Full Partnership Meeting

Where: Chama Senior Center, 2449 US HWY 84/64, Chama, NM and Zoom
When: Wednesday, August 9th, 2023
Time: 8:45 am – 12:30 pm

<u>PAGE & CONTENTS OVERVIEW</u> (Navigate using hyperlinks or PDF Bookmarks)

In attendance (in person):

1. Dana Guinn, *Forest Stewards Guild*
2. Eytan Krasilovsky, *Forest Stewards Guild*
3. Esme Cadiente, *Forest Stewards Guild*
4. Cody Dems, *Forest Stewards Guild*
5. Gabe Kohler, *Forest Stewards Guild*
6. Collin McElroy, *Forest Stewards Guild*
7. Brian LaRoche, *Forest Stewards Guild*
8. Julia Ledford, *Mountain Studies Institute*
9. Alex Handloff, *Mountain Studies Institute*
10. Melissa May, *Mountain Studies Institute*
11. Mary Hoffman, *Adams State University*
12. Caleb Stotts, *Chama Peak Land Alliance*
13. Sage Faulkner, *Chama Peak Land Alliance*
14. Jared Daniels, *Chama Valley Chamber of Commerce*
15. Bede Bissonnette, *Christ in the Desert Monastery*
16. Alan Hook, *City of Santa Fe Water*
17. Erik Skeie, *Colorado Water Conservation Board*
18. Cassie Rodrique, *Environmental Defense Fund*
19. Chloe Schneider, *Environmental Defense Fund*
20. Victoria, *filmmaker*
21. Luis Torres, *High Country News and Defenders of Wildlife*
22. Kyle Tator, *Jicarilla Apache Game and Fish*
23. Mayor Ernest Vigil, *Chama*
24. Brock Lorenzen, *New Mexico Department of Game and Fish*
25. Carrie Parris, *New Mexico Department of Game and Fish*

26. Crystal Medina, *New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute*
27. Eleanor Ludwig, *New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute*
28. Michael Roberto, *New Mexico Forest and Watershed Restoration Institute*
29. Erin McElroy, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
30. Joe Carrillo, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
31. Lindsey Quam, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
32. Mary Stuever, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
33. Michael Andersen, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
34. Rahcel Foe, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
35. George Ducker, *New Mexico Forestry Department*
36. Martha Graham, *New Mexico Rural Water Association*
37. Garth Reader, *North Star Ranch New Mexico*
38. Lisa Reader, *North Star Ranch New Mexico*
39. John Ussery, *Northern New Mexico College*
40. Kathy McKim, *Pheasants Forever*
41. Chuck Holbert, *Rocky Mountain Youth Corps*
42. Dwayne LeftHand, *Rocky Mountain Youth Corps*
43. Jude Ansulu, *Rocky Mountain Youth Corps*
44. Rob Hagberg, *San Juan Water Conservancy District*
45. Glen Miller, *SEED Canada*
46. JR Logan, *Taos County*
47. David Hernandez, *The Nature Conservancy*
48. John Waconda, *The Nature Conservancy*
49. Melissa McLamb, *The Nature Conservancy*
50. Michael Martinez, *Trees Water People*
51. Garrett Hanks, *Trout Unlimited*
52. Shawn Kelley, *USFS*
53. Rob Lawler, *USFS – Carson*
54. Zig Napkora, *USFS – Carson*
55. Laura Moser, *USFS – Region 3*
56. Jeremy Marshall, *USFS – Rio Chama CFLRP*
57. Steven Del Favero, *USFS – Rio Chama CFLRP*
58. Andrea Jones, *USFS – Rio Grande*
59. Michael Tooley, *USFS – Rio Grande*
60. Adam Tlachac, *USFS – San Juan*
61. Brandy Richardson, *USFS – San Juan*
62. Jessica Lloyd, *USFS – Santa Fe*
63. Steve Romero, *USFS – Santa Fe*
64. Preseton Keres, *USFS – Washington Office*
65. Ellis Margolis, *USGS*
66. Bill Trimarco, *Wildfire Adapted Partnership*
67. Carolyn O'Connor
68. Deborah Ortiz
69. Ed MacKerrow
70. Jessica Johnston
71. Mary Ann DeBoer
72. Sandy Southwell
73. Sarah Potter

74. Dan Rioux

In attendance (virtual):
75. Lexi Hersh, *Bureau of Land Management*
76. Connie Maxwell, *New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute*
77. Nick Olson, *National Forest Foundation*
78. Ian Hopkins, *National Wild Turkey Federation/Natural Resources Conservation Service*
79. Kyle O'Neill, *Natural Resources Conservation Service*
80. Jennifer Sanchez, *Representative Leger Fernandez*
81. Daniel Denipah, *Santa Clara Pueblo*
82. Lt. Governor James Naranjo, *Santa Clara Pueblo*
83. Claire Catlett, *Trout Unlimited*
84. Andy Graves, *USDA*
85. Laura Moser, *USFS*
86. Donald Gonzales
87. Maceo Carrillo Martinet
88. Patrick Moore
89. Brett Miller

MEETING NOTES

Welcome and introductions
- Meeting objectives
    - Learn about and discuss the interplay of fire and human history in the Chama, NM area.
    - Consider landscape connectivity related to wildlife migration, landscape disturbances and watersheds.
    - Understand different management jurisdictions, the opportunities they present, and the tools available to meet management objectives.
    - Learn how to get involved with the 2-3-2 Partnership.
    - Build relationships and identify opportunities to work together towards common community and landscape goals.
- 2-3-2 engagement and consensus
    - We will use consensus-based decision making to ensure that any decision the group comes to is actively supported, or at least a decision everyone can live with.
        - Show respect for the personal integrity and values of all participants, in and outside of meetings.
        - Be hard on issues, but not on people; offer critique of ideas, not humans.
        - We can't address issues if we aren't aware of them. The 2-3-2 Partnership will provide multiple avenues (communications channels) for issues to be raised.
        - Regard disagreements as problems to be solved, rather than as battles to be won.
        - Stay solution-oriented: follow statements of disagreement with suggested alternatives.
        - Commit to search for opportunities and alternatives: the creativity of the group will often lead to the best solution.
        - Listen with an open mind.
        - Reflect: consider how our ideas may impact others.

- When considering blocking decisions, to discern if the resulting actions would be something that can be lived with despite some aspects being disagreeable and to also only block when very foundational principles for the Collaborative's work would be compromised.
  - o When it comes to meetings, we will:
    - Abide by the Basic Rules of Collaboration (above).
    - Come to meetings prepared and on time.
    - Refrain from side conversations during the meeting.
    - Voice your concerns during meetings and take the time to resolve those concerns.
    - Monitor your participation and limit or expand your contributions as appropriate, no lectures.
    - Seek consensus by seeking solutions that meet the needs of all participants and recognize it may not always be possible.
    - Respect the role of the facilitator or coordinator and their commitment to a fair, effective process, which will include encouraging compliance with ground rules, serving as a confidential channel of communication for members and observers, and remaining neutral with respect to the outcome of the deliberations.
- Introduction to the 2-3-2 Partnership and Rio Chama CFLRP
  - o Landscape context
    - We are learning about, discussing, planning, carrying out and monitoring work in ecologically, topographically, culturally, socially, and historically diverse landscapes.
    - Consider how to find compromise and shared values that lead to successes as we define them.
    - Identify and highlight windows of opportunity to work together in real time.
    - Where can we agree on why, how, and when to take action and on the kinds of actions to take?
    - Learn from one another and open the door for future conversations.
  - o Structure of the 2-3-2
    - The 2-3-2 is a network, not a hierarchy.
    - The goal is to emerge as something greater than the sum of its parts.
    - If it seems confusing, that's because it is confusing!
  - o Rio Chama CFLRP (Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program)
    - The CFLRP is a funding program through the U.S. Forest Service.
    - The Rio Chama CFLRP is the largest project of the 2-3-2.
    - This project is built on years of collaboration in this landscape.
    - The project was awarded funding last year for $30 million to be used over the course of 10 years.

Fire and Human History in Northern NM
Ellis Margolis, USGS Research Ecologist and George Ducker, NM State Forestry Communications
- Fire history of the Edward Sargent Wildlife Management Area, Chama, New Mexico
  - o Objective: use tree rings to understand the history of fire and Gambel oak age structure at two forest-grassland ecotone sites to inform fire management.
  - o Study area:
    - Ed Sargent Wildlife Management Area (ESWMA)
    - 2 sites, 5 km apart

- Chamita Creek (CHM) is near the town of Chama and the Chama River.
- Nabor Creek (NAB) is more remote, 5 kilometers northwest of CHM.
  - Tree-ring fire scars and oak ages were observed at both sites.
- Methods:
  - Cross-sections of trees are analyzed to determine the age of the tree and to observe scars from fires that burned but did not kill the tree.
    - The trees were usually dead before Ellis and his team cut cross-sections.
    - Fields littered with old tree stumps are a characteristic of the landscape surrounding Chama. This is a result of historical logging, where forests didn't regenerate. Cross-sections were often taken from these stumps.
    - Dendrochronology was used to date the occurrence of fires that impacted these trees.
  - The largest Gambel oak stems were also sampled at each site to determine their age.
- Results:
  - Nabor Creek
    - Ponderosa pine trees survived a lot of fires between 1700 and 1900.
    - The oldest oak trees line up with the last fire observed in the Ponderosa.
    - Oak really began to regenerate in the mid-1900s.
    - Tree ring and fire history statistics:
      - The oldest tree measured started growing in 1589.
      - The first fire observed was in 1679.
      - The last fire scar is dated 1864.
      - There were 18 fires between 1589 and 1864.
      - On average, fires burned this area every 10.9 years.
  - Chamita Creek
    - Ponderosa pine trees survived a lot of fires between 1650 and 1800.
    - Gambel oak is younger than individuals at the Nabor Creek site. Nothing observed before the late-1800s.
    - Also saw lots of oak regeneration starting in the mid-1900s.
    - Tree ring and fire history statistics:
      - The oldest tree measured started growing in 1555.
      - The first fire observed was in 1652.
      - The last fire scare is dated 1830.
      - There were 15 fires between 1555 and 1830.
      - On average, fires burned this area every 12.7 years.
  - Timing of fires:
    - Most fires occurred in early May, when trees were still dormant.
    - There weren't many fires in the late-summer of fall because monsoons usually put the fires out.
  - Composite fire histories show multiple decreases in fire through time.
    - 1685-1707
      - The Pueblo Revolt occurred during this time.
      - It's possible that when settlers left their sheep because of the revolts, the Utes took over and continued grazing them. This would have reduced fuels available for wildfire.
    - ~1750

- o After 1750, there was very little fire at the Chamita Creek site (near present-day Chama).
- o The treaty between the Utes and Spanish (1752) improved grazing conditions because there was less hostility in the area.
- o Prior to 1700, fires were burning synchronously at both sites. Sheep were more than likely grazing more heavily at the near site after that.
- o Summary:
  - Fire historically burned frequently at both sites (10-12 year mean fire interval; 2 year minimum).
  - Fire season was late spring/early summer.
  - Fires historically spread between sites.
  - Fires likely spread historically through the Chama drainage, and match up with fire years in southern Colorado.
  - Fire has been absent for 160-190 years.
  - The oldest oak date to the last fire at the remote side (1860s), and to the mid-1900s at the near site.
- The intersection of fire and human history in northern New Mexico
  - o How could human history be related to gaps in fire occurrence on this landscape?
  - o The Ute, Navajo and Apache grazed sheep and goats as far north as what is now the ESWMA.
  - o In 1598, the Spanish conquistador, Juan de Oñate, brought sheep, goats, horses, and cattle from Mexico.
    - It's possible that he brought as many as 5,000 sheep.
  - o In 1610, Santa Fe was established, bringing an expansion of Spanish settlers up through the Rio Grande, closer to the Chama area.
  - o The Pueblo Revolt of 1680 drove Spanish settlers all the way to El Paso.
    - In 1681, the Spanish sent a recon group to the modern-day Chama area, where they found sheep grazing around the Pueblos, indicating that native people took over the herds and continued grazing after settlers retreated.
  - o In 1696, the Spanish reclaimed the area and the Spanish Governor, Diego de Vargas, established Via Santa Cruz.
    - Vargas brought thousands of sheep, a variety that were much heartier than the sheep that already grazed in the area and could go days without food or water.
  - o The expansion of Spanish settlement continued through the mid-1700s and the Chama area slowly began to develop.
    - There was lots of conflict outside of existing settlements, which led the Spanish settlers to retreat to Santa Cruz in the 1740s. Abiquiu was abandoned at this time.
  - o In 1752, the Spanish established a trade treaty with the Utes and Abiquiu was resettles by 1754, becoming a stronghold in the area.
    - Abiquiu was the farthest north Spanish settlement.
    - As settlers began moving farther north, they had to pass through Abiquiu.
    - The Governor didn't want any more structures to be built, so when settlers from Abiquiu started grazing their sheep to the north, they were doing so at the risk of their own lives.
  - o The Tierra Amarilla Land Grant was established in 1832.

- o In 1859, gold was discovered in the San Juan Mountains and people began flocking to the area.
- o Conflict between tribes and the US was elevated in the 1860s with the US Policy of Indian Removal and the Civil War.
- o In 1880, the Denver and Rio Grande railroad arrived and Chama was established.
  - A booming railroad town.
  - An Anglo-outlaw outpost, a wild west town.
  - Sawmills started popping up.
- Research and value-based management implications
  - o Frequent low-severity prescribed or managed fire would be consistent with historical fire regimes.
  - o Humans influenced fire historically.
  - o Gambel oak structure has been altered by the lack of fire (skewed toward older, taller age/size classes).
    - Large Gambel oak are often dated to the last fire in that location.
  - o All species in the area evolved with fire.
  - o The ponderosa pine forests that were present for > 500 years were severely reduced at the lower forest border through logging. Replanting (with protection from elk) could restore a historically important part of the ecosystem that would be more adapted to climate change.
- Discussion
  - o Grazing animals were the original Smokey Bear.
    - Fire stopped burning on this landscape 80 years before the US Forest Service's fire suppression campaign of Smokey the Bear.
    - Grazing and fire both reduce fuels on the ground, including Gambel oak.
    - In the mid-1900s, grazing pressure was reduced and there was a resurgence of Gambel oak.
  - o Higher elevation forest systems don't burn as frequently, and they tend to burn at higher intensities.
    - Aspen is usually the first to grow back after these fires.
    - Spruce and fir have good seed dispersal mechanisms and regenerate successfully.
    - In the past, low severity fires would start at in the lower elevation forests and burn up into the high country during dry years.
    - Fires in this forest type are conflicting with human interests because they often have detrimental effects on watershed health and other human values.
  - o Ellis Margolis and his team have done other fire history sampling across North America.
    - The Jemez has been heavily studied and they created an area burn reconstruction.
      - The burn reconstruction found that low-severity fires were burning up to 300,000 acres at a time.
    - A similar burn reconstruction could be done in the 2-3-2 landscape if a network of sites is established.
  - o Climate data aligns with tree ring data from this study.
  - o Grazing
    - Grazing animals probably cleared vegetation all the way down to dirt.
    - Different grazers have different impacts.
      - Sheep scatter, but eventually come back.

- Horses were probably brought to this area much earlier than previously understood.
    - o Ellis Margolis' new research question is this: can we detect grazing through tree rings by measuring the change in nitrogen levels?
        - ▪ Need to find the perfect study area, which would include a fence line with trees on both sides, one side being heavily grazed and the other side having no grazing.
        - ▪ Contact Ellis Margolis if you know of a place like this.
    - o If you have more information about the human history of the Chama area, contact George Ducker.

Year	Fire history event	Human history event
1685-1707	Gap in fires at CHM and NAB	Pueblo Revolt, grazing continues
1750, 1752	Gap in fires at CHM and NAB	Spanish trade treaty with the Utes
1830, 1832	Last fire at Chamita Creek	TA Land Grant, continued grazing
1860s	Fire frequency decreasing	US Policy of Indian Removal
1864, 1865	Last fire at Nabor Creek	"Tent city" reported in Chama
Mid-1900s	Oak regeneration at CHM and NAB	Grazing pressure reduced?

Elk Migration and Corridor Connectivity
Kyle Tator, Jicarilla Apache Nation Wildlife Biologist, Department of Game and Fish
- The Jicarilla Apache Nation manages 880,000 acres of land in Northern New Mexico where the Rocky Mountains meet the Colorado River Plateau.
- Migration science
    - o Elk and mule deer migrate between their winter range and summer range at higher elevations in the South San Juans.
    - o There are various life strategies, like a spectrum of migration:
        - ▪ Resident
        - ▪ Localized nomadism
        - ▪ Facultative migrant
        - ▪ Migrant
    - o Migration is a learned life strategy.
        - ▪ Diversity in habitat promotes resilience.
        - ▪ A population's migration portfolio includes the number of routes, timing, distance, pace, habitat types, stopover sites and start and end locations.
        - ▪ Migration also promotes abundance (seasonality of ranges).
    - o Healthy habitats = healthy populations
    - o Body fat is the currency of migration. "Winter weakens, spring kills."
- Jicarilla Apache research
    - o Elk and mule deer were first tracked in this area between 1983 and 1987.
        - ▪ Results show very similar migration patterns to now.
    - o The next elk study was 2014-2016 (n= 44,204 GPS).
    - o Mule deer were studied 2017-2019 (n=285,085 GPS).
    - o The migration corridor for elk and mule deer is roughly 90 miles long, is about 4,000 square miles and crosses public, private, state and tribal lands.
    - o Elk have very consistent migration patterns, while mule deer have very diverse migration patterns.
- Multijurisdictional corridor complexities, challenges and opportunities

- There are at least 20 large private properties, four National Forests, BLM parcels and New Mexico State lands.
  - There are four wildlife management jurisdictions within this corridor:
    - Two states: Colorado and New Mexico
    - Two Tribes: Southern Ute Indian Tribe and the Jicarilla Apache Nation
  - Harvest policies vary by jurisdiction.
- Migration is the umbrella for "shared" populations.
  - There is a need for coordinated initiatives at the landscape level.
- This complexity emphasizes the preservation of crucial habitats: corridors, stopover sites, parturition areas and core-winter ranges.
- Data from Jicarilla Game and Fish research supports conservation beyond the reservation.
  - Highway crossings and dates: New Mexico Department of Transportation and Colorado Department of Transportation
  - State Action Plan (SO 3362)
  - Stopover research (NMSU)
  - Parturition areas
  - Private land initiatives
  - Land planning
  - Prioritization of conservation needs (temporal and spatial)
- Threats:
  - Barriers to connectivity (e.g., Highway 550)
  - Habitat fragmentation
  - Disease (chronic wasting disease)
  - Drought
- Challenges:
  - Critical habitat protection (corridors, stopover areas and parturition areas)
  - Contradicting harvest policies
    - Jicarilla Apache's harvest policy is based on age class and abundance.
    - The adjacent jurisdiction has unlimited harvest.
- Management implications
  - Prevent the dilution of wildness.
  - Protect migration corridors.
  - Keep landscapes whole.
  - Prevent the direct and indirect loss of habitat.
  - Reduce threats to population production and survival.
  - Promote the use of wildlife-friendly fences.
  - Improve habitat by reintroducing fire!
    - Fire can improve diversity and create landscape heterogeneity.
  - Emphasize the importance of private lands.
- Discussion
  - There are more private landowners that are willing to work toward this common goal than landowners that aren't willing to.
    - Avoid making assumptions about landowners before we truly understand their perspective.
    - There are ways to address the human interference with migration corridors.
  - The Jicarilla Apache Nation also puts lots of thought and effort into water.

- Sub-surface solar wells have proven to be the best technique for keeping water out for wildlife.
- Everyone on this landscape is thinking about water.
- o There are a variety of factors that have influenced the location of this migration corridor, including vegetation type and topography.
  - There is risk in becoming complacent and thinking that habitat within the migration corridor is already good enough.
- o The impact of fire on elk populations is site-specific.
  - Depends on what role that habitat plays in the life strategy of the animals.
  - For example, fire in the elk's summer range could be a great mechanism to improve forage, but fire in winter range could invite a monoculture of noxious weeds.
- o This is a unique landscape.
  - Jicarilla Apache has a lot of freedom to do research without bureaucratic red tape.
  - New Mexico Game and Fish does a lot of habitat work in their wildlife management areas. This is one of the only places where the wildlife agency does the actual habitat work.

Wildlife Management Areas, Goals and Outcomes, Management Tools
Carrie Parris, New Mexico Game and Fish Habitat Biologist and Melissa McLamb, TNC New Mexico Senior Conservation Coordinator
- Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs)
  - o The State Game Commission owns land that is managed by the Department of Game and Fish.
  - o Defined in rule: NMAC 19.34.5.7 B, 19.34.5.8, 19.34.4.6, 19.34.3.6, etc.
    - In an nutshell, the land is acquired for the conservation, propagation, and protection of wildlife and fish using a flexible management system that ensures sustainable use for public food supply, recreation and safety.
  - o There are 43 WMAs across 255,067 acres (listed in 19.34.5.8).
  - o The land was procured using hunting and fishing dollars to conserve big game and sportfish species and to provide hunting opportunities.
- Edward Sargent WMA (ESWMA)
  - o The ESWMA is 20,209 acres and is named after the former owner of the property, who was a sheep rancher.
    - Historically, the property was used for sheep and cattle ranching and logging.
    - Livestock grazing practices ceased in 1975 after the acquisition by the State Game Commission.
    - ESWMA was purchased using federal funds by the State Game Commission in 1975 for elk habitat and elk hunting opportunities.
  - o Riparian restoration at ESWMA
    - A fish barrier was constructed on Nabor Creek in 1983 with maintenance in 2014.
    - In 2019, an exclosure was constructed to remove pressures of ungulate grazing on riparian woody vegetation.
      - At this time, the Department of Game and Fish (DGF) started investigating the use of beaver dam analogs (BDAs), post-assisted log structures (PALS) and other low-tech process-based restoration (LT PBR) techniques.

- o BDAs mimic the presence of beaver by creating a log dam and connecting the channel with the floodplain.
- o The more stuff you can put in a stream, the healthier it will be.
    - In 2020, Rio Grande Return installed 30 BDAs/PALS within the exclosure and constructed four more exclosures.
    - In 2021, DGF contracted Watershed Artisans to conduct a watershed-scale assessment of the WMA.
    - The BDA work was expanded in 2022 by implementing structures along about ½ mile of Nabor Creek.
    - Information from the watershed assessment was used to implement natural channel design projects on the next ½ mile of Nabor Creek.
    - Future restoration:
        - Continue implementing the watershed concept plan with BDA installation where appropriate.
        - Plant woody vegetation within the exclosures.
- o Beavers
    - There is evidence that beavers used to live along Nabor Creek, and DGF is attempting to repopulate the stream.
        - There are beavers on the Colorado-side of Nabor Creek.
    - There is no evidence that beavers ever lived along the Rio Chamita.
    - Relocating beavers in the state of New Mexico is incredible complicated, so DGF is hoping that beaver will come on their own.
- Limitations to doing work on WMAs
    - o Seasonality
        - WMAs are closed in the spring for calving season and most, if not all, WMAs are closed from mid-May to June 30th.
        - Some WMAs are covered in snow until April or May.
    - o Hunting season begins in August with bear hunts and elk hunts in September.
    - o That leaves contractors with the month of July to implement projects.
        - This is especially conflicting for revegetation efforts, which need to be done in the fall or winter (outside of growing season).
- ESWMA burn plan history, context and status
    - o The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Partners Program provides technical and financial assistance to private landowners to meet management objectives for habitat improvement.
        - DGF used the Partners Program to create a plan for reintroducing fire to the landscape and working across boundaries with adjacent private landowners.
        - This USFWS funding can be used on private land, but not state or federal land.
    - o The Nature Conservancy (TNC) helped with the acquisition of the ESWMA and creating a burn plan for the property. They also helped fund Ellis Margolis' fire history research to inform the management and use it as an outreach tool to landowners and the public.
    - o The burn plan includes 4,000 acres of ponderosa pine and Gambel oak woodlands on the WMA.
        - USFWS is working with private landowners to secure their interest in working together, across boundaries.
        - The burn plan will be implemented when the community is ready and the conditions are right.
        - DGF will utilize the USFWS burn program because they don't have one.

- - The burn plan expires in December 2026.
    - Burning is unlikely to happen within the next two years.
    - The burn plan can potentially be extended if needed.
  - Challenges:
    - Change of land ownership
    - Staff turnover within agencies

2-3-2 Updates and Getting Involved
- Multiparty monitoring plan
  - The first edition was published this spring.
  - 23 questions:
    - 9 ecologic
    - 14 socioeconomic
  - The questions came from the Washington Office's Common Monitoring Strategy (13 questions), the 2-3-2's Monitoring Committee (9 questions) and Regions 2 and 3 of the USFS (1 question).
  - Are the actions we are taking having the impact we want them to have?
    - The monitoring plan uses a combination of observations, models and reviews.
- Ecological monitoring
  - Monitoring methods include forest plots, stream temperature sensors and stream flow cameras.
  - Get involved with the 2-3-2 Monitoring Committee:
    - Esme Cadiente: esme@forestguild.org
    - Cody Dems: cody@forestguild.org
- Socioeconomic monitoring
  - End of year baseline data collection includes:
    - Surveys to restoration and monitoring contractors
      - Lists of contractors from New Mexico and Colorado have been compiled.
      - Get baseline data by broad outreach and recording the contracts that have been awarded.
    - Surveys to wood processing partners
    - Key informant interviews
      - Partner leverage
      - All lands accomplishments
      - Using focal area approach
    - TREAT modelling
      - Jobs
      - Labor income
  - Baseline data collection is underway
    - UM BBER – mill capacity analysis
      - Mapping of mill locations and restoration and monitoring contractors
    - Census block analysis
      - Income
      - Race/ethnicity
      - Age
      - Workforce participation
    - Forest Plan synthesis

- - - Collaborative governance survey
  - o Wood Innovations Grants
    - ▪ 3 broad programs:
      - • Wood Innovations funding
      - • Community Wood Grant Program
      - • Wood Products Infrastructure Assistance
    - ▪ Applications are due in the Fall of 2023
    - ▪ Grace Sorenson is the lead.
  - o Get involved with the Socioeconomic Working Group:
    - ▪ Gabe Kohler: gabe@forestguild.org
    - ▪ Meets bi-monthly
    - ▪ Broad focus with task-specific subgroups
    - ▪ Currently working with the Tribal engagement subgroup to establish an outreach strategy.
- Rio Arriba County CWPP engagement
  - o Who: core team and public
  - o What:
    - ▪ Establish community risk ratings
    - ▪ Identify values at risk
    - ▪ Prioritize actions/fuel reduction projects
    - ▪ Track accomplishment
  - o Where/when:
    - ▪ Fall of 2023
    - ▪ Focal areas across the county
  - o Why:
    - ▪ Inform "all lands" priorities
    - ▪ CWPPs guide state, federal, and private investments in wildfire risk reduction.
- Upcoming 2-3-2 Partnership meetings and events
  - o 3 meetings in Jan/Feb, May/June, Aug/Sept located in different parts of the landscape.
    - ▪ Always noticed via the newsletter, email and by calendar invite.
  - o Social events, meetings/tours, service work days (new)
  - o Heavy focus on adaptive management and monitoring data synthesis early in the year. More of a focus on showcasing, planning, and/or monitoring projects later in the calendar year.
  - o 2-3-2 Picnics
    - ▪ We're trying a new way of connecting between in-person meetings and events. 2-3-2 Picnic lunches will be held when a partner or group indicates they have something to share with the 2-3-2, including a story, opportunity, or desire to work together.
    - ▪ These will be held virtually and announced via calendar invite and in the 2-3-2 newsletters. We'll always take notes and post relevant information on the 2-3-2 website for those who can't attend the picnics.
    - ▪ Please don't be shy, we're trying something new, so let us know how it's working!
    - ▪ **Reach out to Julia Ledford and Dana Guinn to schedule a 2-3-2 Picnic.**