

2-3-2 Cohesive Strategy Partnership

September Meeting, Wednesday, September 12, 2018

Location: Meeting in Pagosa Springs: Fire Station #1, 189 N Pagosa Blvd, Pagosa Springs CO 81147

Time: 10 am – 3 pm

ACTION ITEMS:

- Opportunities w/ Matt Tuten for continued “silviculture” learning
 - Jim White on the tour for San Juan cutthroat (Pauline)
 - Asks: “if x then y”
 - Looking at stops, working with relevant partners to develop specific talking points/asks
 - Practice run for Transboundary Meeting – Turkey Springs & Wolf Creek
 - Invite other folks who can offer feedback
 - Solicit additional input on asks via email
 - Re-circulate Mission/Vision/Accomplishments
 - Include updated partners
 - Shwag?
 - Coozies
 - i.e. “lick wildfire”
 - Start thinking now about future funding (i.e., Joint Chief’s a year or more in advance)
 - TRAM action: Norm & Anthony re: monitoring
 - Post PODS presentation from Mike Caggiano on the website
 - TRAM to meet re: PODS & 2-3-2 (Garrett, Aaron, Anthony, Matt, Mike C & Collin)
 - Help clarify which wildlife and what the concerns are more specifically
 - Opportunity to work with Fireshed on monitoring (Fireshed using drones)
 - Pre-NEPA, mapping, prioritization, monitoring
 - Request for emphasis on connectivity vs. corridors
- Re: define committees
- Fire management to take on “post-fire” and fire on private lands
- Executive Committee call re: future of the 2-3-2
 - Talking points to Page
 - Circulate checklist from Andrea
 - Nov. 9 = San Juan Chama Membership meeting in TA

I. Welcome and Introductions

- a. Andrea Jones, Conejos Peak Ranger District, Rio Grande NF
- b. Page Buono, Mountain Studies Institute
- c. Garrett Hanks, Trout Unlimited
- d. Anthony Madrid, San Juan National Forest
- e. Anne Bradley, Nature Conservancy NM
- f. Matt Cook, Mountain Studies Institute
- g. Jeremy Bailey, Nature Conservancy CO – Fire Learning Network
- h. Emily Hohman, Chama Peak Land Alliance
- i. Kevin Khung, District Ranger Pagosa SJNF
- j. Ellen Drew – Mora Wood Products Cooperative
- k. Caitlin Barbour – Americorp VISTA – Chama Peak Land Alliance

- l. Adam Moore – CSFS Alamosa Field Office
- m. Mike Caggiano – Colorado Forest Restoration Institute
- n. Mark Loveall – CSFS Durango
- o. Mellissa Simmons – CSFS Durango
- p. Mary Stuever – New Mexico State Forestry, Chama District
- q. Laurel Smerch - Unaffiliated
- r. Randy Johnson – Private Consultant CSFS
- s. Jeremy Marshall – Tres Piedras, Carson National Forest
- t. John Waconda – USFS Restoration Partnership Coordinator, SW region 3
- u. Sid Hall – Rio Grande National Forest
- v. Colin Haffey - Nature Conservancy NM
- w. Pauline Ellis – SJNF (ret)
- x. Bill Trimarco – Firewise Southwest CO
- y. Anthony Culpepper – Mountain Studies Institute
- z. Matt Tuten – SJNF Pagosa Ranger District
- aa. Aaron Kimple – Mountain Studies Institute

II. **Fire and TREX Updates –**

a. **TREX – Emily Hohman**

- i. Supposed to start in early Sept and run for two weeks
- ii. Postponed – low enrollment due to fire activity nationally
 - 1. Not cancelled, will be rescheduled to Fall or Spring 2019
 - 2. Shifted towards a cooperative burn effort with SJNF – Pagosa and Columbine districts
 - a. Saul’s Creek and Yellow Jacket Rx fire
 - 3. This shift in plans was made possible through the agreements of TREX. Agreements built gives lots of flexibility – valid through Nov 2019

b. Mike Caggiano

- i. USFS very operationally focused, TREX gives opportunity for participants to be exposed to a broad spectrum training materials
- ii. Hoping to engage in more field trips and training opportunities for 2019 TREX

c. Jeremy Bailey

- i. Insurance requirements can create barriers for TREX events.
- ii. Lower level FF (FEMO and volunteer firefighters) insurance requirements being adjusted nationwide
- iii. In the past TREX has been pigeonholed to hire individuals from larger organizations as they were better able to meet the insurance requirements

d. Matt Tuten

- i. TREX allows for good dialogue between different divisions in the SJNF. As folks often get shoehorned in there organizational divisions. Different program objectives are a barrier for collaboration within organization
- ii. Jeremy Bailey – Attending field trip with SJNF was helpful from perspective of Rx fire practitioner – talking with contractors and getting their input on costs of operations

e. **Discussion RE: Public Perception of Fire**

- i. Anthony M: Rx burn being fairly well received

- ii. Mary: people beginning to get the message about fire being good. How do we help the public understand when to embrace fire and when we don't want to encourage it on the landscape
- iii. Matt T: TRES is helping break down silos w/in forest service b/w forest silviculture & forest suppression – value of the 2-3-2, learning more about what can be done with fire, opportunities provided by TRES like gold, don't happen naturally because of different objectives w/in programs. “Forced integration” - if you have down time, let's look at and talk about more stuff
- iv. Ann B: Can we model treatments that incorporate silviculture & fire
 - 1. Aaron K: Ann's point echoed by conversation with Garrett
- v. Aaron Kimple
 - 1. Comments in the Durango Herald were mixed about the cooperative burn
- Anthony Madrid
 - Appreciates the messaging by different partners for local Rx fires.
 - Acknowledges the mixed opinions on Rx fire operations
- Mary Stuever
 - Public feedback on Rx fire/smoke. People are getting the message that fire is a necessary component but also think that large high severity fires are acceptable as well. Need figure out that messaging because not all fire is necessarily good.

III. Transboundary Meeting in October

- i. Intent is to inform and educate state delegations of the cross boundary work that is being done.
 - 1. Trying to highlight 232's different partners' work
 - 2. Various stops in CO and NM group will be split for a portion
 - ii. Open dinner for networking on 10/15 or 10/16
 - iii. 232's initiatives align with that of USFS on the national level
 - iv. Who is preparing briefings?
 - 1. Bill & Matt T. doing a bullet point briefing from this end
 - 2. Paul Orbach and Page Buono to work on briefing content and messaging
 - 3. Pauline: In the past, more intensive talking points compiled internally. Next someone is chosen to voice this messaging. Limiting the amount messaging is important – needs to be concise.
 - v. Matt T. – Suggests a practice run of the tour to make sure timing works out
 - vi. Mary S. – Any opportunities for local communities to join a future tour?
 - vii. Mike C. – Suggests to highlight the groups strengths that sets 232 apart.
- b. What's the Ask?**
- i. Consider 2-3-2 as priority landscape
 - ii. Asks depend on who is in attendance:
 - iii. Emily H – philosophically support concept of cross-boundary & the administrative agreements necessary to make it happen (i.e. partnership agreements)
 - iv. Engage in conversation about fire management and risk
 - v. Environmental outreach and education events for diverse audiences to get across the environmental sustainability message
 - vi. Objectives vs Accomplishments vs Asks

1. If we had X then we could do Y
2. Articulate what we could accomplish with the asks
- vii. Proactive funding and coordination of fire mitigation
- viii. Industry and economic incentives
- c. Andrea: important to acknowledge existing support
- d. Anthony: risk management discussion
 - i. More tolerance for taking on risk, discussions with leadership
 - ii. Here are some things to think about: (from Matt T.) that could set precedent at a larger scale
 - iii. Need capacity that isn't tied to standard boxes in an org. chart
 - iv. Creativity/out of the box thinking
- e. Ann Bradley:
 - i. May have to pull back and do some basics (fire successes, etc.)
 - ii. 416? TP stop?
 - iii. Discovery within 2-3-2, funding mechanisms or lack there-of,
 - iv. BAER team for private lands?
- f. Anthony:
 - i. We can talk about the partnerships, but what can we show and what are our next steps?
- g. Mary S:
 - i. Unfunded, regional issues (i.e., developing biomass)
 1. Efforts have been isolated, but if we're going to be effective, need the resources to expand across the region
 - ii. Complicated public information
 1. Budget support for education (being in the schools, events, way to target residents, downstream users, etc.)
 2. Need a stronger pillar of development for outreach and education efforts
 - iii. Challenge of post-fire impacts on private lands
 1. No clear authority
- h. Adam M:
 - i. If we had more of this area established as a Joint Chiefs area, we could have more support for work here
- i. Ellen D (Mora):
 - i. Reallocation of funding priorities (re: mitigation vs. suppression)
 - ii. Importance of distinguishing b/w large and small industry, rural America
 - iii. Opportunities for local communities (cultural, historical), people already engaged in it
- j. John W.:
 - i. Have industry conversation at the mill
 1. Include economic recovery/development incentives
 2. Related to jobs, employment, insurance, etc.
 3. Business development
 - ii. Matt T – have that theme across multiple sites
 1. Turkey Springs + Wolf Creek + ?
 - iii. Push local collaborative groups to challenge USFS to come up with more creative ideas
 - iv. SW CO highlights potential impacts of climate change/drought
- k. Mike:
 - i. Play up regional successes and play to strengths that set this region apart
 - ii. Menu options: i.e., here's the problem, here's the ask that include no-cost options
- l. Randy Johnson:

- i. Emphasis on economic impacts of the fires
- ii. Who is calculating that on the 416?
- iii. Forest products loan program

IV. COMMITTEE REPORT OUTS

- a. Executive Committee:
 - i. 1-pager
 - ii. Mission/Vision/Accomplishments
 - iii. Problems with fire on public/private land
- b. Biomass & Markets
 - i. Bill update: working with “Good Wood” for cross-boundary branding (Rachel)
 - ii. Currently grant funded, grant running out
 - iii. *For tour: biomass is vital part of any treatment/resiliency work*
 - iv. Randy:
 - 1. Marcus Kaufman, biomass handbook guy, the book is online
 - a. He’d like to do a modeling program (small community mill?)
 - b. Would do a test market with the handbook
 - c. Does anyone have a good project?
 - d. Forest products loan program
 - 2. Proposed biomass meeting in Durango
- c. Funding & Support
 - i. Joint Chiefs?
 - 1. Need NRCS at the table + others
 - 2. Extremely competitive
 - ii. Future funding of 2-3-2
 - iii. Goal of bringing Andrea & Jeremy together
 - 1. Concerns: is already \$\$ for some of the private land work
 - 2. How do we effectively use that?
 - iv. Matt T: trying to pull off a proposal across state & lands cumbersome
 - 1. Can promote partnerships within the proposals
- d. Fire Management
 - i. MOU meeting, barriers
 - ii. Success on Rx burn: Yellow Jacket = Rio Grande, Carson, San Juan, SCC, BLM, State of CO, Chama Peak, NSF, Michigan State, National Park Service, and US F & W – 2-3-2 accomplishment, discussion of shared resources
- e. TRAM & Wildlife
 - i. Pre-NEPA scoping piece
 - ii. Reached out to Santa Fe Fireshed
 - 1. They’ve developed one that runs in tandem with current draft
 - 2. Opportunity to learn from their efforts
 - iii. When discussing work on ground, can we include all the appropriate components
 - 1. What are the components?
 - 2. Process proposals in the context of all components
 - a. i.e., wet meadows
 - b. riparian areas
- f. SJNF for starting to look at resource concerns into traditional veg management NEPA actions (Garrett)
- g. Wildlife connectivity – increased pace & scale
 - i. Could be a success or a hurdle moving forward

- h. RCPP needs help with monitoring
- i. Region III: Riparian & ? Ecosystem Strategy (John W.)
 - i. Latest science, best practices, priorities
 - ii. Elevate riparian attention-
 - 1. Programmatic NEPA – in the midst of Forest Plan Revision
 - 2. Documented strategy and approach to be used as a model for other locations
 - 3. Create efficiencies and consistencies

V. LUNCH

VI. PODS – Fire Planning Presentation

- a. Spatial Fire Planning and Potential Operational Delineations (PODS)
 - i. New take on an old concept
- b. Big picture
 - i. Provides a risk based approach for managing fire – ecological and suppression
 - ii. Support system
 - iii. There are gaps in existing decision spatial planning support tools
 - iv. Simplifies complex management decisions
- c. This model provides potential control locations
 - i. Fuel breaks, burn scars, roads, rivers
 - ii. Scale from a couple hundred to 10,000's of acres – highly variable
 - 1. Small pods adjacent to WUI, large pods in wilderness areas, etc
- d. Models the fire effects and behavior in each POD
- e. Utilizes local fire expertise with risk assessment and spatial analyst
- f. Provides a decision support system
 - i. Framework for summarizing all available information
- g. Potential for advanced safety for fire and emergency response
- h. Calibrating Energy Release Component to use as a tool to determine whether manage fire or suppress
- i. **Questions/Discussion**
 - i. Jeremy Bailey – Can we integrate private land or other land inholdings?
 - 1. Yes, these efforts are cross boundary – potential conflict in decision making for different land managers
 - ii. Emily – How is this information kept up to date?
 - 1. Updates will be required, most potential control locations should stay fairly static. WUI layers will be changing, Every fire will change veg conditions.
 - iii. Collin Haffey – Opportunity for a communication tool. Gets at the intersection for building local capacity for local fire mgmt, intra-agency communication.
 - iv. Adam Moore – incorporate this process in CWPP
 - 1. Same values that go in risk assessment for pods align with CWPP
 - v. Emily – Bringing this back to the 232. Encourages bringing this effort across the landscape of 232.
 - vi. Important tool for when Type I & II teams arrive
 - vii. Acts as a communication tool to the public
 - viii. Intersection of what collaborative groups are dealing with
 - 1. Building local capacity

- 2. Breaking down silo walls/intra agency communication
- 3. Incorporate post-planning into the burn
- j. Furthers CWPP process
- k. Bringing it back to the 2-3-2
- l. Emily – that information is critical for MOU
 - i. Cross-cuts jurisdictions
- m. Don't update to erase the history – include it!

VII. Future of 232

- a. Post fire role of 232
 - i. Anne- pilot a program to include post fire impacts in community hazard plans and CWPP's – 16 & 17 of October.

VIII. Future of the 2-3-2 – 30 min

- a. Post fire role of 232
 - i. Anne- pilot a program to include post fire impacts in community hazard plans and cwpp's – 16 & 17 of October.
 - 1. Would like to integrate post fire risk for flood and debris flow into WFDs?
- b. Planning efforts
 - i. PODS? Next steps?
 - 1. Mike – in the past workshops have been held as an initial step with NF fire staff and partners
 - 2. Small group of us get together and make sure we have approval from appropriate decision makers. TRAM committee?
 - a. Anne – concerned about wildlife corridors and more wildlife priority definitions are needed within the committee
 - b. Colin – RGWF could learn from 232. Drone program for effectiveness monitoring.
 - i. Learning exchange necessary? TRAM.
 - c. Andrea – use connectivity rather than corridor language in TRAM
 - ii. Adam – “After the flames” - post wildfire workshop – Coalitions and Collaboratives. Details TBD
 - iii. Post fire impact response – lump it into fire management committee?
 - 1. Mary – likes the idea of a subgroup within existing committee
 - iv. Ann B & John W.: Working with BIA, Fire quals,
 - 1. More tribal engagement
 - 2. TREX/ prescribed fire as an “in”
 - v. Tribes & BLM major missing components
 - 1. To achieve truly multi-jurisdictional
 - vi. Report outs from local watershed groups
 - 1. More time in the agenda for local watershed groups
 - vii. Capacity and staffing for the 2-3-2, funding to support existing + new shared staff?
 - 1. Emily – funding and capacity for future of 232. Aaron – can we share capacities with partners? Emily – If we had someone to focus on MOU it get done much more quickly.

II. Project Updates Round Robin

- a. San Juan Headwaters
 - i. Mapping work on the ground

- ii. Moving into evaluation process
 - iii. Annual evaluation process
 - iv. Rx Fire
 - v. CAFA grant on the Headwaters
- b. 2-3-2
 - i. Utilizing work of NMWFRI to map 2-3-2 (opportunity mapping)
- c. Jeremy Bailey
 - i. All Hands, All Lands agreement with three forests in NM
 - ii. CFRP will support it, stood up by Rio Grande Water Fund
 - 1. Support staff on the Alamosa Rx Burn
- d. Andrea
 - i. Hoping for a burn window on a cross-boundary fuels project
 - 1. Rio Grande & Carson
 - ii. Analysis for district-wide salvage
 - 1. Moving forward to treat up to 14,000 acres (of 170,000 dead spruce)
 - 2. Has a method for easily having new projects being approved and move forward (checklist)
 - 3. Online (and input period)
- e. Collin
 - i. Through Rio Grande Water Fund, Mule Deer foundation doing 500k of thinning
- f. John W. Region III
 - i. Entertaining larger stewardship contract /cost share agreements
 - 1. NFF, WTF
- g. Mary S.
- h. building ecological site descriptions

Outcomes:

- Any Updates and coordination for recent fires
- Rx Fire initiatives in the region
- Planning for legislative tour
- Deliverables for Tour
- Asks for Tour Attendees
- Learn about PODS efforts
- Goals for the future of the 2-3-2