

Forsythe II Multiparty Monitoring Group (MMG)
August 8, 2020, 9:00 AM to 1:00 PM
Field Trip Summary – FINAL

ATTENDANCE

Field Trip Participants: Teagen Blakey, Chad Buser, Marin Chambers, Aurelia DeNasha, Angie Gee, Alex Markevich, Betina Mattesen, and Kevin Zimlinghaus

Facilitation: Samuel Wallace

ACTION ITEMS

MMG Participants	Examine the quality of the old-growth forests on the south side of Emory Road and share their observations with the US Forest Service (USFS).
Kevin Zimlinghaus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Talk to the private landowners who are approving treatments in the defensible space zone about the interior forest and why some areas can be treated and not others. • Incorporate the direction to leave trees with large squirrel middens into the design criteria for mixed conifer thinning in Unit 29. • Incorporate the direction to not pile on top of culturally significant human-made structures into the design criteria. • Write a version of the prescription in Unit 29 that describes the treatment in layman’s terms. • Consider whether a patchcut or thinning treatment would be more advantageous in the polygon east of TB26 and in Track 15 to prevent snow from breaking lodgepole pine trees. • Mark the boundaries of the surface fuels treatment in Unit 29 to delineate where the treatments will take place. • Send out a table on the number of acres being treated based on the prescriptions in Phases 5 and 6 so far and the patchcuts in Units 23 and 24.
Kevin Zimlinghaus, Chad Buser, and Aurelia DeNasha	Develop the specifications that will determine what surface fuels will be retained in surface fuels treatments in terms of existing and activity fuels in Unit 29.
Kevin Zimlinghaus and Teagen Blakey	Fill out the final decision box in the prescription evaluation for Unit 29 before the virtual meeting on August 12.
Aurelia DeNasha	Add a legend to the Unit 29 map to more clearly define which areas are identified as old-growth forests and interior forests.
Angie Gee	Add driving rules to the handout that all firewood permittees receive when they are issued firewood collection permits.
Teagen Blakey	Send Kevin Zimlinghaus the proposed area to be excluded from the lodgepole pine patchcut on the eastern side of Track 15 in Unit 29.

UNIT 29 DISCUSSION

Field trip participants discussed their perspectives on treatments in Unit 29. Their comments are summarized below.

Stop 1

- Stop 1 in Unit 29 was off of Emory Road on the southeast end of the Unit.

- The proposed treatment in the southeast corner of Unit 29 includes a U-shaped patchcut. The proposed treatment also involves cutting all conifer trees underneath the powerline that runs parallel to Emory Road.
- The timeline for the USFS is to begin to flagging treatments in Unit 29, starting the week of August 10 in treatment areas where the MMG agrees on the prescription.
- All of Unit 29 is being treated manually.

Defensible Space Zone Treatments

- Neighbors adjacent to Unit 29 have expressed interest in the USFS treating in the defensible space zone.
- One of the neighbors has confirmed with the USFS that they want treatment completed in the defensible space zone up to their private property boundary. That private property runs along a section of the southeast boundary of the Unit. The treatment would be about 8.5 acres in size. The USFS has not officially mapped the treatment area yet.
- The cover type in the defensible space zone along the southeast corner of Unit 29 is a mixture of aspen and lodgepole pines. Aspen stands with some lodgepole pine concentrations are located alongside the road. Behind the aspen stands, further from the road, are lodgepole pine stands. The treatment in the defensible space zone is adjacent to an old-growth retention forest.
- The plan is to implement one to three patchcuts in the lodgepole pine stands in the defensible space zone up to the 30% threshold that the Decision Notice (DN) allows. Ponderosa pine treatments would be retained in the lodgepole pine patchcuts, except for low-quality ponderosa pines. The treatment in the aspen stands would follow the DN's guidelines for treating in aspen stands. The defensible space zone treatment will not extend into the old-growth retention forest.
- The USFS has partially validated the old-growth retention in the defensible space zone.
- Other decisions, like D Space, require adjacent private landowners to treat on their property for the USFS to treat in the defensible space zone. For Forsythe II, the property owners are not required to treat on their property to be eligible for the USFS to treat in the defensible space zone. The landowners have to give permission to the USFS to treat in the defensible space zone.
- There is a second landowner that has expressed interest in the USFS conducting treatments in the defensible space zone up to their private property boundary. The second landowner's property runs along the entire eastern boundary of Unit 29. The USFS is waiting for the second landowner to confirm that they would like the USFS to begin planning treatments in the defensible space zone adjacent to their property.
- If the second landowner approves treatment in the defensible zone, the USFS will have to conduct interior forest mapping. Kevin Zimlinghaus should talk to the private landowners who are approving treatments in the defensible space zone about the interior forest and why some areas can be treated and not others.
- The treatments in the defensible space zone will follow the guidelines laid out for old-growth and interior forests for the rest of the Unit. These guidelines include cutting conifer trees in interior forests up to the six-inch DBH limit on north-facing aspects and cutting conifer trees in the interior forest up to the eight-inch DBH limit on south-facing aspects.
- The USFS does not have a specific deadline for when they expect to hear back from the private landowner on the eastern boundary. There will be a date by which the USFS will have to hear back from the landowner on whether they are going to treat in the defensible zone on the eastern side of the Unit.

Emory Road Corridor Treatment

- There is a proposal to treat an area alongside Emory Road Corridor. The Emory Road Corridor treatment would extend southwards from the power lines to the defensible space zone boundary on the south side of the Unit.
- There are characteristics of a mixed conifer old-growth forest in the treatment area. The USFS conducted an assessment on the quality of the old-growth in the corridor. The area within the Emory Road Corridor treatment has old-growth characteristics, but the stands do not satisfy the requirements to be designated as functioning old-growth forest.
- The higher quality old-growth forests in Unit 29 occur outside of the Emory Road Corridor treatment boundary. There is the potential for areas in the northern part of Unit 29 to be designated as old-growth.
- The Emory Road Corridor treatment should include cutting all conifers with a diameter at breast height (DBH) of 12 inches or less. This treatment would restore aspen and address fire safety concerns within the corridor, which serves as an ingress and egress.
- The treatment would leave pockets of conifers to deter people from leaving the road to camp or ride off-road vehicles. The pockets of conifers will partially retain areas of higher quality old-growth, but the overall purpose of the pockets of conifers is to discourage people from going into openings.
- The Emory Road Corridor treatment is roughly three to four acres in size. The fuels reduction treatments in the corridor would not impact the old-growth characteristics of the forest. This means that the treatment would not impact the old-growth criteria that could lead to the USFS in the future to designate the area as old-growth once the stand has had an opportunity to mature.
- In the Emory Road Corridor treatment, there are areas with dense lodgepole pine stands intermixed with the stands that have old-growth characteristics but are not functioning as old-growth. The treatment should target the dense lodgepole pine stands and areas that are not as beneficial to wildlife.
- One reason that the mixed conifer stands lost their integrity as old-growth is because people have altered the stands by cutting trees for firewood.
- The treatment along the road is a better alternative than treating further into the forest. Recreational access is a concern, so the USFS should keep track of recreational behaviors following treatments.
- Some members of the MMG would like to examine the quality of the old-growth forests on the south side of Emory Road and share their observations with the USFS.
- There will not be any landings for treatments in the Emory Road Corridor treatment. The treatment will be conducted manually. The trees will be piled up to an eight-inch DBH. Trees with a DBH between eight inches and thirteen inches will be left on the ground.

Old-Growth and Interior Forests

- There should be a map that distinguishes old-growth forests that have been verified by the USFS from unverified old-growth forests. Treatments should be based on the conditions on the ground rather than on what is identified on a map.
- The USFS created a map of Unit 29, on which they indicated the location of old-growth forests and interior forests. The map also displays locations where the USFS has examined the old-growth characteristics of the forest and filled out old-growth inventory sheets. Aurelia DeNasha can add a legend to the Unit 29 map to more clearly define which areas are identified as old-growth forests and interior forests.

- Unit 29 contains many different types of stands. There are components of old-growth lodgepole pine and old-growth mixed conifer forests. Some of these stands are separated by forest matrix.
- Some areas in Unit 29 are not labeled as interior forest but potentially could be designated as interior forest.
- The USFS is continuing to evaluate and verify old-growth and interior forests in Unit 29. It is helpful for the USFS to have an accurate assessment for inventory, mapping, record keeping, and future planning efforts. The purpose of verifying old-growth forests is to ensure that areas of old-growth forests are designated appropriately and potentially uncover new areas of previously undesignated old-growth forests.
- The only treatments that were added to Unit 29 in old-growth forests include surface fuel treatments in the northwest section of the Unit. The surface fuel treatments will not impact the old-growth characteristics of the area. The northwest section of Unit 29 has not been completely verified as an old-growth forest yet.

Stop 2

Mixed Conifer Thinning

- The mixed conifer thin treatment in Unit 29 should favor ponderosa pine trees by removing smaller Douglas firs, especially on south-facing aspects. The mixed conifer thin treatments will leave snags on the landscape.
- The mixed conifer thin treatment would remove ponderosa pine trees infested with mistletoe. Removing infected ponderosa pine trees would prevent larger ponderosa pine trees from dropping mistletoe on any ponderosa pine regeneration.
- The marking crews should avoid marking trees with squirrel middens for taking. Kevin Zimlinghaus will incorporate the direction to leave trees with large squirrel middens into the design criteria.
- Trees should not be piled on top of human-made structures with cultural significance. Kevin Zimlinghaus will incorporate the direction to not pile on top of culturally significant human-made structures into the design criteria.

Stop 3

Stop 3 was located within a community proposed mixed conifer thinning treatment area in the interior forest, also referred to as Track 18.

Mixed Conifer Thinning - Overview

- The community proposed prescription for mixed conifer thinning is to thin the lodgepole pine trees while leaving the other mixed conifer trees. Ideally, some larger lodgepole pine trees would be left, and the thinning would focus on smaller lodgepoles.
- There are several mixed conifer treatment areas identified in the community proposed prescription. These mixed conifer treatment areas were intentionally spaced to leave areas of non-treatment in between them.
- The treatment should be implemented manually because mechanical equipment would impact the soil and because the treatment area is too steep for mechanical equipment.
- The treatment area in Track 18 is on a north-facing aspect. Because the area in Track 18 is in an interior forest and on a north aspect, the DBH limit for conifer removal would be to remove conifers up to a six-inch DBH. This DBH limit would leave larger lodgepole pine trees and focus on maintaining Douglas fir and ponderosa pine trees.

- The DBH limit for an interior forest would be six inches on a north-facing aspect and eight inches on a south-facing aspect. Not every single tree under this DBH limit would be removed. If the forest is opened up too much, some of the lodgepole pine trees will be at risk of being blown down.
- It would be helpful if the prescription said that the USFS would selectively cut trees under the specified DBH limit. The USFS crews understand that the prescription means that not every tree under the DBH limit will be removed. Kevin Zimlinghaus can write a version of the prescription in Unit 29 that describes the treatment in layman's terms.
- The canopy closure should also be kept at 40%, according to the DN. The canopy closure of the stop in Track 18 is roughly 50%.
- The interior forest in this treatment area is in good condition and should not be treated. A treatment could open up the forest to wind issues. If treatment occurs in the defensible space zone on the eastern boundary of the Unit, there should not be treatments in this part of the interior forest.
- The treatment area in this part of the interior forest was recommended in the community proposed prescription plan.

Mixed Conifer Thinning – Wildlife Perspectives

- Treating in Track 18 in the interior forest has benefits to wildlife. The regenerating trees produced from the treatment could provide habitat for wildlife, depending on the specific species. Regenerating trees are also a component of an old-growth forest. Removing some of the younger trees in the forest will also provide nutrients to older trees and increase the quality of the older trees. However, leaving the forest as is would also not be harmful from the wildlife perspective.
- On south-facing aspects, the treatment should cut Douglas fir regeneration, but on north-facing aspects, some Douglas fir regeneration should be retained. Douglas firs are a more valuable tree to wildlife compared to lodgepole pine trees.

Mixed Conifer Thinning – Fire Perspectives

- There are not many regenerating trees in the stand in Track 18 as is. If some larger trees are removed, then there will be more light and regenerating trees in the area. These regenerating trees will increase fire risk over the long term compared to the current condition of the stand.
- Across the entire Unit as a whole, there should be different areas, some with more regeneration and some without regeneration. Treating in this area will create patches of diversity in the interior forest that can be maintained over time.
- Regenerating trees can act as ladder fuels unless broadcast burns are used to manage the regeneration. Broadcast burning could be a solution to managing ladder fuels, but the timeline for implementing any broadcast burns is unclear at this time.
- From a fire perspective, any fire in this stand in Track 18 would be stand-replacing. By creating patches of areas with treatment and without treatment, the prescription is modifying fire behavior to move around the islands of regeneration. The modification in fire behavior increases the resilience of the Unit overall. There will be a period when the area will be more susceptible to fire, but in the long term, a treatment will increase the resilience of the treatment area and the Unit. "Fire resilience" means that a fire will burn surface fuels but has less of a chance of transitioning to the canopy and leading to a high-intensity wildfire.
- There is an assumption that areas being treated are more fire resilient than areas not being treated. After the Cold Springs Fire, some areas that were not treated were spared by the

fire, and some areas that were treated were burned. The idea that reducing the canopy density makes the forest more resilient is unclear based on past observations. There are some assumptions being made about areas that are not being treated as well.

- Stands on both north-facing and south-facing aspects have fire risks. The difference between north-facing and south-facing aspects is the number of days during which a fire could burn. During drier conditions, the number of days of high fire risk increase on both north-facing and south-facing aspects.
- If a fire is burning with low intensity, fire crews will be able to manage that fire. A fire that is burning at a higher intensity will require different tactics from a fire crew.
- With a ground fire, there may be an opportunity to let the fire burn naturally. Considering the number of homes in the wildland-urban interface around Nederland, there are very few opportunities to let a fire burn naturally.
- There is academic and scientific literature that suggests that treatments can make a landscape more wildfire resilient and literature that suggests that treatments do not make a landscape more wildfire resilient. Wildfire behavior can be hyper-localized, and all fires are different. Fire managers have experiential knowledge of wildfire behavior because they have watched fires spread on the landscape. Since the MMG is working with limited knowledge, they have to make judgment calls with the available information. Some treatments should occur, but the MMG should avoid being overconfident about the effectiveness of treatments. Alex Markevich and Marin Chambers can continue this conversation about how to manage uncertainty and incorporate different forms of knowledge offline.
- The treatments in the eastern half of the Unit were purposefully placed along a ridgeline. The ridgeline provides opportunities for firefighters to build a control line using the topographic features of the area. The existing proposed prescription aligns with that objective.

Surface Fuels Treatment

- A surface fuels treatment in Track 18 would pile existing surface fuels up to a four-inch DBH limit. Activity fuels would be piled up to an 8-inch DBH limit.
- Leaving existing surface fuels above the four-inch DBH limit would be acceptable from a wildlife perspective. The surface fuels left behind also act as carbon storage.
- The surface fuel treatments across Unit 29 should follow the same DBH guidelines to make the treatments as simple as possible to implement for the contractors.

Northeast Aspen Stand and Lodgepole Patchcut

The lodgepole patchcut attached to the aspen restoration treatment in the northeast corner of Unit 29 (Track 23) is very small. This patchcut contains a patch of regenerating lodgepole. Although it is small, it creates an opportunity for aspen and other conifer trees to expand into it.

Stop 4

Stop 4 was on a two-track road that leads north from Emory Road on the east side of the unit.

Gate and Road Closures

- Private access roads invite the public to recreate in the interior forest. People have used the private road for illegal motorized vehicle use in the past.
- The two-track road that field trip participants visited is a permitted private driveway, not a public road. At the time the easement was issued, there was a potential alternative road

from Coal Creek Road that could have led to the landowner's property. Instead, the landowner was issued an easement, starting at Emory Road, to get to his property.

- There should be a gate where the driveway meets with Emory Road, and the private landowner should be given a key to that gate. A gate would prevent motorized use on the road but would not prevent non-motorized use. Mountain bikers may eventually find the trail, so the USFS should monitor recreation use on the road.
- The landowner recently proposed building a house, but Gilpin County denied a permit to the landowner. There are concerns that the private driveway will become more developed and invite more recreation into the area.

Stop 5

Stop 5 was located right outside of Track 15, which the community proposal identifies as a lodgepole pine patchcut.

Splitting the Track 15 Polygon for Two Treatments

- The polygon for Track 15, which is located in the western half of the Unit, is currently identified as a lodgepole pine patchcut. The polygon should be split into two different treatment types: the eastern half for a lodgepole pine patchcut and the western half for an aspen restoration treatment.
- There was a proposed alternative to slightly change the boundary on the lodgepole pine patchcut for the eastern half of the Unit. Teagen Blakey will send Kevin Zimlinghaus the proposed area to be excluded from the lodgepole pine patchcut on the eastern side of the Track 15.
- The aspen restoration treatment half of Track 15 is mostly aspen stands with some lodgepole pine trees located in them. The treatment will involve removing lodgepole pine trees up to the DBH limit as specified in the DN. The few ponderosa pines and Douglas fir trees in the aspen restoration treatment area will also be removed up to the DBH limit as specified in the DN.

Stop 6

Stop 6 was located in the northern part of Unit 29, east of marker TB26 on the community proposed treatment map.

Proposal for an Additional Polygon for a Lodgepole Pine Thin/Patchcut

- There was a proposal to add a polygon for an additional treatment in the area east of marker TB26. The treatment would involve thinning regeneration lodgepole pine trees according to the specifications in the DN. The purpose of the treatment is to set the condition of the lodgepole pine forest back to a younger forest. The lodgepole pine forest is currently in an intermediate structure. Thinning the forest would help create structural stability and reduce fuel loading over time, especially on a south-facing aspect. The proposed treatment would be an acre and a half.
- Thinning the lodgepole stands in the treatment area would create structural stability by decreasing the spread of mistletoe. In a thick stand, larger trees can drop mistletoe onto smaller regenerating trees and spread the infestation.
- The lodgepole pine stand east of marker TB26 seems to be well-spaced already. The reason some of the conifer forests are well-spaced is because people had already implemented treatments and removed trees for firewood several decades ago. Past treatments are one reason why open conditions exist in flat areas and not steep areas.
- The lodgepole pine stand seems to be around 50 years old.

- The aspen aggregations in the area should be promoted to break up the spread of fire. Aspen trees are in the proposed treatment area and to the south of the proposed treatment area.
- There was another proposal for the treatment to involve a patchcut in the proposed additional polygon (one and a half acres) and a thinning of intermediate-sized trees from the proposed patchcut to the patchcut in Track 15. This treatment would help promote aspen aggregations.
- From a wildlife perspective, promoting the aspen through the treatment area would increase forage for wildlife.
- If the additional polygon included a patchcut, there would not be any technical issues with it being within 100 yards from the Track 15 patchcut, considering that Track 15 is being split into two different treatments.
- A patchcut in the additional polygon east of TB 26 is tolerable if the roads get closed through the area. People would potentially use the roads to harvest firewood. Additionally, a vehicle could use the roads to get to blue spruce old-growth forests. The MMG will discuss road closures further during their meeting on Wednesday, August 12.
- There is a concern that snow could overwhelm lodgepole pine trees and break them if the treatment area involves thinning and not a patchcut. Kevin Zimlinghaus will need to consider whether a patchcut or thinning treatment would be more advantageous in the polygon east of TB26 and in Track 15 to prevent snow from breaking trees.
- The proposal to extend the thinning treatment to connect from the additional patchcut to the Track 15 patchcut is not fully supported. The lodgepole pine trees interspersed with aspens are a natural development of a forest, and a thinning treatment to Track 15 may compromise this part of the forest.

Stop 7

Stop 7 was located in the northwest corner of Unit 29, where the community proposed implementing surface fuel treatments.

Surface Fuel Treatments

- The USFS should draw a polygon around markers TB1, 26, and 28 to identify the area for surface fuels treatment in the northwest corner of Unit 29. The USFS will also need to draw a polygon around markers TB18 and 30 if the surface fuels treatment around those markers is large enough to require a polygon.
- The steep hillside in the northwest corner of Unit 29 will be used as a boundary for the surface fuels treatment.
- The surface fuels treatment will involve piling existing surface fuels with a DBH between one inch and five inches. Some live trees, up to a seven-inch DBH, around constructed piles will need to be removed to minimize the scorching of the overstory.
- The specification for the surface fuels treatments will need to be aligned with the surface fuels treatment in Track 18. If the MMG decides to treat surface fuels with a one- to five-inch DBH, that would create more material to potentially scorch the overstory than a treatment that piled existing slash with a DBH of 4 inches or less.
- The surface fuels treatments will add acres to the USFS's acreage targets.
- The surface fuels treatment should leave some surface fuels. The surface fuels help keep the soil healthy, cycle nutrients, and facilitate the growth of native plants. Taking too many surface fuels may also lead to erosion issues.

- The surface fuels treatment would remove surface fuels in the short term. However, with the residual trees in the overstory, there will be a natural cycling of materials as needles and branches fall off the trees.
- The surface fuels treatment would involve trimming and piling branches up to a 4-inch DBH off of larger boles. It would also involve removing and piling the top portion of a larger bole to reduce fuel loading. Trees that have fallen and are resting diagonally would be piled up to the DBH limit. The diagonally resting trees act as ladder fuels and are good to take out to reduce fire risk.
- Some surface fuels will be left on the ground, such as small twigs and needles.
- The amount of surface fuels varies throughout the surface fuels treatment area.
- From a wildlife perspective, some surface fuels should be kept to benefit different species. Leaving more surface fuels on the ground creates a complex environment, which can benefit mid-range carnivore species.
- In the northwest corner of Unit 29, a surface fuels treatment would provide some value from a fire perspective. A reduction in surface fuels creates one less factor that could increase the intensity of a fire and keep it from going into the canopy. With the right wind direction and intensity, a fire could hit a jackpot of fuels and torch several trees. The torched trees would scatter embers, and potentially start a fire in other surface fuels. Reducing surface fuel loads decreases the chance of a fire transitioning into the canopy.
- The surface fuels treatment prescription should include the direction not to construct burn piles in the nearby ravine. The DN already indicates that burn piles cannot be located in stream corridors.
- From a wildlife perspective, surface fuels in the stream corridor should mostly be left on the ground.
- The USFS will mark the boundaries of the surface fuels treatment to delineate where the treatments will take place.

Stop 8

Stop 8 was located between two proposed lodgepole pine patchcuts (Track 16 and Track 26).

Additional Patchcut Proposal

- There was a proposal to add a patchcut between Track 16 and 26 to treat an area where there are aspen trees interspersed in conifer. The purpose of the proposed patchcut is to take the lodgepole pine out to promote aspen restoration. Dead lodgepole pine trees would remain, as well as some ponderosa pine trees and Douglas fir trees.
- There is a subtle shift in the terrain in the area of the proposed additional patchcut. The area of the proposed additional patchcut is primarily lodgepole pine trees with a small number of aspens. There are not enough aspens to justify taking out the lodgepole pine in this proposed patchcut.
- From a wildlife perspective, it is not as necessary to treat in the area of the proposed patchcut between Track 16 and 26. There are not as many aspens in the proposed patchcut, which make the treatments less beneficial to the wildlife. There are also squirrel middens in the area.

Acreage Targets

- As the MMG continues to develop prescriptions, they should keep in mind that the USFS's target is to reach 600 acres of treatment. This 600-acre target incorporates the counting method in which treatment acres are counted multiple times depending on the treatment

method (i.e., a manually treated acre is counted once for cutting and again for piling). Surface fuel treatments are only counted once.

- The USFS has not calculated how many acres the current prescriptions for Phases 5 and 6 contribute towards reaching this target of 600 acres.
- Before Unit 77 and 81 were dropped from Phases 5 and 6 of Forsythe II, the acreage target for Forsythe II was 1,000 acres.
- The broadcast burning from 2019 is counted in the overall National Forest's acreage target. The 600-acre target is assigned specifically to Forsythe II and does not incorporate the acres from the broadcast burning.
- If the USFS is not going to reach their acreage target, it would be preferable for them to treat the additional patchcut between Track 16 and Track 26 rather than in another area. Before the MMG adds treatments to help the USFS reach their acreage targets, they should have a better idea of how many acres are proposed for treatment under the current prescriptions. Units 52, 53, 54, 55, and 80 will likely be short on acres. Kevin Zimlinghaus will send out a table on the number of acres being treated based on the prescriptions so far and the patchcuts in Units 23 and 24.
- If the USFS is not going to reach their acreage targets, the MMG should find ways to implement treatments that are going to cause the least amount of damage possible. Certain treatments are more invasive than others. The MMG can discuss the acreage targets further at the virtual meeting on Wednesday, August 12. The MMG should also consider how many acres they are not treating as well.

Surface Fuels, Firewood Collection, and Road Closures

- If there were a patchcut between Track 16 and 26, the treatment would cut larger lodgepole pine trees. The patchcut would be treated manually, so any tree with a DBH greater than eight inches would be left on the ground. With the road system, people could come in to collect the larger trees left behind for firewood. The USFS could steer people to this treatment area to collect the larger boles as firewood when they acquire their firewood permits.
- It would require an additional contract to close the road. If the road was closed, it would likely occur after the treatment was finished. The firewood would likely all be collected after two months before any road closure could be authorized.
- The firewood permits allow people to collect dead wood for firewood. People are not allowed to cut live trees for firewood under that permit. If people are cutting live trees, any observers should contact the USFS. All permittees are given a handout with the rules on how to collect firewood. One rule includes not driving 100 or 300 feet off the road. Angie Gee can add driving rules to the handout that all firewood permittees receive when they are issued firewood collection permits.
- The Motor Vehicle Use Maps (MVUM) should indicate that the road will be closed.
- Some community members could be given USFS volunteer uniforms to help patrol firewood collection.
- During firewood collections, people tend to take all the firewood out of an area. This activity would likely not leave surface fuels for wildlife species that benefit from a certain amount of surface fuels. The amount of surface fuels left is often less than the minimum for the amount of surface fuels required to be left on the ground. People will tend to leave more surface fuels further from the road and further down the road.
- One idea to keep some surface fuels on the landscape is for law enforcement to give the USFS updates periodically on the amount of surface fuel left on the ground and then close the road once they have reached a certain amount.

- The proposed patchcut between Track 16 and 26 would be an acre and a half in size. The blowdown, as a result of the patchcut, will account for the surface fuel retention minimums over time. Additionally, some pile burning may also leave some additional surface fuels on the ground.
- Kevin Zimlinghaus, Chad Buser, and Aurelia DeNasha will develop the specifications that will determine what surface fuels will be retained in terms of existing and activity fuels in Unit 29.

Stop 9

Stop 9 was in an area between Unit 61 and Track 14.

Surface Fuels Treatment

There is an opportunity for a surface fuel treatment between Units 61 and Track 14.

Phase 3 Contractor

- The Phase 3 contractor has a work crew in place. The contractor could start work as early as August 17.
- The USFS Boulder Ranger District does not currently have a sales administrator, but they are bringing someone from the USFS Enterprise Team to administer the contract. The sales administrator from the Enterprise Team will know how to administer a timber contract. The USFS will need to inform the person from the Enterprise Team about all the commitments the USFS has made to the MMG team.
- The USFS will share an update on the Phase 3 contractor during the MMG virtual meeting on Wednesday, August 12.

NEXT STEPS

- Due to the complexity of treatments in Unit 29, the zones of agreement among field trip participants are less clear than the field trip on July 18. Kevin Zimlinghaus and Teagen Blakey will work together to fill out the final decision box before the virtual meeting on August 12.
- During the virtual meeting on August 12, MMG meeting participants will review the prescription on Unit 29, discuss the USFS's acreage targets and road closures on Unit 29, and discuss an update on the Forsythe II Phase 3 contractor.