

MINUTES FROM FRONT RANGE ROUNDTABLE Q2-11 QUARTERLY MEETING



Date of meeting: Friday, May 27, 2011, 9:30 am – 3:30 pm

Location: Boulder County Parks and Open Space 5201 Saint Vrain Road, Longmont, CO

Roundtable contact: Gali Beh, c/o Beh Management Consulting, Inc., 1107 12th St., Boulder CO 80302, 303-499-1576, gali@behconsulting.com

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Chelsea Gunsalus who took notes for these minutes. Thank you also to Boulder County Parks and Open Space for hosting us in their facility.

ATTENDEES

At the Front Range Roundtable Quarterly meeting in Longmont, Colorado on May 27, 2011, 45 members and guests participated. If you attended the meeting but your name is not recorded in the list below, please send an email to Gali Beh at gali@behconsulting.com.

Table 1. Roundtable Meeting Attendees, May 27, 2011—Longmont, Colorado

Name	Organization
Mike Babler	The Nature Conservancy
Cheri Bashor	US Forest Service
Jim Bedwell	US Forest Service, ARP
Gali Beh	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Rosalie Bianco	Environmental Energy Partners
Alan Brewer	Town of Nederland
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey
Peter Brown	Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research
John Burke	Blue Knight Group
John Bustos	US Forest Service, ARP
Coleen Campbell	Colorado Air Pollution Control Division
Glenn Casamassa	US Forest Service, ARP
Joe Cenvorst	Coal Creek Canyon Fire Protection District
Tony Cheng	Colorado State University
Jessica Clement	Colorado State University
Steve Dwyer	Douglas County
Richard (Dick) Edwards	US Forest Service
Leslie Ellwood	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Cesar Gellido	Coal Creek Community
Russell George	Colorado Department of Natural Resources
Hal Gibbs	US Forest Service, ARP

Kris Gibson	Gold Hill Fire Protection District
Shane Greer	US Forest Service, PSICC
Chelsea Gunsalus	US Forest Service, ARP
Barbara Halpin	Boulder County
Craig Hansen	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Eric Howell	Colorado Springs Utilities
Chad Julian	Boulder County
Merrill Kaufmann	US Forest Service
Brian Kent	Rocky Mountain Research Station
David Lasky	Sugarloaf Fire Protection District
Lyle Laverty	Colorado State Parks
Patricia Limerick	Center of the American West
Peggy Littleton	El Paso County
Tom Mahon	Colorado Renewable Resource Cooperative
Jerri Marr	US Forest Service, PSICC
Dave Oettinger	Anchor Point Fire Management
Jill Ozarski	Office of U.S. Senator Mark Udall
Gini Pingnot	Colorado Counties Inc.
Chuck Romaniello	Bureau of Land Management
Deborah Schofield	US Forest Service, ARP
Joel Schwartzman	Blue Knight Group
Kendall Slee	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Carl Spaulding	Colorado Timber Industry Association
Bruce Ward	Choose Outdoors

REVIEW OF ROUNDTABLE VISION AND PROGRESS AGAINST 2010 GOALS

Speaker: Gali Beh, Roundtable Facilitator

- Fire season of 2002 sparked the need for a collaborative effort, such as the Roundtable. It included the Front Range Implementing Agencies: USFS, BLM, RMNP, USFWS, & CSFS. Partnerships broadened in 2004 to TNC and TWS
- In 2006 the Roundtable vision document was created.
- The RT selected the lower montane where fire risk mitigation = ecological restoration because the historical range of variability were understood and conditions at high risk for ignition and fire spread.
- Land base spans Larimer to El Paso Counties – share Grand and Park Counties with CBBC
- Successes:
 - Woodland Park, CFLRP, Stewardship Contract, new funding from FS and ARRA, biomass utilization improvement, and the approval of 75 Front Range CWPPs.

- Recommendations: Increase appropriate application of prescribed and wildland fire use, increase utilization of woody biomass for facility heating, and limit growth of fire risk
- June 23 – discuss whether facility heating is appropriate to pinpoint in objectives
- After survey in Dec. 2010, add “Change local policy” to #7 of recommended initiatives.
- Executive Team – leading formation of coalition to recommend policy initiatives; agree on collaborative adaptive management process, fundraise at least \$40,000
- IM Team – Selected community; recommendation 5/27/11; will develop project plan
- OP Team – Four Mile fieldtrip and D.C. Trip planned (Sept. 13-15)
- BUSS Team – 2nd annual talking points workshop in June
- CFLRP Team – Monitoring plan
- Metrics Team – Define ecological restoration

3. Southern Rocky Mountains Ecosystem (SRME) Consortium (Mike Babler)

- Funded by the Joint Fire Science Program
- Objective – facilitate communications and information exchange between developers of science information and people on the ground
- There are currently 8 consortia across the U.S.
- Developed as a result of valuable information not getting to the ground; wanted to create an exchange from people on the ground back to the developers. The program is trying to reduce barriers between the two groups.
- The program encourages communication with all levels of stakeholders
- Southern Rockies Eco-Region originally went into New Mexico; the SRME consortium spoke with the Southwest group and chose to remove involvement in New Mexico. Implementing plan in Colorado before reaching out to Wyoming and the Black Hills
- Participants include: Mike Babler – Principal Investigator; Merrill Kaufmann – Co-Principal Investigator; Megan Kram (TNC) helps keep program on track as facilitator; Created Steering Committee – Todd Richardson (BLM), Tony Simons (LRX), Jim Thinner (USFS), Katherine Timm (CSFS), Jenny Briggs and Jessica Clement
- Go-to source of fire science information in the region
- Met with Forest leadership groups, went to burn boss meeting, met with scientists from universities.
- Trying to partner w/ local LCC
- Audiences – Fire & vegetation professionals (primary focus), scientists (primary focus), land management decision makers, general public, and educators
- Many multi-agency/cooperative groups struggle with getting to meetings; trying Webinars instead
 - The average attendance rate has been approx. 70 per webinar
- Roadshow scheduled for July 13-14 for Uncompahgre Plateau Project in Montrose
- The proposal included a demonstration site that would provide a place to dive into questions the group has. Working with the Pike National Forest to get a site set

- up. The Pike developed a set of questions they'd like answered. Group is working on getting that back to the PSICC.
 - If demonstration site on Pike goes through, can provide crossover from CFLRP project and SRF project.
- Smoke monitoring research being conducted in Piedmont, looking to move west. That group submitted JFSP to work on proposed demonstration site.
- Need input from Roundtable
- The program is funded for two years, but the intent is to make it a long-term effort; will likely expand Southern Rockies area farther north.
 - A plan has been created for the two funded years
- Provide feedback to Webinars attended; make it worthwhile to users
- People want literature – how to find info; trying to determine process to make sorting of information apply to region (Southern Rockies). Need more input from the field; going to continue to push for responses. The program wants to efficiently and effectively communicate to the field. Talk to Megan, Jenny or Mike if have any ideas.
- Southern Rockies Fire Science Network is the new name
- If proposals are coming through network, have weight on decision to pursue from fire science group

4. Impact of Mountain Pine Beetle (MPB) on Forested Ecosystems in Front Range (Jenny Briggs)

- The study was prompted by questions from management agencies about how Front Range would be affected by beetle kill and how it would affect treatments, untreated areas and fire behavior.
 - Beetles often get specialized and stay within host tree species.
 - How can resilience be altered? Less dense stands can allow for more resilient trees. Lodgepole/ponderosa eco-tone (Peak to Peak Hwy) – objective 1
 - Ponderosa-dominated zone – objective 2
 - Thinned ponderosa stands may be less resilient long-term; slow regeneration and few young trees.
- Wanted to measure MPB activity and answer the management question
- Sites span five counties from the Wyoming border to Denver area
- Summarizing all years where lodgepole or ponderosa infestation occurred from 2004-2009;
 - Variation from site to site
 - Average infestation level was 25% of trees infested per acre in 2009.
- Infestation levels higher in Northern Front Range
- Dispersal of beetles is hard to follow
- 2010 Data:
 - Within high activity sites, there was a large decrease in 2010 in newly infested acres
 - Within low activity sites, there were no new attacks in Boulder County sites in the fall of 2010
 - 2010 numbers were encouragingly low in sites
 - Beetles may knock out portions of stands and move on.
- Additional studies were conducted regarding host selection

- Successful infestation of ponderosa compared to lodgepole
- 66% more MPB emerged from ponderosa than lodgepole.
- Objective 2 – Past management effects on potential MPB impacts in ponderosa
 - Selected sites of different treatment types, 26 10-acre study plots were surveyed so far and use data from 2004 through the 5-county region.
 - Available vs. infested trees: infestation level low in all different treatment types.
 - Categorized as an epidemic level due to definition (1 infested tree per acre per year)
 - Thin + burn and thinning had the lowest percentage of infestation
 - Study needs to be expanded to further understand various treatment types.
 - Entomologists say bark beetle may be attracted to burned areas due to epidemic nature (less resilient trees, etc.)

Q&A

- Are you looking at live trees in burned areas? *Yes*
 Difference between MPB on scorched tree and on healthy tree on burned plot
Need to look into whether thinning is slowing down activity but there's a question of whether areas happen to have healthier trees or is it spatial? Spacing of stands wasn't making the trees more resistant or additional stress from burn was off-setting thinning advantage.
 Definition of trees/acre? *Anything down to 2.5" DBH (diameter at breast height)*
 In burned areas, do trees have bigger diameters? *No, there was a similar range of sizes.*
 Talk to Jenny if you have questions or input.

5. Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP): Discuss what implementation process is, what it looks like and get feedback on how Roundtable can reasonably inject involvement. Look for the right opportunities to collaborate

- Implementation on Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland (ARP) (Hal Gibbs): Restoration Prescriptions - NEPA (National Environmental Protection Act requirements) has been done, limits changes – little opportunity for involvement in first 5-6 years; talk about more in depth what will happen in 2011 and show where going for 2012-2013 w/ planning. Field Trip for monitoring effort in June (June 15 on PSICC, June 30 on ARP). Looking at planned treatment areas in 2012. Discussing additional fall field trips looking at 2013 planned treatments.
 - Good news: \$3.5 million for CFLRP
 - Redfeather/Crystal Lakes: Prescribed burn may be done in 2012; mechanical (machinery or hand) treatment in 2012; 2013 treatments planned. The west side of Red Feather/Crystal Lakes has already been treated.
 - Southeast of Estes: Treating mostly in 2011 and some in 2012 and 2013; treated in 2010.
 - Nederland: 2011 and 2013 treatments planned
 - Treatments are situated next to “something” – most have hazardous fuels reduction purpose, near communities, developments or some value at risk. CFLR have restoration purpose as well.
 - 2011: Estes Valley: 5-780 acres, Walker Black 25 acres, Walker Red 800 acres, Kelly/West Magnolia 85 acres (CLFR acres)
 - 2012 Red Feather 900 acres, Cache la Poudre Rx fire 1000 acres, Horse Creek 190 acres

- 2013: Redfeather 2-1000 acres, Redfeather Rx fire 1000 acres, Ceran 180 acres, Gold Hill 190 acres.
 - Burning on Front Range challenging.
 - Prescription: ARP is trying to match Canyon Lakes Ranger District treatments to Boulder treatments prescriptions. Mechanical treatments: reduce live basal area by 40% (individual trees and clumps), create 15'-25' gaps, leave larger ponderosa and lodgepole (in response to Taylor Mountain project), species preference (ponderosa, limber, Englemann, aspen, Doug-fir, & lodgepole) 70-95% of species composition will be ponderosa, remove dead trees
 - Walker Red – thin trees to 17'x17' spacing, leave ponderosa, composition 60% ponderosa, preference (ponderosa, aspen, Englemann, limber, Doug-fir, and lodgepole), Leave ponderosa >10"
 - Thin understory of Walker Red

How do you make decisions of biomass removal? *Depends on access, type of material, roads suitable for logging trucks or chip van, (ARP road infrastructure is a problem). Access to units (steep, etc.) Mechanical equipment cannot be used on any slope >40%*

What do you do with snags or downed trees? *Leave 2 snags per acre standing per the forest plan.*

Communication to contractor, how prevent them from even spaced? *Provide guide and often mark sample area of 2-3 acres, will treat area, have people on site frequently during start-up. Interaction between CO and contractor*

Are you looking at Ipsps or twig beetle trees? *If pitch tubes show or infestation is obvious, the tree is taken out.*

Were prescriptions modified for beetle stands? *Yes, leaving more small trees instead of trying to take out all small trees – major change from always thinning from below. Affects basal area.*
 - Estes Valley 5 (Dick): Objectives – Hazardous fuels reduction in wildlandurban interface (WUI) (Near Big Elk fire burn area on north, going to treat fuels on south side of subdivision) Ponderosa restoration, maintenance of existing old growth or development of future old growth. (Area has ponderosa and heavy doug-fir understory; between upper and lower montane.) Improve forest health - lodgepole is 30-40% infested w/ MPB. Ponderosa is 10-15% infested; wanted to leave smaller trees for future forest, aspen patches are being overtaken by conifers – try to enhance and perpetuate aspen stands, utilize forest products when feasible. Implemented under Front Range Long Term Stewardship Contract. 2 diff. areas (mechanical where products removed (80 acres of treatment area produce usable product))
- Prescription: Remove lodgepole >5" dbh, removal all dead or MPB infested ponderosa (2 snags/acre), retain all Douglas-fir >8" dbh, thin remaining non-saw timber (<5" diameter) and biomass trees to 20'x20' spacing, whole tree yard saw timber/non-saw timber to landing, pile slash in landing. Similar tree preference to Boulder prescription. Remove stems w/in 5' of bowl of tree. Ask contractor if want the biomass.
- Manual treatment – steeper slopes, smaller trees, 90-200 basal area. Removal of dead or MPB infested, retain all saw timber size trees, thin

remaining non-saw timber and biomass 20'x20' spacing, hand pile slash for burning, removal of conifers to diameter limits in aspen closed >1/4 acre

MPB hits in patches, thinking if removing patches and leaving clumps of live trees will get desired result. Anticipate 20-25% mortality in ponderosa, taking out all lodgepole. Expect to continue to have mortality in PP, but still have old growth component.

Cost associated with burning later on. Different from Taylor Mountain because understory thinning will be primarily mechanized. Tight spacing makes commercial thinning challenging; do separate entry from pre-commercial thinning.

(Glenn) Changing Rx in response to concerns during Taylor Mountain - Increases cost. Road work done to access area due to concerns from off-highway vehicle (OHV) community. Hauling concerns from private landowners – trying to manage that piece. Make arrangements for power line that are over roads that are low, can't get a log truck due to power lines.

- Implementation on PSICC (Jeff) - Prescriptions
 - Trout West Fuels Reduction: Currently active; started w/ 1st project in Phantom Creek about 2 weeks ago. 4000 acres, expect to award two more task orders in 2011, one in 2012. Finish on contract next year, still operation in 2013. LTSC. 1500 acres in 2011, 960 in 2012. Shooting for 1500/year on avg. Rx – thin from below, removal of smaller, suppressed and intermediate trees and retain older/larger trees in stand. Thin to avg. 25% canopy closure (60 sq. ft basal area), thin trees to create clumps intermingle w/ small opening to ¼ acre. Looking for areas where some aspen enhancement can occur, avoiding areas too thick w/ high density of aspen. Trying to implement variable spacing – still working. Descriptions in task orders don't necessarily show; work must be done between sale administrator and Contracting Officer. Come up with pictures of range of clumpiness. Cover types – aspen (5% project area), ponderosa (40-50%), mixed conifer (30-40%), Douglas-fir (10-15%) and spruce (<1%). Favor ponderosa (restoration objective). Project on ridge creating variation in cover types. Ponderosa – Before 200 trees/acre (100 basal area) to 42 trees/acre (50 basal area) Mixed conifer 537/acre (156 basal area) to 57 trees/acre (70 basal area). NEPA approves large amounts of thinning, not trying to get huge rush of regeneration. Starting at a density, can't bring down in one entry without causing stand to fall apart. If large conifer in viable aspen area, will usually leave large diameter tree.
 - Catamount Forest Health and Hazardous Fuels Reduction Project: Start in 2013, large analysis area, close to Manitou Springs. Decision 2/11 21,000 acres of treatment non-mechanical fuels reduction treatment. 6,000-7,000 of restoration w/ product removal.
South Rampart: Starting planning
Treatments result in high level of variability for residual stand conditions w/in treatment areas. Look at how much is ponderosa (closer to 60 sq. ft) Seedlings and saplings at low density <100/acre, not trying to treat. Equipment for mastication have 8-10' width – don't want to chase small pocket of regeneration. Follow up treatments can allow for treatment of

these areas later. Rocky outcroppings prevent equipment from entering and want to keep them untreated for diversity of structure.

Natural regeneration will occur at lower stand densities.

Identify target trend and range – post treatment conditions may not be attainable in one entry.

Target ranges wide enough to capture variation of major cover types – trend toward residual trees/acre range. Increase amount of ponderosa after initial treatment but may not get tight parameters for residual numbers.

- Roundtable involvement – NEPA planning document identifies where treatment occurs and what is going to happen. Some flexibility, ¼ acre opening limitation due to NEPA although 5 acre openings are what was desired in Phantom Creek area. Applying what heard from monitoring group, and trying to implement as much as possible. South Rampart analysis is about to start and can recommend larger opening sizes because NEPA document hasn't been signed yet. Want to come up with something broader that won't limit treatments as much.
 - Phantom Creek – complete next year
 - Catamount – 2013-2016 NEPA completed
- Sarah: South Rampart analysis for 2016 projects. This group can help define Rx. Pull together proposal for other funding to do fire history in area to possibly drive what end state looks like. This fall looking at field trip to get some ideas out on recommendations. Visual product of clumpiness – get together collaboratively for a definition of what it looks like. The more info we have, the better products. Selecting where treatments occurs before 2016 can't happen.
- Glenn: Collaborative planning – field trips can provide opportunities. Can be flexible with prescriptions even on decisions already made. Sideboards can be made wider. Relate to other interests outside of group and incorporate into decisions in out-years.
- Hal: NEPA on ARP – limited opportunity to have as much flexibility as Pike. Although where is already determined, opportunity to influence how. Can get closer to where wanted to be anyway. Clarify desired end result. Send message to Gali about if information/presentation was valuable.
- Paige: Presentation provided a better understanding of what the FS is doing in terms of restoration. RT looking at landscape beyond CFLRP projects. Look w/in both forests and remember larger landscape interest exists.
- Patty: History does have bearing and could be useful. Looking at larger constituents. Older photos of clumps to show what it looks like. Center of American West may be able to provide better photos of 100 year old forest.
- Hal: Prepared task orders to account for all money – if money was less, would have dropped things off. Units already planned. Decisions can be reassessed, supplement new info and adjust accordingly if necessary.
- New large-scale – Cedar Park in Buckhorn Canyon lower montane in later years in CFLR bring back to RT to address plan. 25,000 planning area. Meeting objectives is the most important part –w/in framework of Rx, there is a lot of flexibility built in to plans.

7. Executive Team Updates:

- CSU Case Study (Jeff Janke): Interviewed 5 RT members. Students conducted study of conflict resolution
- “Conservation Leadership through Learning” – 30 in program, broken into groups of 5
 - Outcome available for viewing; Gali will post it or send it out
 - People felt strongly about communications – important for success of RT, particularly when dealing with conflict. The strength at which it was emphasized indicated significance.
 - Building trust – have built trust and not let trust wane.
 - Interviewees impressed with optimism and enthusiasm of members of RT
 - Recommendations: Stay optimistic and enthusiastic. Recommended model on how to resolve conflict. Executive team trying to deal with creating a model for conflict resolution
- RT budget (Gali): Target \$40,000 7% goes to Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Foundation, raised \$48,000 so far. RT will get \$44,600. 7% charge may increase next year to try to bring amount of work and charge closer together
 - Need to ask if want to do another year
 - CSFS gave extra \$3500 to get through the rest of the FY (begin FY12 on July 1)
 - Hired Beh Management Consulting two years ago under public competitive process; chose to do another year to continue contract
 - Competitive process or negotiate contract with Gali for 1 year and 1-year extension?
 - Will have to be competitive again
 - Short turn-around time on solicitation – longer term of contract
 - Paige will edit and post RFP
 - Want to continue with Beh Management Consulting

8. Bruce Ward: Went to the Forest Service Regional Office and going to make \$10,000 commitment and \$10,000 in matching funds to increase and ramp up effort to mitigate beetles. Create messaging that stakeholders agree upon. Clear up misunderstanding. Engaged 360 media in Denver. Creating questionnaire and selecting key stakeholders. Trying to create more national awareness. Trying to build a house of beetle kill trees to bring awareness. Working to integrate beetle kill wood into projects on Broadmoor-type hotels. Will send something to Gali to send out to the group – proposal is working its way around to get attention.

8. Implementation and Mapping (IM) Team results of RFI process for community partner (Gali)

- Map from 2006 wasn't kept and documented. Picked back up at 2009
- RT map overlaid with Watershed and Northern Front Range Mountain Pine Beetle Work Group; trying to focus resources
- Community selection process since Nov.
- 0 responses from Harris Park
- Larimer – coordinated response from 3 groups
- Boulder – 5 from FPDs
- Team reviewed and filled out scoring sheets
- Red Feather (3 HOAs) – sent survey to entire community; trying to get air curtain burner, estimate high volunteer rate; mostly red zone for fire risk
- Nederland – red zone for fire risk, BLX offered \$25,000 matching funds.

- West Boulder County Healthy Forest Initiative – 6 FPDs, lower montane restoration zone, county offered \$25,000 matching funds
- Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP) brought in to assist in public meetings
- The selected community was West Boulder County Healthy Forest Initiative
 - The other two communities will remain in the pipeline
 - Fundraising will be driven all for West Boulder County Forest Initiative; contacted Environmental Energy Partners to find out about mill and how to utilize biomass
 - Gali, Rosalie, & The Nature Conservancy have committed to funding
 - June/July: work with community and determine scope of partnerships, determine deliverables, org chart for interactions w/ roles, MOU outline, Boulder County is fiscal agent to manage money, maps will be created, RT responsible for funding (looking for grant opportunities), creating budgets, and work plans
 - Share how success was achieved for other communities to use
 - August 24 – Fourmile Canyon field trip with elected officials – can share how selected community affected by fire within RFI.
 - Media roll out of award – press release to announce selection; try for on-going series about effort with Boulder Daily Camera – Outreach team will discuss on next call
 - Letters will be written to other communities so can use for other grant opportunities
 - Fire district grant opportunities available – community is looking at SAFER grant
 - IM Team will find grants and try to write grants internally within team
 - Outreach within community
- Outreach and Policy Team
 - Elected official field trip to Four mile fire site – 12 guests and 4 hosts have RSVP
 - Anticipating a lot of interest and involvement
 - Planning visit to D.C. in Sept. – focus on CFLRP and broader Front Range work
 - Policy initiative – increase work related to WUI, reenergize decision makers and stakeholders dealing w/ WUI. Jeanne Nicholson was contacted – coming to next Executive Team meeting to discuss her involvement and potential spearheading of this effort
- Biomass Utilization and Slash Sites (BUSS) Team
 - Monthly calls share info
 - June 23 – workshop; exchange statements and alter them until everyone believes them
 - Track biomass accomplishments
 - Map of utilization locations – tracking which counties have what types of utilization facilities
 - Biomass utilization working group under CSFS leadership; send talking points from BUSS team to new CSFS group to try to get them involved

9. CFLRP (Gali)

- Working since October
- Meet once a month
- Led by Jessica Clement

- Formed between contract between Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI) and USFS
- Jessica laid out process for coming up with monitoring plan and decision making process (unanimous show of thumbs)
- USFWS identified wildlife for monitoring consideration
 - 10 diff. animals identified
 - Looking for 5 key species that will be indicative of ecological restoration
- Ecological monitoring variables in a table – what to measure, method of measure, when and scale. Team has agreed to metrics. Economic and social monitoring variables – how many jobs created and other non-ecological variables. 16/25 votes. BUSS and Outreach team invited to that meeting June 13. Draft of monitoring plan June 1 for social & economic monitoring, feedback by June 12 from group.
National CFLR Meeting in Denver that members of the CFLR group will attend; come up with small number of monitoring indicators that would be standard across projects.
- Metrics Team – RT didn't finish job. Said where, not how to accomplish restoration. Must define metrics – read 17 documents and interviewed 15 people. Finished report in 1 month
 - Where: Prioritize those that already have information and non-north facing slopes; use aerial photos
 - Planning treatments at site: Assessment of each site, fire assessment before treatment, follow Bald Mountain example, do not extrapolate outside data, different metrics from North and South
 - RT must decide to take advice or agree on metrics anyway
 - Monitoring treatments: what wildlife is going to be affected
 - Bring back Science and Monitoring team and would collect GIS layers of fire histories, future CFLRP monitoring, further define terms
 - All agreed in favor

FWS put out funding opportunity as part of Southern Rockies \$260,000 available. CFLRP put together proposal for wildlife monitoring, non-FS lands, to broaden scale beyond what's available to FS. Continue to pursue funding – way to make monitoring data more robust.

Calendar: The next quarterly meeting is a field trip on Friday, August 5; all meetings for the rest of the year in packets provided.