



**DWC Stakeholder Meeting Wednesday, May 8, 2024, 1:30-3:30pm -
MEETING NOTES**

In person: Dolores Water Conservancy District – [60 Cactus St., Cortez, CO 81321](#)

Time Topic
1:30-1:40 **Introductions, check-ins, meeting agreements**

Attendees: Justin Pitts, Robert Meyer, Danny Margoles, Nick Mustoe, David Casey, Travis Bruch, Derrick Padilla, Steve Garchar, Ken Curtis, Wade Bentley, Logan Davis, Anthony Culpepper, Nina Williams, Emma Reineman, Duncan Rose, Bruce Short, Emily Lockard, Julia Ledford, Kyle Hanson, Ryan Cox, Mark Pearson, Andrew Slack

1:40-1:45 **Approve/amend agenda**
- No changes

1:45-2:00 **DWC Collaborative Decision Making Process** – Review Salter AAR recommendations (see table) and some decision-making frameworks. Decide on process to affirm decision-making process

Collaborative process recommendations to be conducted in Winter/Spring 2024		
Topic	Recommended action	Notes
Decision making	DWRF will develop a formal decision making process. This will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How consensus-based decisions are made • How dissenting views are recorded • Process for adding decision-making to agendas • How decisions are tracked • How decisions are publicly shared. 	Examples of decision making frameworks can be seen here The decision making process used by CFLRP can be viewed here .

- Collaborative decision-making aimed at consensus: Everyone holds some of the truth-no one holds all of the truth
- Five finger vote system: 3-5 I can live with to I think it's great, 1-2 I can't live with it
- 80/20: 100% of the people are 80% on board
- 4 Levels of Agreement
- Input on how folks would like to proceed: Ken supports 4 Level concept, Robert asked if consistency with CFLRP (5 finger vote) would make sense. Steve Garchar suggests Robert's Rules of order.
- Keeping in mind that in conversations regarding Salter not everyone spoke up about concerns
- Derrick: was well aware of SJCA concerns, but had made it clear that diameter cap changes were not on the table. No one pushed back against that saying they couldn't live with it.
- Decision-making process should ideally surface disagreements. Voting might have brought out within the group that folks weren't okay with it. There were

- different levels of understanding within the group
- Bruce: We didn't have a good way of documenting recommendations for Salter. Not just environmental analysis recommendations, but also comments on desired conditions
- Kyle: Not try to overrun Collaborative with too much formality. What decisions need to trigger formal decision-making and recording? Keep going back to idea of number of people or entities touched by a position. Did DWC do a position paper of where we stood? No, there was no formal process.
- Bruce: We were trying to be informal while also allowing people to express their opinions. We weren't formal enough in the process and thus thought everyone was okay with where things stood. We were surprised by key stakeholders not being able to live with decisions who never voiced their opinions
- Do we feel this decision needs to be fleshed out more or can we make a decision today?
- Danny: We can choose one and start fleshing it out
- **Agreement/Decision to adopting 4 Level of Agreement decision-making process**
 - 4 - All in, I support this
 - 3 - I have reservations, but I can live it
 - 2- Don't agree, but support group moving forward
 - 1- Don't agree and **do not** support moving forward
- **Duncan (3 finger vote on decision-making process): Who will do all of this and write it all up? 3 fingers out of concern about capacity issues**
- Danny: Flesh out a process for a formal vote: who votes and what elevates something to requiring collaborative vote

2:00-2:20 **Updates - Discussed at end of meeting to allow time for Anthony's presentation**

- **CFLRP:**
 - DWC representative on the CFLRP Council - Danny's term up in June - will select the next rep at June Stakeholder meeting.
 - Next steps on recommendations to San Juan NF
 - Full Stakeholder Meeting June 11th Durango
- **May 9th, P and D hearing for Bio Char, starts at 7**
- **Forest Health Workshop Field tour: July 12-13, 2024** July 13th will be classroom workshop, July 12th will be tour in Lone Pine area. Hosted by SJNF and GMUG forest health folks
- **New COSWAP Proposal** - DWC supporting submission by MCD to continue private lands thinning, D-space and Rx fire on private lands
- **Landowner Fire Preparedness Bootcamp May 18** - Jackson Lake Area
- **Forest Water Mtg** - DWC convened meetings to explore relationship between forest management and water cycle - partners working on goals and scope for additional monitoring and modeling for our watersheds
- **TU Grant** - received \$100K from CWCB for stream improvements in the lower reach of the West Fork of the Dolores.
- **DWC Program Asst.** Nina and Emily working on job description and budget

2:20-3:30 **Presentation by Anthony Culpepper of Mountain Studies Institute: 2023 Salter Landscape Monitoring: A Review of House Creek Pre-Treatment Conditions.** Followed by discussion and Q and A

- Context & Background: Ongoing environmental assessment engagement
 - Lone Pine (2020) & Salter (2022)

- Salter Monitoring begun in 2023
- MSI is putting together fact sheets for both Lone Pine and Slater landscapes, will send those out to the collaborative soon
- For 2024-Working with David to understand when and where MSI should be monitoring vs when folks are out there doing work on the ground. Don't want to collect data when a sale may sit for several years before treatment occurs. Also safety issues with crews being out during active logging
- Salter monitoring Presentation (for 2023 pre-treatment data)
 - Working with David and Emma to ensure data can be accessed by anyone who wants it
 - Additions to Salter Protocol included tree cores (up to 3 different trees per plot to reduce bias) and large tree qualitative metrics
 - Limited core data unusable due to cores not being on center, will be working on improving core sampling training
 - Adapted characteristics from Ponderosa General Tech Report (GTR) crown shape, live crown ratio, trunk shape, and bark for trees greater than 16 inches. The higher the score, the more old growth characteristics. Doing this for every tree on plot above 16 inches.
 - Banquet Unit Control and Plot Establishment: Control blocks were selected where treatments will not occur
 - House Creek IRSC: Similar process as above, control blocks were established for monitoring changes over time
 - Resilience metrics: 15 metrics developed by a DWC subgroup see: [Ponderosa Pine Ecosystem Resilience Metrics and Desired Conditions](#)
 - (refer to slide to see metrics)
 - Primarily focusing on these metrics:
 - **Noxious and Invasives:** reduced occurrence of listed species, especially post treatment
 - *Bromus tectorum* (cheatgrass) documented in House Ck
 - *cheatgrass was also documented in Lone Pine
 - **Tree Density and Basal Area:** Complex mosaic of tree density and basal area to promote resilience. Higher densities in areas that are more productive and lower densities in less productive sites.
 - Most plots are in 80-120 basal area range
 - Higher basal area - Higher vulnerability to round head beetle infestation.
 - 25-27 DBH called out in EA - can only be cut if bark beetles or mistletoe is present. Greater than 27 is no cut.
 - **Tree Sizes:** A wide range of DBH classes that promotes ecological resilience
 - Heterogeneity in a landscape
 - Diameter distribution map shows bell curve (highest populations of median diameter caps reflects history of extensive logging)
 - Post-treatments will show a reduction in 12-20 in dbh class: long term you want to see more seedlings and more large trees
 - **Tree ages:** Increased old growth
 - Very few >27 dbh in landscape
 - **Snags:** Complex mosaic of snags
 - >1 snag per acre to maximize habitat
 - **Insects and Disease:**
 - Monitoring documents insect and disease presence (dead,

- pitch tubes, green)
- Low prevalence of beetles, relatively few snags (this is just a snapshot of one area and one landscape)
- Would this data lean toward increasing snag retention? not necessarily due to bark beetle activity. Plots are not representative of how many snags are on the landscape.
- **Plan for 2024**
 - Once data storage system is established/improved, anyone can request the monitoring info from Nina and she can share
 - Experimenting with tablet data collection again, but have had issues with clunkiness that isn't present with paper datasets
 - Priorities for monitoring: Boggy Draw, Banquet, Bradfield
 - Interests in establishing current conditions monitoring on Haycamp (old-growth recruitment) - *Not in Salter EA*
 - 3D Mapping of snowpack and forest health (UAS)
- **Questions:**
 - Duncan: With respect to the difference overall current stand states and desired conditions is there any expectation to do root cause analysis? (say we see a negative trend in beetle mortality, what is the management action to be done to address that concern)
 - That is a difficult question because of variability. Basal area map example - you want to see a variety of "colors" across the map, if we see a high rate of one color, USFS knows their mark was off and needs to revisit marking protocol
 - Duncan: The more we reduce understory, are we reducing soil moisture enough that it affects recruitment?
 - We are not collecting soil moisture data. That is a gap in our monitoring, but snowtopography monitoring should feed back into this.
 - If you are getting cones and no seedlings, perhaps we are reducing basal area down too much. MSI is tracking cones.
 - Duncan: Do we understand the implications of opening tree canopies, reducing soil moisture, and how it relates to warming climate?
 - This is a focus of the forest-water working group
 - 1 plot per 15 or 20 acres for sampling data
 - Long term monitoring is occurring, monumenting plots with rebar, but those can get pulled up
 - Travis: Common Stand Exams are poor at collecting age class data because they only core the first tree on the plot. USFS is working with MSI on collecting more coring data. Age does not necessarily correlate to tree size.
 - Nina: Interesting dynamic between pine seedlings needing bare ground for germination vs keeping soils covered for soil health.
 - David: Focus on interspace, 20ft space between clumps is where we see most regeneration
 - Anthony: Plots show high amounts of litter/duff and shrub



ground cover. Treatment would open up more bare ground (bare mineral soil)

- MSI is not capturing 1000 hours fuels (logs)
- Bruce: On Duncan's concerns, research paper looking at treatments impact on stream flow in - openings increased snowpack as long as they weren't so large to allow wind scour. Not much research has been done in SW CO ponderosa forest.
- Longer term watershed research has been done around Flagstaff
- Incorporate some soil moisture probes in monitoring sites. Need funding source to support that outside of USFS
- Robert on snowtopography: Can we do a QR sticker at site to inform folks about research?
 - Connect Robert with Jake Kurzwil

3:30 **Next steps and adjourn**

PARKING LOT (Future agenda items) : Field Trips, Continue on w AAR recommendations



Nina Williams is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting.

Topic: DWRF Stakeholder Monthly Meeting

Time: May 8, 2024 01:30 PM Mountain Time (US and Canada)

May 8, 2024 01:30 PM

Jun 5, 2024 01:30 PM

Jul 3, 2024 01:30 PM

Aug 7, 2024 01:30 PM

Sep 4, 2024 01:30 PM

Oct 2, 2024 01:30 PM

Nov 6, 2024 01:30 PM

Dec 4, 2024 01:30 PM

Please download and import the following iCalendar (.ics) files to your calendar system.

Monthly:

<https://us02web.zoom.us/meeting/tZUvdumspzktEtDWA13j2r7hIMlUtZ-Zwg3N/ics?icsToken=98tyKuGprDoqHt2XtxGDRpwcAlj4c-jxmHpaj7d5qz60UCoBcFT-Os9OB6ZFXeLH>

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/81210492784?pwd=OHo3dUM1bVoyWFJZY0lKdnJtYmRpQT09>

Meeting ID: 812 1049 2784

Passcode: 382458

One tap mobile

+17193594580,,81210492784# US

+12532158782,,81210492784# US (Tacoma)

Dial by your location

• +1 719 359 4580 US

• +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma)

• +1 346 248 7799 US (Houston)

• +1 669 444 9171 US

• +1 669 900 9128 US (San Jose)

• +1 253 205 0468 US

• +1 646 558 8656 US (New York)

• +1 646 931 3860 US

• +1 689 278 1000 US

• +1 301 715 8592 US (Washington DC)

• +1 305 224 1968 US

• +1 309 205 3325 US

• +1 312 626 6799 US (Chicago)

• +1 360 209 5623 US

• +1 386 347 5053 US

• +1 507 473 4847 US

• +1 564 217 2000 US

Meeting ID: 812 1049 2784

Find your local number: <https://us02web.zoom.us/u/kdt4HUqrAd>