facing aspect, it would be more appropriate to leave the stand as is because north-facing slopes are important for wildlife movement.
- There is good habitat in this stand. Treatment could help enhance some of the features for wildlife, even if the stand is north-facing.

Picture 5: Mixed Conifer – Unit 45

Background

The downward perspective of the picture makes it difficult to evaluate the stand. Knowing the aspect of the slope would also be helpful to evaluate the stand.

Wildfire Perspectives

- The amount of surface fuels is low and not concerning.
- The surface fuels in the foreground are minimal, buttheir decaying condition would make them receptive to fire.
- There are ladder fuels that pose a wildfire risk on the right side of the picture.

- The trees in the upper right of the picture are dense, and some of them are dead. That stand should be thinned to reduce wildfire risk.
- It would be possible to conduct a prescribed burn if there are good control features around the stand. The area solely in the picture does not have good control features. There are pockets in the picture, particularly on the right side of the picture, that would torch. There is a narrow window of conditions in which it would be possible to conduct a prescribed burn in the area.

Forest Health Perspectives

- The material in the foreground is decaying, and the bark on some of the trees is peeling. These signs indicate that a fire has not been in the stand for a while. The lack of fire is allowing Douglas firs to encroach into the stand, changing the stand from a ponderosa pine stand to a Douglas fir mixed conifer stand.
- The shadows in the picture indicate that the stand is fairly dense. It would not be possible for ponderosa pine to regenerate in this stand without more sunlight.

Wildlife Perspectives

- The denser underbrush, in combination with a denser canopy, makes the stand good habitat for a goshawk. Small mammals move through the underbrush, and the open mid-story allows for goshawks to hunt them.
- If the surrounding area of the stand is denser, then it would be a good habitat for lynx or martens.

Picture 6: Mixed Conifer – Unit 54 or 55

Background

- Estimates for the amount of surface fuel loads in tons per acre are based only on coarse wood that has a diameter greater than six inches. The photosampling technique guide used to estimate surface fuel loads did not have examples for coarse wood less than six inches in diameter, and it is difficult to measure fine fuels based on pictures.
- The snow cover makes it difficult to assess the amount of surface fuels. Above the snow, it does not look like there are any surface fuels with a diameter greater than six inches. There may be woody debris that is greater than six inches under the snow, but it is difficult to see.

Wildfire Perspectives

- The amount of surface fuel loading in this picture is not concerning.

- From a fire standpoint, it would be beneficial to promote aspen. Thinning the stand or conducting a prescribed fire can help promote the aspen. Prescribed fire, in particular, can help trigger suckering in the aspen roots.

Forest Health Perspectives

- There is a decent amount of downed woody material as well as some young aspen trees. This area may be a good place for thinning to help promote the aspen and manage the surface fuels.
- The area may be in a higher elevation and above the natural range of ponderosa pine.
- It looks like there was once more lodgepole pine trees that were replaced by Douglas firs and now aspens. The process of the changing forest seems natural.

Wildlife Perspectives

- There is subnivean habitat as a result of the downed material.
- The MMG should consider what affects thinning would have on wildlife habitat in this stand, especially if it is on a north-facing aspect.
- Promoting aspen in this stand could help provide thermal and escape cover as well as a source of food for wildlife. Pockets of aspen stands are good for wildlife. Depending on the surrounding landscape, an aspen stand in this location would create a diversity of cover types across the landscape, which is good for wildlife.

Picture 7: Mixed Conifer – Unit 54

Background

Unit 54 is designated as an old-growth forest in the Decision Notice. The unit has open areas and dense sections.

Wildfire Perspectives

- The density of the stand in the background poses fire risks. The overstory should be thinned.
- The fuel loading is heavy, but if the fuel loading is an isolated incident, then it is less of a concern. The fuel loading in the foreground would also be less concerning if the overstory in the background was not as dense. A surface fire could transition from these surface fuels to the overstory.
- From a fire perspective, firefighters could use this stand to manage a major forest fire. Since it is labeled as an old-growth forest, however, there are tradeoffs on how to manage this

stand and questions about how to make incremental fire improvements while maintaining the old-growth characteristics.

Forest Health Perspectives

- This stand has a good structure. There is an opportunity to reduce the existing basal area up to 40 or 50% depending on the species composition and still maintain the structural diversity. There are many ways to treat this stand to reach the objectives of Forsythe II.
- It would be difficult for ponderosa pine to regenerate in this area based on the existing conditions.
- Removing the Douglas fir regeneration to maintain the older overstory in this stand could be an appropriate treatment to maintain the old-growth characteristics.
- The windthrown trees on the right of the picture may be the result of an adjacent patchcut or clearcut. The topic of managing windthrown trees and whether the USFS can come back to remove fallen trees and surface fuels should continue to be a discussion point.
- The forest looks healthy. Unit 54 has intermittent dense and open areas.

Wildlife Perspectives

- The downed woody debris could be beneficial to wildlife. There are also forbs and berries for wildlife to eat.
- In a stand with trees of this size class, it would be beneficial for wildlife to have more snags for nesters and dens.
- If the area surrounding this stand is open, then this stand could be designated as a wildlife island.

Picture 8: Mixed Conifer – Unit 40

Background

- The surface fuels in this photo are the result of a lop-and-scatter treatment. The size of this pocket of surface fuels is about one-hundredth to one-fiftieth of an acre.
- Some of the trees in this unit have been marked for cut.

Wildfire Perspectives

- A surface fire would transition quickly into the canopy and torch the tree. The material should be piled and burned instead of scattered underneath the tree unless the goal is to thin the forest by using prescribed fire to torch trees.

- This use of lop-and-scatter seems questionable. The material left on the ground looks like it was left there because the foresters ran out of money. The woody material was left intentionally on the surface as a part of the prescription in Unit 40 for future prescribed fires.
- There are scattered piles of woody material throughout the forest that are larger than this one. This pile of surface fuels is not as concerning as some other larger ones. There should be more follow-up to manage these types of piles.
- Considering there are lop-and-scatter piles like this throughout Unit 40, it seems like the intention was to use prescribed fire to scorch trees. From a prescribed fire management perspective, they have techniques to manage the prescribed fire and the scorching of trees. The amount of surface fuels left on the ground gives the burn manager multiple choices when developing the burn plan.
- The surface fuel loading in this picture is too heavy. The surface fuels may help carry prescribed fires in the future, but a patch with fewer surface fuels could also carry a prescribed fire. There is a wildfire risk in the intermediary time between the treatment being completed and a prescribed fire being implemented.
- When community members outside of the MMG see piles like this, they see a fire risk.
- The area around this stand may be an opening that could serve as a holding area for a fire.

Wildlife Perspectives

- The stand has good thermal and escape cover for wildlife.
- The pile on the ground could serve as a wildlife pile, but it would be more useful if it was moved away from the forest. Locating the wildlife pile away from the stand creates opportunities for small mammals to have intermittent stopping places between denser stands.

Picture 9: Mixed Conifer – Unit 39

Wildfire Perspectives

- Community members outside of the MMG question the fire danger that these piles present. There are concerns about how close the piles are to the surrounding trees.
- The bottom of the pile is about four to five feet away from the trees. This pile was also located in a stand that was treated lightly.
- This pile is representative of the type of piles that are burned in the winter. Burning this pile would result in some scorched trees and maybe one or two trees torched in certain conditions. Overall, scorching trees can be a beneficial activity because it raises the canopy,

which makes it more difficult for fires to transition into the canopy. If the canopy is raised, it makes it easier to conduct a broadcast burning as well.

- There is a relationship between recreation and forest management. People from nearby campsites and other recreation areas may try to take apart the piles or burn them. These piles are more of a concern when they are near places of high-activity recreation. The number of incidents where a recreationist has set a pile on fire is minimal, and there may have been one incident over the past ten years.

Wildlife Perspectives

- This pile is too dense for wildlife to use. If it broke down over time, there might be some opportunities for wildlife to use it.
- The surrounding habitat could provide cover to wildlife.
- Burning this pile and torching the nearby trees can be beneficial to wildlife. Torched trees that remain standing can turn into snags. Snags serve as denning and nesting habitat for many wildlife species. Wildlife species have preferences about the degree of hardness of snags. Torching trees creates opportunities to develop snags with varying levels of hardness. The hardness of a snag depends on many factors, including tree species, age of a tree, and time. (Snags soften over time.)

Picture 10: Mixed Conifer – Unit 39

Background

Based on the spacing of the forest, it looks like the stand is on an east- or west-facing aspect. This forest would be drier and hotter in the summer.

Wildfire Perspectives

- The piles in this stand seem easier to burn than the one in picture 9. Burning piles in this stand would result in less torching than burning the pile in picture 9.
- The treatment in this picture is great preparation for a prescribed burn. The stand spcing may be a little thin to get the desired fire effects, but it would be possible to introduce a prescribed fire into this stand.

Picture 11: Mixed Conifer – Unit 39

Forest Health Perspectives
Broadcast burning would be ideal in this unit. The tree spacing is appropriate, there are not many ladder fuels, and a fire would stimulate suckering in the aspen.

Wildlife Perspectives
- Subnivean wildlife species would use this stand.
- This stand would be a good place for a munching trail if the aspen were enhanced.
- Because the trees are closer together, it is appropriate to leave fewer wildlife piles in the area.

Picture 12: Mixed Conifer – Unit 39

Background
- The burn piles in this stand are likely from Phase I of Forsythe II in 2018. The piles will likely be burned next winter.
- This stand may be designated for future prescribed burns after the initial pile burning.

Wildlife Perspectives
Dead trees are sometimes left after thinning to serve as snags for wildlife. Snags benefit bats, martens, and insects. Snags serve different functions for different animals, so it is important to have a variety of them.

Other Perspectives
Once the piles are burned, the forest will look natural. This stand was thinned nicely.

PERSPECTIVES ON BASAL AREA REDUCTION DISCUSSION
MMG participants discussed their perspectives on basal area reduction. Their comments are summarized below.

- Treatments should be based on the various conditions of a stand.
- Some existing treatment layouts have the goal of changing a mixed conifer to open ponderosa pine cover type. This goal may be appropriate in some places based on the elevation and aspect of the stand, but in some places, it may not be appropriate. There is a figure in GTR-373 that displays the appropriate elevation and aspects for different tree species. The figure in GTR-373 that outlines the generalized set of guidelines for dominant forest types may bs shifting as a result of climate change and other disturbances. The current prescriptions try to follow the directions of GTR-373 as much as possible.
- Using ponderosa pine regeneration as a goal of treatments should depend on the characteristics of a stand. Opening up forests in the mid-montane areas can help promote ponderosa pine regeneration. The Forsythe II environmental assessment does not mention mid-montane areas. Ponderosa pine regeneration as a goal of treatments is appropriate in lower montane areas. In upper montane areas, ponderosa pine regeneration may or may not be appropriate based on the characteristics of the stand. Most of the Forsythe II acres are in the upper montane. Ponderosa pine regeneration as a goal of treatments is generally appropriate on south and southwest aspects. For example, in Unit 48, there are ponderosa pine forests with some lodgepole, and in those areas, it may be appropriate to remove lodgepole. There are lodgepole forests, like those in Unit 77, where ponderosa pine regeneration as a goal of treatment might not be appropriate.
- Basal area reduction should vary with the aspect of the slope. Some treatments are appropriate on a south-facing slope but are not appropriate on a north-facing slope.
- It sometimes seems that prescriptions are made without walking an area and that people who mark a treatment have not been involved in the MMG discussions. The process for writing prescriptions begins with USFS crews gathering data on the ground, but they cannot walk every acre on the landscape. The USFS silviculturist interprets the collected data and uses general concepts to develop prescriptions. The prescription focuses on how to maintain limited aggregations over the dominant features on the landscape. For example, in a stand that has a higher frequency of ponderosa pine trees than aspen, a prescription will remove ponderosa pines (dominant feature) to promote aspen (limited aggregation). There are concerns that there are areas that should not be treated but will be treated because the data collectors cannot walk every area. Having community members walk through the units may help avoid some of these issues.
- There were varying perspectives on whether to set a flat percentage for basal area reduction. It can be a helpful method to set the number of trees removed as a function of the percentage of basal area reduction (e.g., 40% basal area reduction). When a treatment is based on the percentage of basal area reduction, the number of trees removed will be responsive to the density of the forests (i.e., more trees will be removed in denser forests than less dense forests). By using basal area reduction percentages as a method to set the number of trees removed, it helps maintain the already existing mosaic on the landscape. There should not be a flat number that applies to every prescription on the landscape. Instead, the number of trees removed should be responsive to the realities on the ground and characteristics of the stand.

- Years of fire suppression in forests that are meant to have fires have put the forests in a non-natural state.

PERSPECTIVES ON MANUAL VERSUS MECHANICAL TREATMENTS DISCUSSION
MMG participants discussed their perspectives on manual versus mechanical treatments. Their comments are summarized below.

- Ideally, there would not be any mechanical treatments on the landscape because mechanical treatments damage the land and the remaining trees.
- Recreation is a rising issue along the Front Range. More trees are removed as a result of mechanical treatments, and as more trees are removed, recreationists see it as an invitation to come in and impact the restoration efforts. More recreationists could also increase the risk of fire starts. Mechanical treatments should not occur near trails or other recreation areas to prevent recreationists from entering into the forest.
- There is not enough law enforcement to oversee the number of recreationists. Recreationists in the forest are engaging in dangerous activities and putting others at risk.

OTHER PERSPECTIVES ON TREATMENT DESIGN DISCUSSION
MMG participants discussed other perspectives on treatment designs. Their comments are summarized below.

- Prescribed fires should not be used as a justification for treatment unless the area is specifically designated for prescribed fire.
- There are south-facing areas in which there are stands with ponderosa pine trees with mistletoe and Douglas fir trees without mistletoe. The general approach for treatment in these stands would be to remove the larger infected ponderosa pine while keeping the younger ponderosa pine trees in the understory. More information is needed on the intensity of the mistletoe infestation to determine what treatment is appropriate.

FIELD TRIP AND FUTURE PLANS DISCUSSIONS
MMG participants discussed future field trips scheduled and other plans for the summer. Their comments are summarized below.

- The current USFS policies on group gatherings will first have to change before field trips are possible. If the USFS policies ease up, then MMG participants would have to indicate they are comfortable going on field trips. Field trips would have to follow six-foot social distancing rules, and each participant would have to wear masks and feel healthy. It may also be possible to have smaller field trips with only a couple of MMG participants who act as representatives.
- The next field trip is scheduled for June 20. Many of the current USFS policies will be expired by then, but it is uncertain if they will be renewed. The MMG can keep it planned as a field trip and adjust accordingly based on the USFS policies.
- If the MMG cannot have field trips, some MMG members are uncomfortable with marking the units this year.
- The USFS has onboarded the marking crew. The marking crew will be ready to go into the field in relatively short order. The marking crews will start on Clear Creek to give the MMG time to conduct their assessments. The USFS has the capacity to mark all the units they were planning to do based on whether the MMG can get out into the field and look at the units.
- There is a proposed timeline with benchmarks for MMG participants to provide their unit evaluation and designs. The proposed timeline sets dates at the end of June, July, and August. The first set of units for the MMG to evaluate by the end of June are mixed conifer

units (Units 52, 53, 54, 55, and 80) because they take a long time to mark. Then, the MMG will evaluate lodgepole units by the end of July and larger units by the end of August.

- Units 29, 30, 31, and 61 were started by the USFS in preparation for 2019 implementation as a part of Phases 3 and 4. They were not completed in time, so they were not included in the Phases 3 and 4 contracts. These units have been held over from previous phases. The planned patchcuts in Unit 31 should be a future discussion topic or field trip. If there are any units on this list in which MMG participants can accept the proposed prescription, they should let the USFS know so that the marking crew can focus on those units for their initial efforts. The USFS will provide maps with the proposed patchcuts in these units. Angie Gee will work with Marin Chambers to create a map with the proposed patchcuts in these units and updated treatments that can be used in Avenza once they have access to the appropriate files.
- The current schedule is acceptable, but there will need to be more meetings to occur between the field trips. There will need to be a meeting at the beginning of June, mid-July, and mid-August to discuss the upcoming units for that month. Samuel Wallace will send out a Doodle to schedule a virtual meeting at the beginning of June.
- Community members can begin to evaluate units. The MMG will learn through the process as they work through this schedule.
- The USFS has prepared a draft document with treatment considerations for MMG participants to think about as they evaluate and design units. Angie Gee will send the draft document of treatment considerations to the MMG. As MMG participants read the document, they should keep in mind that the document is not meant to be prescriptive or directive. It is supposed to act as a set of questions to help the MMG think about potential opportunities or considerations related to forest health, wildlife, and wildfire as they layout units. The USFS is also not looking for a consensus recommendation from the MMG. It is okay for the MMG to put forth multiple opinions and recommendations.
- MMG participants can use the Forsythe II December 6, 2018 map on the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute Forsythe II website in Avenza to help MMG participants figure out in which unit they are.

NEXT STEPS

- The next meeting topics include the potential for a June field trip, restoration and resiliency and preparing the landscape for prescribed fire, the treatment considerations document, and the upcoming June units (52, 53, 54, 55, and 80).
- Other topics for future meetings include:
    - Updates on opportunities to join sales administrator to inspect during and after treatments
    - 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