

## **DWRF Stakeholder's Meeting**

Wednesday, September 13, 1:30-3:30pm

Hybrid Meeting

**Attendees:** Danny Margoles (DWRF Coordinator), Derek Padilla (Tres Rios BLM), James Dietrich (Montezuma County), Bruce Short (Short Forestry, LLC), Elizabeth James (Wildfire Adapted Partnership), Tara Harris (Mancos Conservation District), Ryan Cox (Colorado State Forest Service), Robert Meyer, Alex Handloff (Mountain Studies Institute), Dana Guinn (Forest Stewards Guild), Steve Garcher (Dolores County Commissioner), Doug Muscanell, Ken Curtis (Dolores Water Conservancy District), Michael Remke (New Mexico Highlands University)

Notetaker: Tara Harris

Reviewer: Danny Margoles

Discussion about conflict of interest - Conflicts of interest are not actually an issue, but it is could to disclose them

### **Discuss CFLRP Projects and Places: DWRF Priority Area Identification**

What CFLRP P&P does:

- Discusses projects within the CFLRP mission and geographic boundary
- Support work of place-based collaboratives

Show 2023 Meeting Priority Community Fire Mitigation Areas map

Danny has been having conversations around WUI, fisheries, etc about where needs are

We will have specific conversations in the near future about CFLRP Desired Future Conditions before October DWRF meeting - so that we can have a more directed conversation about the DFC in October

Robert - wants to have a conversation about prescribed burning in the Chicken Creek area

Recreation priorities are specifically articulated in [CFLRP desired future conditions](#)

CFLRP boundary primarily includes the San Juan National Forest (it includes all of the SJNF) and in the DWRF landscape, includes lands of different ownerships that are east of HWY 184.

The CFLRP boundary does not include all of our priorities and as we move forward, it's most important to identify DWRF priorities without being too concerned about specific program areas. Meaning, there are different programs/funding sources out there, and we want to make sure we first identify where the group's priorities are.

The collaborative has mainly focused on warm/dry forests. Water concerns are often most significant at higher elevations and there are possible future projects - like a mixed conifer prescribed fire EA - that may help address water resource concerns.

Derek - BLM will be more competitive if cross-boundary work can be shown

### **Collaborative actions connected to Salter and future collaborative work**

Is there a way that we can act more directly in how the litigation proceeds? What, in the long term, steps are we taking? How do we get there? Use Salter as the Case Study for how to move forward and do things differently

Coordinating Committee thoughts:

- Keep focus on the long term. Examine what has happened and how best to move forward.
- Keep the entire group in the loop in order to make sure everyone is on the same page and there is transparency.
- Keep everyone engaged, use collaborative as a springboard for listening and resolving issues
- There is power in the collaborative - keep it healthy, learn from the litigation, find a unified thread

There were unresolved issues that weren't addressed - are there ways the collaborative can speak more forcefully, influence a negotiation

Is the cost (of spending time to do the work) worth the benefit? At some point we will need to address these issues - Should we go forward?

Consensus was, yes - we should move forward with an after-action review, working through core issues of how we got here and where we should invest moving forward.

This document would probably not make a difference in court, but it could be very beneficial for the collaborative - improve communication, build trust, and where there was the communication breakdown.

Thought that addressing EIS vs EA should be on the after-action review list - how is the decision made between one or the other?

How do we honestly, openly discuss disagreements within the collaborative? There must be complete honesty around expectations and feelings. Everyone should speak to whether or not they can "live with it".

Do we as a collaborative revisit the approach of “getting everyone to speak with one voice”? There may be objectives we can not deal with within the collaborative. How do we set our expectations?

Should we always have the goal of speaking as a unified voice?

- Yes, although we may not always meet it
- Always capture dissenting views, at minimum
- If there are objections, what role can we play in helping resolve them? Are we willing to?

Could we, as a group, have put forth both sides (if we can't come to a consensus), saying “Agency” this is your decision? This should be in the after-action report and brought to the group

From the agreements document, DWRF articulated the group would make decisions with as much consensus as possible

Goal in future - work through objections before we even get to the objection process.

Audience - The after-action review should be for collaborative and decision making agencies (SJNF).

Understand the knowledge gap of what is financially viable? What is the cost benefit analysis?

How detailed do we want this after-action review to be? Do we want to just identify issues or actually work through them?

Identify, maybe state how it could have gone differently. Use what you learn to affect future projects

What is the next EA DWRF will be involved in? Haycamp EA, timeline unknown. But have an after-action review done before this EA. Have review finalized by January, for February meeting?

Who will work on the After Action Report?: Coordinating committee + anyone else interested draft a review to bring before the group

### **Updates:**

Derek/BLM - beginning Rx burns, Carpenter Ridge and West Dolores Rim area; large piles in the Rim timber sale will be burned this winter; Durango, Grandview pile burn; awarded contract for Dawson Creek that includes research with ASU for vegetation treatments in PJ

Community members are still getting wood chips from the ironwood mill, but quality seems to be diminishing.

Ryan/CSFS - Ute Mountain Ute tribal council - hoping to put out skid and deck RFP to clean up Adam's Ranch; COSWAP marking, layout at Adam's Ranch; FRWRM grant open until Oct. 18th

Ken - CWCB has Wildfire Ready Watershed funding that would need to be secured by December 2024; Ken may go for funding for PJ thinning; CWCB has a local representative that is interested/able to support accessing these funds.

Cross-boundary committee - identified what funding is out there that people are using right now; putting together a process for writing letters of support

Mike Remke - Field crew member working on an expansion of snowtopography focusing on dust on snow; trying to start a more collaborative process across southwest doing envirothons to outreach high school students; launching an MF in Forestry, trying to fill a reforestation niche; hoping to have capacity for 5 million seedlings per year

Robert, Mancos Trails Group - successful season, some high elevation work in July; trails are in nice shape going into fall

CFLRP Coordinating Council - has been discussing Salter and how to move forward; may write a similar letter requesting negotiations; we don't want to plow ahead with out the FS participating

James - Montezuma county working on update to CWPP in October; map we looked at early was a part of that process

Pueblo Community College and CSU Extension wants to develop workforce programs for the Forest Products Industry and fire training - Meeting Oct. 3rd 1-3pm

Fire Learning Network - starting in SW CO, funding through MSI to bring this to fruition; would be great to get the BLM and USFS involves; more conversations to come

Reinstalling snowtopography sites, Ian Crews will be reanalyzing photos; may have data to discuss this fall

Next steps: dive into after-action review and report; Danny will put together a draft w/ CC to bring before the group