

**Multiparty Monitoring Group (MMG) Field Trip
August 18, 2022, from 4:30 pm to 7:30 pm
North of Emory Road at the Boundary of Units 29 and 61
Meeting Summary – FINAL**

ATTENDANCE

Participants: Jessie Ansari, Karen Blakemore, Teagen Blakey, Chad Buser, Tania Corvalan, Mark Foreman, Erin Fried, Sarah Jensen, Maya MacHammer, Alex Markevich, Kevin McLaughlin, Ellie Prain, Sheila Ranegar, Kirin Riddell, Susan Wagner, and Kevin Zimlinghaus

Documentation: Izzy Sofio

ACTION ITEMS

Chad Buser	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide the MMG with updates about the prescribed fire project. • Provide the MMG with an update regarding the USFS Chief's announcement regarding the national prescribed fire ban lift at the end of August.
Kevin Zimlinghaus	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notify the MMG when the contractor completes the Lazy Z units. • Ask Marin Chambers if any of the Forsythe II units were included in CFRI's monitoring plots. • Coordinate with Teagen when the Lazy Z units are complete.
USFS	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up with the MMG in several years regarding lodgepole pine thinning in Forsythe II. • Provide the MMG with relevant updates via email.
Izzy Sofio	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email the MMG to ask for consent to share the email addresses of MMG members with the USFS so that the USFS can manage communication with the MMG going forward. • Cancel the standing meetings throughout 2022.

INTRODUCING BOULDER DISTRICT RANGER KEVIN MCLAUGHLIN

MMG members had the opportunity to get to know the Boulder District Ranger Kevin McLaughlin and ask questions about the MMG, Forsythe II, and the Boulder District. Below are key points from his introduction.

Introduction

- Kevin McLaughlin has worked with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) for nearly 20 years. He has experience as a forester and silviculturist with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) planning. He was previously the Forest Program Manager for the Arapaho Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grasslands (ARP).
- He has engaged in collaborative efforts such as the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CLFRP), which focused on some Forsythe treatments. His involvement with the CLFRP also included working with the Landscape Restoration Team dedicated to science and monitoring.
- Kevin hopes to build collaborative groups on the forest to address several of the larger-scale challenges facing the Forest.
- The USFS does not have planned work for Forsythe II in the foreseeable future, aside from the previously discussed broadcast burn projects.

Clarifying Discussion

- The broadcast burning project will be organized into three sections and limited to 340 acres a year. The project would require at least three separate burns.
- There is some interest in more prescribed burning in the area to address surface fuel. Generally, the MMG is relatively supportive of prescribed fire. Pile burning was a more contentious topic than prescribed fire.
- Some MMG members have the sense that the USFS leaves the most contentious units of contracted work for last. If the USFS intends to return to this area and complete some of the more complex treatments, they should re-engage the MMG.
- Some MMG members intend to work with Denver Water and the USFS to develop alternative proposals for the haul road associated with Denver Water's Gross Reservoir expansion project. It appears there is more than one proposal out currently: one using the flat campground area as staging area and building a new road into Lazy Z and the other going past the campground and building a switchback road down to Lazy Z. Lazy Z was originally a haul route, so that may be a suggested alternative proposal.
- Denver Water has identified the USFS Regional Office as the main point of contact for USFS matters relating to the project.
- There is talk of Denver Water issuing the logging contract for the expansion project next year. However, the USFS has procedures that must occur before that. For example, the USFS will need to boat out to the various locations, sample similar stands, and assess the larger trees.

Clarifying Questions

Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Questions are below in italics, and corresponding answers are in plain text.

Will all of the treatments included in the Forsythe II decision still occur?

While there are signed NEPA decisions, the only planned work in the area for the next several years at this time is the prescribed fire work. The USFS intends to focus on other work on the Boulder District.

What is the USFS's jurisdiction regarding the Denver Water Gross Reservoir expansion project?

Denver Water's plans fall under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC). Kevin McLaughlin has not been involved in the conversations regarding the haul road proposals. However, over the last two months, he has had several discussions regarding other aspects of the Denver Water project.

GENERAL CONTRACT UPDATES

Kevin Zimlinghaus provided general contract updates. Below are key points from his overview.

Updates

- While the entirety of Phase 5 is not yet complete, most of the work outlined in the contract is complete. Units 49, 73, 48, and 74 remain to be treated. There are piles in Unit 74 that have not yet been burned. There is a quarter acre that the USFS will exclude from treatment in Unit 74. The contractor is still in the area, so the unit will be completed this year.
- Some areas by the powerline were not treated due to their proximity to the powerline and concerns about damaging it. The crew will return to complete pile burning in the area as it is possible to burn without damaging the powerlines.

- Kevin Zimlinghaus, his team member Katie, and Teagen Blakey marked nine trees in Unit 61 per the MMG agreement to ensure the contractor does not cut borderline trees. There are slash piles from the treatment in Unit 61.
- United Power completed treatment in their corridor right of way. The USFS does not have jurisdiction over United Power's right of way; United Power is under a permit with the USFS to maintain its corridor.
- The USFS planted ponderosa pines in the spring after thinning conifers in Unit 99.
- The USFS will install a gate at Emory Road to prevent access to the road the MMG took to get to the field trip location as it is not a system road.

Clarifying Questions

Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions. Questions are below in italics, and corresponding answers are in plain text.

When will treatments in Lazy Z be complete?

It is challenging to determine an exact time frame as contractors are working across the districts. It will likely be several weeks. When the contractors return, Kevin Zimlinghaus will notify the MMG.

Will the USFS burn the piles by the powerline?

The USFS will determine pile size and distance from the powerlines. The piles will likely be smaller when they are closer to the lines. In some areas, the power line is 40 feet high, providing room to ensure the burn does not damage the powerline.

UNIT 29 D ASPEN TREATMENT

Kevin Zimlinghaus provided an overview of the treatment work completed in Unit 29 D. Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and discuss the treatment. Below are key points from the discussion.

Overview of Treatment

The focus of the treatment in Unit 29 D (2 acres) was on retaining aspens. In time, the area should see sprouts due to increased sun exposure. The materials from the treatment were piled.

Clarifying Questions

Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the Unit 29 D treatment and other relevant topics. Questions are below in italics, and corresponding answers are in plain text.

Will the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI) be involved in the MMG in the future?

There are some plots CFRI continues to monitor. Kevin Zimlinghaus will follow up with Marin Chambers to see if any of these units were included in CFRI's monitoring plots.

When will the USFS return to a treated area to thin once growth returns and how beneficial is the treatment if trees grow back densely?

Ideally, the USFS would return to thin once trees are six to eight feet tall. The Forsythe II decision allows for follow-up thinning after regeneration.

At what age should young trees be to conduct burns?

- It is possible to conduct burns when trees are five to six feet tall. There are various techniques to employ when conducting burns with young trees (e.g., multi-stage burns, tree well burns, and/or snow well burns). Another option, requiring a NEPA decision, would be

to thin lodgepoles, Douglas firs, and/or ponderosa pines, break down the fuel, and burn the area to provide seed sources for species in the area.

- When trees are young, there is a higher risk of mortality from burning. Waiting to burn until trees are older yields a higher survival rate. However, waiting also creates additional material to remove. The state of the surrounding area also impacts the decision to conduct burns near young trees.

CFRI and Denver Water, through the Forests to Faucets program, were conducting monitoring in these areas. Outside of those monitoring efforts, what does the USFS have planned for monitoring time frames and check-ins?

It is typical to revisit an area in two to three years for monitoring. The USFS's time frames and check-ins for monitoring are based on staff availability.

How do USFS personnel acquire information about previous treatments?

The USFS has an accomplishment reporting database for current and future personnel to reference. One example of information uploaded to the database is: patch cut treatments with forest regeneration specifically require surveys after five years. Treatment proximity helps the USFS keep track of treatments and surveys.

Would the USFS visit specific treatment polygons if they conduct overviews of the treatment area as a whole?

If the silviculturist is unable to visit the treatment, then their crew would visit and report to the silviculturist. The visits would be scheduled as there are many other ongoing projects in the area.

How can the USFS stay up to date on surveying?

Surveying for a treatment like Unit 29 D would not be formally scheduled. A silviculturist designs a treatment, writes a prescription, and considers the impacts of the treatment. Once the work is complete, the silviculturist walks the area to observe whether the treatment achieved the desired impact.

Is aspen regeneration an objective for clear cuts and patch cuts?

It is, and it is for overstory removal.

Will the USFS revisit Unit 29 D in three years?

Yes. It is important to set outcomes for aspen regeneration to identify what the USFS will observe. Elk presence may not be impactful here.

Clarifying Discussion

- Teagen Blakey and Aurelia DeNasha corresponded prior to the meeting as Aurelia was unable to attend the meeting. Teagen inquired about excessive browsing in Unit 29 D and other units, which Aurelia indicated does not appear to be an issue in this instance.
- Typically, aspen enhancement projects remove larger conifers to allow for the suckering of aspens into the open space. Because there are conifers around the area in Unit 29 D, aspen expansion outside of the unit is not expected. However, aspen enhancement is expected within the unit. In patch cut treatments with replanting and regeneration, the USFS conducts survival surveys, a requirement of the National Forest Management Act (NFMA).
- In terms of a plan for monitoring these units, Kevin Zimlinghaus and his team typically conduct walk-throughs for visual observations. They do not typically write summaries of their visual observations.

- It appeared unclear whether monitoring from the MMG would be included in the USFS record. The USFS keeps information shared by the MMG to reference. The monitoring information of interest to the USFS is whether there is enhancement occurring in a treated area rather than the specifics about individual trees. There are many components of the project work that the MMG could monitor (e.g., aspen enhancement or planting success).
- Many MMG members understood generational diversity to be one of the reasons for the work in Forsythe II. One purpose of replanting trees, especially those that are more resistant to fire, in a treatment area is to provide the area with seeds in the event of a large-scale fire. Without a seed source, a dense forest can transform into a grassland ecosystem after a fire. An area with one species of tree will have a higher probability of burning, exemplified by the Hayman and Calwood Fires.
- Whether the USFS can return to a treatment area to thin a densely regenerated forest depends on the NEPA decision.
- It is important to the MMG that the USFS returns and commits to returning to these units for monitoring.
- Over the years, there have been several treatments (e.g., Lump Gulch, Winiger Ridge, the Magnolia area, and the Little Prince project). It appears that personnel are not always aware of previous work and decisions when returning to an area for additional treatments.
- Following a treatment, the USFS returns for stocking surveys one year, three years, and five years later. By year three, the USFS observes whether the stands are regenerating. USFS personnel enter that information into the aforementioned database.
- Moose in the area are bringing down some regenerating trees. Boulder County Open Space (BCOS) installed fencing around some treatments to protect the area from elk. BCOS will monitor differences between treatments in fenced and unfenced areas.
- Boulder Watershed Collective (BWC) aggregated treatment polygons to one map. The map included information about the treatments, such as the name and date of the treatment and more for some. BWC intends to update the map every five years or so.
- Boulder County has a map of the conservation areas. Conservation easements can move with changing ownership, too.

UNIT 29 C – PATCH CUT

Kevin Zimlinghaus provided an overview of the treatment work completed in Unit 29 C. Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and discuss the treatment. Below are key points from the discussion.

Overview of Treatment

- The treatment in Unit 29 C (4 acres) was a patch cut. The USFS primarily cut lodgepole pines and worked to retain aspen snags, ponderosa pines, and Douglas fir. There is less wood here now than after the treatment because people are coming to gather the residual wood. This patch cut treatment is an example of others completed throughout Phase 5.
- There are aspen clones in Unit 29 C. Once the USFS burns the piles, there should be aspen expansion into the edges of the unit.
- The USFS plans to replant this area with mixed conifer species (e.g., ponderosa pine, Douglas fir, and limber pine), which are natural components of this area.

Clarifying Questions

Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the Unit 29 D treatment and other relevant topics. Questions are below in italics, and corresponding answers are in plain text.

When will the USFS burn the piles in Unit 29 C?

The piles were cut this spring, so the USFS will most likely burn them next winter (the winter of 2023-2024).

How are people able to take residual fuel for firewood?

A person can use the nearby road to drive into this area and walk from the road into Unit 29 C to carry the wood back to their vehicle. Depending on the location of a treatment to a road and the drivability of a road, that is a possibility.

The stand appears sparse. What was the purpose of treating this area?

Before the treatment, it was quite dense. The stumps are still visible, indicating the density of the area. The MMG visited this area on a previous field trip. Information from that field trip is available.

What is the timeline for replanting in Unit 29 C?

The USFS submits sowing requests for replanting seeds to the nursery every October. Typically, seeds grow for a year at the nursery. By the end of the following summer, the nursery organizes the seedlings into coolers for the winter. By the following spring, the USFS comes to the treatment area to plant. Those trees are called 1 – 0s. If a tree is contained for one year and planted in a bed for 1 year, they are 1 – 1s. Depending on the species and the species' requirement for growing, trees can be 2 – 0s or 3 – 0s.

How many patch cuts will the USFS replant?

The USFS evaluates all patch cuts for replanting. This spring, the USFS replanted Unit 99 because the crew had the trees and time. Patch cuts in Units 73 and 75 will be replanted, as well as the other patch cuts in Phase 5. The planting will occur all at once.

If the intention is to have aspen regrow in Unit 29 C, why would the USFS replant mixed conifers?

The USFS evaluates aspen regrowth and suckering before replanting additional trees, such as mixed conifers. The purpose of replanting with mixed conifers is to provide diversity to the landscape.

Why does the USFS plant in areas where there are seed sources?

Whether the USFS plants in areas with seed sources depends on the area's species composition; for example, Douglas fir regeneration is consistent, while ponderosa pine regeneration is more challenging. As ponderosa pines get older, they become less viable, even as they produce seeds. Therefore, it is important to replant ponderosa pines. Lodgepole pines tend to regrow in manual units and less in mechanical units, potentially due to the mineral turnover in the soil in mechanical units.

The noxious weeds in Unit 29 C look good. In Big Springs, there is a lot of thistle and mullein. Is the presence of those noxious weeds related to mechanical treatments?

Mechanically treated areas typically see less thistle and mullein. Chipping tends to invite more thistle to an area.

Some patch cut treatments may see high rates of lodgepole pines. What preventative actions will take place to ensure that the same forest that was originally cut does not regrow?

The Forsythe II decision identified thinning treatments in the event of dense regrowth. Ten-to-15-year monitoring is the next step for these patch cut treatments.

What can change about lodgepole pine thinning treatments to make them more effective (e.g., remove material or cut earlier)?

- One barrier to removing material is related to slope and access to the area.
- If there is one tree and six piles to burn, the lone tree will most likely not survive prescribed burning. Leaving a group of trees and leaving the piles could be one option.

It is possible to “weed whack” small trees to lop and scatter. How old should the trees be to do this? Would thinning earlier yield less material to lop and scatter, therefore, generating less surface fuel?
The ability to “weed whack” depends on the size of the tool used for the work. Additionally, the decision to lop and scatter depends on the treatment objectives. Thinning earlier could lead to the unknowing removal of healthier trees. Thinning earlier is more effective in mixed conifer stands.

Is it possible to model which regenerating trees would be the healthiest?
Modeling that is not accurate.

How does one identify dominance in a regenerating (lodgepole pine) tree, and is it possible that there is no dominance?

Typically, the height and girth of the tree indicate dominance. It is possible for there to be no dominance.

Clarifying Discussion

- There will be a paper out in the late winter or early spring examining the survival rate of replanted trees after the Cold Springs fire. Replanting was accomplished with the support of USFS staff, volunteer children, and the Fort Collins Hot Shot crew without a contractor. There was a 60 percent survivability rate.
- Regarding the noxious weed presence, it appears that mechanical equipment could be responsible for bringing seeds into an area. The USFS cleans machines before entering a new area to avoid issues such as that.
- Thistle and mullein are better adapted to compacted soil, whereas native species are better adapted to uncompacted soil.
- Lodgepole pine thinning treatments on Winiger Ridge appeared to be insufficient and resulted in an eventual patch cut.
- In practice, lodgepole pine patch cuts work when fuels can be left to lop and scatter for effective spacing for regeneration. However, in Forsythe II, there was no support for leaving fuels on the ground; therefore, this patch cut treatment is different than traditional treatments.
- The USFS’s work in West Magnolia is the best example of mixed conifer thinning in this area. The USFS needs a new NEPA decision to thin the West Magnolia area, so it has not yet been thinned.
- Comparing untreated areas to treated areas is an important component of this work that will inform the effectiveness of treatments.
- The USFS will follow up with the MMG in several years regarding lodgepole thinning in this area.

UNIT 29 A – SURFACE FUEL

Kevin Zimlinghaus provided an overview of the treatment work completed in Unit 29 A. Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and discuss the treatment. Below are key points from the discussion.

Overview of Treatment

- Unit 29 A (2 acres) is an example of one of the three surface fuel treatments throughout Phase 5. The piles, which will be burned, are collections of surface fuels.
- It will be challenging to burn the pile as there is no fine fuel to accelerate the burn. The burn crew will use jelled fuel to sustain the burns. Chad Buser and his crew try to burn piles like these earlier in the season before too much snow falls. From a fire perspective, these piles appear to be negligible. It will likely take 30 minutes to light each pile, so this work is time-consuming.

Clarifying Questions

Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the Unit 29 A treatment and other relevant topics. Questions are below in italics, and corresponding answers are in plain text.

How were the criteria for this treatment determined?

The MMG determined the criteria. Fuel between 1 inch and 4 inches in diameter were gathered unless it was in the ground.

What would assist the piles in burning more easily?

Adding approximately 50 percent of a nearby tree for greenery and the needles would assist with a successful burn. The greenery and needles act as kindling.

Would including larger pieces of fuel from the ground assist with the burning?

Additional material from the ground will not help as that material will be wet by the time burning occurs.

How does Unit 29 A compare to Unit 74?

The piles in Unit 74 were larger and burned late in the winter. The piles were fairly dry; however, it took a lot of fuel to burn the piles. Some of the piles were not burned because it was too late in the season. For the piles that the USFS burned, it was easier to burn them due to the north-facing aspect, the larger size of the pile, and the denser stack, keeping snow out of the pile's nooks.

When will the piles in Unit 29 A burn?

The USFS could burn them this winter because the piles are already cured; however, these piles are not a high priority. The USFS may try to burn these piles with other units for efficiency.

What is the concern with surface fuels on a steep, north-facing slope?

One of the potential approaches the USFS is considering for the St. Vrain project is to minimize treatments on north-facing aspects to focus on increasing the removal of basal areas in the south, east, and west. This could create buffers around a refugium.

Clarifying Discussion

- For surface fuel treatments to be effective, it is critical for the piles to be burnable. In this treatment, it is possible there will be effects on the overstory from burning because there was no thinning in Unit 29 A.
- Even if additional trees were cut to add to the piles, the burnability of the piles would only slightly increase. Removing additional trees, some of which are large, would depart from the objectives this treatment. It is not possible to change the treatment at this point as the contractor completed their work here, following the contract instructions.

- Piling the rest of the surface fuels in the area and thinning the ladder fuels in some of the smaller Douglas firs and spruce trees could improve the burnability of the piles. However, the generational diversity in this area appears to be in the ladder fuel.
- North-facing lodgepole is a lower concern for fire risk. North facing aspects retain more moisture. However, when there is a drought summer, it is likely that those north-facing aspects will burn regardless, like what happened in the Cold Springs Fire. Under certain fire conditions, it is possible for everything to burn.

UNIT 29 B – MIXED CONIFER THIN

Kevin Zimlinghaus provided an overview of the treatment work completed in Unit 29 B. Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions and discuss the treatment. Below are key points from the discussion.

Overview of Treatment

The treatment in Unit 29 B (10 acres) focused on thinning a portion of the mixed conifer stand. The treatment focused on thinning lodgepole pine primarily to maintain the Douglas fir and ponderosa pine in the area.

Clarifying Questions

Meeting participants had the opportunity to ask clarifying questions about the Unit 29 B treatment and other relevant topics. Questions are below in italics, and corresponding answers are in plain text.

Will the Units along Emory Road be treated, and will poles stay in the ground in those Units?

Yes, the contractor will return to complete those treatments. Because the units are not proximate to the road, poles will stay in the ground.

How can the burning process reduce the number of scorched trees if the burn occurs all at once here (and in other similar units)?

The USFS can stagger burning the piles; however, that tactic can impact firefighter health as the individual will breathe in more smoke. Another option is to light several piles one day and wait to complete the others on subsequent days. Ultimately, burning depends on the wind, too.

Why treat areas with patch cuts if 90 percent of the trees are lost from burning?

Trees with crowns require distance from piles during burning when the size of the piles is similar to those in Unit 29 B. Radiant heat is also a factor. Even if a fire does not touch a tree, the radiant heat can impact tree health.

What was the purpose of treating Unit 29 B?

The purpose was to thin the stands and generate genetic diversity. The treatment intended to cut lodgepole pines so that residual aspens could expand.

Would it be possible to plan the cutting so that piles could be organized further from the groups or individual trees remaining post-treatment? Would two phases be beneficial?

If a fire burns through a landscape, then trees would likely burn in a stand replacement fire. Additionally, this approach could increase the cost of the project and the required time. Breaking the work into two phases would require more time and two days of acceptable weather conditions to burn.

When is the next prescribed burn?

The prescribed burn will ideally occur early next spring. Chad Buser and his crew are preparing for the burn in case there is a window this fall.

How is Unit 29 B set up for a broadcast burn?

Unit 29 B is not well suited for a broadcast burn as Unit 29 B has several short needle conifers. Broadcast burning in areas with short needle conifers can be problematic, whether the trees are alive or dead.

Is it possible, pending a NEPA decision, to return to units earlier for prescribed burn treatments before returning to an area to treat it again?

It is possible, and it depends on the situation (e.g., the location, size of the area, work required, and planning needed). Additionally, burn plans require a significant amount of work. Small-scale broadcast burning requires intensive planning. Size is a limiting factor, too. Fire is more impactful in larger areas.

Would it be possible to plan for a prescribed burn in Lazy Z near the Coal Creek Canyon area on the north ridge and south aspect?

The peninsula that MMG members visited on the South Boulder Creek drainage has the potential for a relatively sizable, prescribed burn. That area is located on a consistent south-facing slope, leading into Gross Reservoir, providing a good control feature for firefighters.

If there are high rates of mortality here or in other polygons, will the USFS re-enter the area to remove those trees?

Depending on the size of the area and the aspect, the USFS could return for removals. If the area is south, east, or west-facing, the USFS might consider returning to plant ponderosa pines.

Would the USFS return to an area, such as Unit 75, to remove standing snags or remaining small trees?

That requires a site-by-site evaluation. In Unit 29 B, for example, the snags can facilitate insect life, so they should not be removed.

Clarifying Discussion

- There are pros and cons to mechanical and hand treatments. Mechanically treated areas have fewer piles, for example.
- There is still life growing on the ground in Unit 29 B. Some landowners in the area oppose mechanical cuts because of the equipment's impact on the environment of the treatment area. The scorching that will likely occur from the pile burning in Unit 29 B is a tradeoff for not treating this unit mechanically.
- Targeting groups of trees (e.g., 40 to 80 trees) to keep post-treatment rather than keeping individual trees can be effective because fewer trees are dispersed, and those groups of trees are more resilient to the wind.
- Including criteria in a contract so that piles are organized in open spaces and 1,000 feet or so from other piles and trees to avoid scorching would require clear definitions in the contract. Some MMG members wonder if this could help retain the genetic diversity of the trees.
- The purpose of this treatment and others in Forsythe II was fuel reduction, age diversity, and forest health. Additionally, there was a beetle epidemic on the West Slope during the beginning of this work. Many community members perceived previous treatments in the area as tools to decrease wildfire risk.

- Some treatments were traded to preserve certain sections of the area, such as aspen groves.
- Mark Foreman, who could not attend the full meeting, asked an MMG member to convey his interest in prescribed burns in treated units. The end goal of this work should be to burn in the area.

NEXT STEPS FOR THE MMG

- The USFS does not have plans for additional treatments in this area for the foreseeable future. Therefore, the MMG no longer needs to meet on a monthly basis. The current monthly standing meetings will be canceled.
- Going forward, the USFS plans to provide the MMG with relevant updates via email rather than Peak Facilitation Group. MMG members present at the end of the meeting provided Peak Facilitation Group consent to share their email addresses with the USFS. Izzy Sofio will email the MMG to determine if other MMG members who were not present at today's meeting would like their emails shared with the USFS to be included in relevant email updates.
- Chad Buser will provide emails regarding fire-related plans and activities in the area. The national prescribed fire pause will lift at the end of August, and the USFS Chief will provide information about how to proceed. Chad will provide the MMG with an update regarding the Chief's announcement.
- Teagen Blakey is interested in visiting the Lazy Z units once they are complete. However, at this time, it is unknown when the work will be completed. She will need USFS assistance to access the area. She will communicate with the USFS offline to coordinate this.