

**Front Range Roundtable (FRRT)
Quarter 1 Meeting – March 4, 2016
Boulder County Parks and Open Space Department
Meeting Summary - Final**

Attendance

Sam Adams	Jonas Feinstein	Jim McGannon
Rob Addington	Paula Fornwalt	Mike McHugh
Greg Aplet	Pat Gayner	Pat McLaughlin
Kevin Barrett	Joseph Hansen	Allen Owen
Jeff Cannon	Chad Hoffman	Brad Piehl
Marin Chambers	Eric Howell	Stefan Reinold
Tony Cheng	Chad Julian	Jay Stalnacker
Sylvia Clark	Don Kennedy	Nick Stremel
Megan Davis	Jason Lawhon	Kirk Will
Chuck Dennis	Boyd Lebeda	Monte Williams
Katie Donahue	Mike Lester	Brett Wolk
Marla Downing	Karen Mandiyano	Kevin Zimlinghaus
Carol Ekarius	Mark Martin	

Facilitation: Heather Bergman and Katie Waller

Next Steps

Executive Team	Tee up a conversation regarding a long-term work plan for the Q2 June meeting.
Heather	Send out another survey for name suggestions before the Q2 June meeting.

Outcomes

- The Roundtable will talk about creating a more detailed and holistic action plan at the Q2 June meeting.
- There will be two maintained email lists, one for members and one for non-members. Members are those people who have completed a Membership Commitment form (available from Katie Waller). The email list separation will occur before the June quarterly meeting.
- Executive Team members must represent an organization that has been active in the Roundtable for at least one year, but they do not have to have been personally active for one year.
- Pat Gayner is now an Executive Team member, representing the general FRRT membership.

Presentations

The Executive Team, Community Protection Team (CPT), and Landscape Restoration Team (LRT) chose panelist to present to the Roundtable regarding the meaning of success for community protection and landscape restoration work. Panelists were asked to discuss the goals and desired outcomes, actual outcomes, tradeoffs, and measures of success for their identified project or line of work. Below are summaries of each presentation.

Boyd Lebeda – Lory State Park and the High Park Fire

- The Lory State Park Fuels Treatment took place from 2006 to 2008 in a lower montane ecosystem composed of mainly ponderosa pine with Douglas-fir on north-facing slopes,

Rock Mountain Juniper and Mountain Mahogany on south-facing slopes, and a granitic-based soil.

- Neither fire nor cattle grazing had been present on the treatment area in recent history; lack of management led to conditions full of ladder fuels.
- The treatment is in a high-density wildland-urban interface (WUI) area, close to Horsetooth Reservoir.
- The treatment was meant to create fuel breaks and reduce hazardous fuels through mastication, chain saws, and pile burns.
- The fuels management plan and biological evaluation goals were mainly focused on protecting natural resources and ecological values and reducing the potential for stand-destroying wildfire by addressing wildland fire hazards and risks for wildfire ignitions.
- The initial basal areas (BA) of the two plots impacted by the High Park Fire were 160 and 110 square feet per acre (ft²/ac) with a post-treatment target of 40 to 60 BA.
- The High Park and the Gallena Fires burned through some of the treated areas in 2012.
- Forest and fuels management expectations under extreme burning conditions are typically more focused on reducing the impact of the fire on the forest to increase resilience post-fire rather than stopping, slowing, or preventing the spread of fire.
- The monitored treatment sites burned on either June 9 or 10, 2012, and were not exposed to high winds.
- May 2006, before treatment, shows spotty regeneration and a decent distribution of size class trees on the treatment site.
- June 2009, after treatment, shows increased understory growth, as well as masticated material left from the treatment.
- August 2012, after the fire, shows a high scorch height indicative of a surface fire rather than a canopy fire; regeneration is evident and plentiful.
- September 2013, after the fire, shows a loss of tree cover due to fire and a bark beetle epidemic; the area was also reseeded by local water organizations to prevent an increase in sediment in Horsetooth Reservoir.
- September 2014, after the fire, shows further loss of trees, but still a forested area that has regenerated after being exposed to fire.
- November 2015, after the fire, shows the treatment area reverting to a natural state that is indicative of what it would look like in the future.
- The current BA of the treatment areas are probably between 20 and 40, an acceptable number due to fire and bark beetle impacts.
- This treatment is typically viewed as a success, because it led to the retention of the stand and the seed sources, was instrumental in positively impacting fire behavior and reducing the severity, exhibited the advantages and disadvantages of mastication, and lowered the stand density to increase understory and regeneration.
- Knowing that the treatment area would be exposed to fire, it would have been possible to leave a higher BA.

Joseph Hansen – Community Protection in Jefferson County

- The Jefferson Conservation District (JCD) conservation philosophy is to restore proper forest structure on a large scale, so that fire is mitigated and unwanted ecological impacts are avoided.
- As forests have changed over time due to natural occurrences and management practices, fire behavior has changed as well.
- JCD works with willing landowners and is dependent on partner organizations to pay for treatments and to complete monitoring.

- Logging contractors execute all the work on private lands.
- The Mirador Ranch treatment was executed to elongate a natural opening in the landscape, as well as protect older ponderosa pine trees in the stand when possible to retain seed sources.
- The West Ranch treatment started with a small group of landowners in a 52-person community, but expanded to over 950 acres of treatments as more landowners requested treatments after seeing the progress on their neighbors' properties.
- The Stransky Ranch treatment area was initially logged in 1893 and was treated again recently to create a discontinuity in the canopy to alter fire behavior and create additional opportunities for fire suppression efforts.
- The Pine Country Lane treatment was completed on challenging acres in a community where one landowner convinced neighbors to treat their lands; the outcome was altering fire behavior and creating contiguous treated acres between multiple property owners.
- The Ridge Road treatment is another example of one treatment leading to additional treatments; one landowner initially requested a treatment, and many others soon followed suit, leading to drastic changes in the future development of the forest.
- Other than the more obvious ecological impacts of treatments, most of JCD's successes are executing aggressive treatments on private lands.
- To convince landowners to complete treatments on their land, JCD makes a point to show them evidence of past historical forest structure and how this has changed over time, which typically leads to landowners becoming more agreeable and hands-off in regard to treatments.
- JCD also takes prospective landowners to active treatment operations to show what their property will look like during treatment and to completed treatments to show what their property will look like after treatment.

Chad Julian and Jay Stalnacker – Bald Mountain

- The Bald Mountain treatment was executed right outside of the City of Boulder and was impacted by the Fourmile Fire in 2010.
- The treatment occurred in a lower montane ecosystem and initially had a basal area (BA) of 122 square feet per acre with a high potential for crown fire and a high chance of exhibiting extreme fire behavior, difficult to contain with suppression tactics.
- Neighbors and nearby landowners were initially very upset about this treatment and pushed back politically to try to keep the treatment from going forward; the treatment was able to continue due to support from Boulder County, City of Boulder, US Forest Service (USFS), and Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS) leadership.
- The treatment significantly changed the stand density and dropped the BA to 50 (ft²/ac) (measured in 2009).
- Fire operations people anecdotally stated that the Bald Mountain Treatment was a success for the fire response community in regard to response to the Fourmile Fire, and it created a much-needed anchor that allowed slurry pilots to utilize fire suppression tactics to protect public property, private homes, and possibly a large portion of the City of Boulder.
- The treatment site in 2010 shows trees left in groups and clumps on the ground, as well as sparse fuel on the nearby ridge - the ridge targeted by slurry pilots during the fire.
- The treatment was focused on fuels treatments, structural restoration, process restoration, and treatment longevity. After the Fourmile Fire, the treatment resulted in the reduction of tree density and ladder and surface fuels; the restoration of a landscape mosaic, forest resilience, and natural biochemical and hydrological processes; and the development of a natural fire regime.

- This treatment and subsequent fire exposure can offer many lessons for landscape resilience and community protection treatments, such as the importance of:
 - Building strong relationships with the academic community to understand implications of treatments
 - Gathering and analyzing monitoring data to present to the public with the hope of increasing legitimacy
 - Creating good relationship with local leadership, particularly fire chiefs, fire district employees, enforcement agencies, local and state governmental agencies, and the public
 - Reaching out to the media, the public, and nearby landowners before executing a treatment
 - Defining the scale of the treatment, the conditions under which it will be successful, and the initial expectations
 - Enacting treatments in Zone 3 to increase the chance of success in Zones 1 and 2
 - Removing activity fuels from the site rather than utilizing the lop-and-scatter method
- A sociological study was done on the public in 2007 regarding the treatment, but the results were skewed as it was still an emotion issue for local landowners; however a study conducted now would be useful as people have more distance from the controversy associated with the treatment and the Fourmile Fire.

Brett Wolk – Measuring Success

- Achievable goals are important for any landscape restoration or community protection treatment to avoid undesirable outcomes and increase the chance of success.
- Achievable goals matter, because they set realistic expectations for treatments, encourage the creation of detailed operation plans, and determine the kind and extent of post-project monitoring.
- Goals encourage practitioners to state their definition of success and recognize potential and conflicting goals before any tangible actions occur.
- Creating a detailed action plan for landscape-level treatments should be detailed enough to accomplish the intended goals but still work within a range of basal areas, as the range is more important than the average.
- Treatments should be dynamic, a characteristic that can only be measured by monitoring over time.
- The Upper South Platte Partnership (USPP) is unique because it is coordinating and maximizing activities and impacts for landscape resilience, fire-adapted communities, and fire-response, the three legs of the USFS's Cohesive Strategy.
- The USPP has been working to create a shared understanding of treatment success for the three legs of the Cohesive Strategy by compiling information and agreements from existing sources; however, the landscape resilience section is much more developed as there is a larger body of work for this category as compared to the other two.
- Management goals are important when designing a treatment, but understanding the reason behind them is imperative; for example, reducing crown fire is often identified as a management goal, because it reduces fire intensity and severity.
- Understanding the reasoning behind management goals is the best way to realize that there are many appropriate actions that may actually accomplish the same goal.
- The goals table Mr. Wolk is creating defines the range of treatment options while exposing similarities and differences between treatments and the associated goals with the intention of helping to create well thought-out projects with more successful outcomes.

- The FRRT has worked on mastication issues in the past, but the process, including identifying goals, was not completed; Mr. Wolk is hoping to complete a draft of the mastication document by the end of April.

Small Group Discussions

After hearing the different examples of success from the panelists' presentations, participants broke into small groups and discussed how to define success. Below are summaries of these discussions, broken down by question.

What are common ways your table defines "success"? What are some key differences? What influences these definitions?

- Ecological treatments that are successful have meaningful impacts and outcomes that are appropriate for their size and scale.
- Prescriptive and performance definitions of success are different depending on goals and can be linked; linkage is not guaranteed, especially if other values are factored into the equation.
- Some definitions of success are descriptive while others are performance-based.
- An example of prescriptive success would be reducing basal area.
- An example of performance success could be a certain percentage of tree-stand survival under certain types of weather conditions.
- Success is a process that includes stakeholders.
- Success is having groups with different goals come together in the spirit of collaboration.
- Science and monitoring inform success and adaptive strategies.
- Collaboration with open minds and support between agencies, scientists, researchers, fire defense, etc., increase the chance of success.
- A plan helps to define success.
- Specific definitions of success are different for different efforts, such as increasing the chance of tree survival after a fire or gaining neighborhood support for treatments.
- Success means accomplishing the intended goals.
- Success may be subjective depending on the goals and conditions of a project, and this is fine.
- A project can fail at its intended goals, but as long as the results are analyzed for lessons learned, the project can still be a success.
- The Roundtable is unique in how it allows different stakeholders to come together to collaborate and share science.
- To create a larger definition of success, the Roundtable must define consensus to address some of the more prominent, but untouched, underlying issues in the community.
- A project or organization can be successful even it does not accomplish its intended goals.
- Success can be defined by assessing collaboration, specific needs, science support through monitoring, or creating a plan or guidance document.
- There are many ways to measure success, such as treatment success, measurable outcomes, adaptive management, social challenges, and use of consensus.
- Success can be defined as working toward and achieving common, measurable goals through the integration of a diverse group of ideas and concepts.
- Success can be defined as restoring fire regimes and functionality of ecosystems while protecting communities and infrastructure.
- Success for the Roundtable can be defined as engaging policy makers in the Roundtable, completing an evaluation of recent research and implementation practices, and applying restoration concepts and science to on-the-ground activities.

- Broad success can be defined as still having a forest after a fire.

If there are different definitions of success among Roundtable members, is that okay? Why or why not?

- Success will be measured differently, as some variables are quantifiable while others are not.
- It is okay if success is defined differently, as there is power in the diversity of opinions.
- It is fine if success is different, as long as everyone is striving for linkages and has flexibility toward different ideas.
- Projects can fail to accomplish their intended goals and still be successful, as not meeting goals could be related to uncertainty or risks associated with certain elements of the project or the situation.
- Some members will be more concerned about ecological impacts, while others are focused on social impacts.
- Often, the larger definitions of success between members will be similar, but more specific definitions will be different.
- It is acceptable for members to have different definitions of success, as long as there is a safe space to have this debate.
- Scale largely impacts definitions of success.
- It is acceptable to have different definitions of success, as different people bring in a variety of perspectives and ideologies, and they all provide for a richer and more collaborative result.
- It is okay to have different definitions of success, especially if the Roundtable is striving to be a body of knowledge that informs others; the Roundtable needs to refine its definitions of success to inform better management over time.
- The social dimension of fire on a landscape relies on being effective communicators.

What tradeoffs exist between different definitions of success and what drives (or should drive) which tradeoffs are made in a given context?

- Tradeoffs are okay, but there must be a meaningful impact.
- Common tradeoffs include financial outcomes, social outcomes, and political outcomes.
- Tradeoffs may depend on scale.
- Money and aesthetics are tradeoffs, which can impact treatment longevity and effectiveness.
- Fire is crucial for land health, but it also has large, negative social impacts for communities.
- Satisfaction and optimization are tradeoffs.
- Tradeoffs depend on how much risk will be taken with each project, and they should be identified and agreed upon beforehand, creating an operational guideline.
- Tradeoffs depend on a willingness to take risks and are often not absolute.
- Monitoring should be used to ensure treatments are effective and make sure organizations are utilizing adaptive management techniques.
- Fire is crucial for land, but there are negative impacts of fire like death and loss of houses.

Does success look different for community protection versus landscape restoration? If so, how?

- The CPT and LRT are going to view success differently.
- There are more resources and political support available for WUI projects.
- Success looks different for community protection and landscape restoration.
- Success is complicated within a community.
- Success can be different depending on physical location.
- Ideally, success should be the same for community protection and landscape restoration.

- Success does look different for these two types of work and is a question of whether certain goals have metrics that can be defined.
- To compare the success of projects with many dissimilar variables, decisions should be matricized to help define numeric and non-numeric goals.
- The goals table will be a good way to start looking at the universe of treatments rather than always thinking of these issues as community protection versus landscape resilience.
- CPT and LRT goals should be the same, which may require broadening the scope of each project type to ensure it takes the other into consideration.
- Defensible space concepts are focused on protecting the home, and that is socially acceptable; landscape restoration work can fill in between communities according to ecological guidelines.
- Definitions of success for these two types of work depend on the social environment and the population density in the WUI.
- Different definitions of success will become even more evident as landscape restoration and community protection practitioners being to delve further into mixed-conifer ecosystems.
- There is tension between restoration for ecological land health and impacts on communities.

How should the Roundtable think about success going forward?

- The Roundtable will be successful if it can help people apply a body of knowledge on the ground.
- Members may have different strategies, but the Roundtable can help people further define goals and do better work.
- The Roundtable should focus on outreach, particularly working with groups and agencies that have different knowledge and perspectives, and getting the Roundtable message of challenges in the upper and lower montane out to professionals and the public via white papers or the media.
- Success is situational and will vary based on social, natural, and financial resources.
- The Roundtable needs to work to protect communities and resources.
- The Roundtable should think about success in terms of measurable goals and outcomes.
- The Roundtable should not get hung up on details as to not overshadow larger goals and successes; this will ensure that the needle is moving in the correct direction.
- The Roundtable must have a plan to define success other than the 2006 document.
- There is no need to make all goals quantifiable, but the Roundtable should work to define the goals that do need to be quantified.
- The Roundtable offers a unique opportunity to get together many types of people and organizations who have the ability to think about problems in different ways.
- Details should not overshadow progress in moving the needle forward.
- The Roundtable should identify its audience, learn from past implementations, and utilize adaptive management through monitoring in the future.
- The Roundtable should question and ensure that there is progress being made in meeting currently identified goals before moving on.
- The Roundtable must identify what the group can agree on and do collectively while also identifying how each agency should contribute.
- Other organizations can come in and do presentations to help give the Roundtable more social and political leverage.
- The Roundtable must help to increase organizational capacity for prescriptive fire at all levels, but particularly encouraging the development of more professional wildfire people at the local level.

- The Roundtable should capitalize on the professional understanding and support for prescription fire on public lands and work with neighbors who are adjacent to public lands.
- The Roundtable should operate as one singular group rather than a loose association of separate organizations.

Goals for the Front Range Roundtable

After discussing the differing definitions of success, Roundtable participants identified the need to define the Roundtable's role in creating progress. Using previously created CPT, LRT, and FRRT goals, participants, discussed the following points:

- Many of the previously identified goals overlap with definitions of success, such as elevating and increasing recognition of the Roundtable.
- When the Roundtable was created in 2004, the Front Range Fuels Treatment Partnership did all the actual work, but this is not the case anymore; the Roundtable must transition into a new role to remain relevant.
- The Roundtable must decide its next area of impact to help practitioners deal with community and public push back for landscape and community resiliency work.
- There is a large social element to all these treatments, and the Roundtable exists in a unique way that it can help move policies, decisions, and perceptions in a more liberal direction.
- The vision of the Roundtable is already cross-boundary, although there may be subtleties between organizations that seem to be bigger problems than they actually are.
- Individual organizations are an easier target for negative public perception than a collaborative group, such as the Roundtable; the Roundtable must do everything possible to leverage mutual support between organizations and agencies.
- The goals and outcomes table will be a useful tool to better inform the public and begin to shift perception.
- The Roundtable has struggled in the past with identifying forums to engage in and inform outside conversations, but taking the necessary science and information to the public in a cohesive manner needs to happen now.
- Brett Wolk created the goals table to identify how landscape restoration treatments interact with Zones 1 and 2 and to encourage thinking that treatments are continuous and feed into each other.
- The goals table is more efficient for this group rather than a treatment-by-treatment table, because at a higher level, the overarching goals are more important than the specific tool used to reach these goals.
- Community protection and landscape restoration work may sometimes have different objectives, but there will also be times when they overlap and share defined goals and outcomes.
- Prescription-based goals are different than performance-based goals; the goals table is looking to define performance-based goals so that the Roundtable can collectively speak to a singular message.
- Each Roundtable member organization needs to clarify what they can do to define a direction for a work plan.
- By the end of the year, each organization should specifically state what they can contribute to help the Roundtable accomplish its goals by 2020.
- The next few quarterly meetings could focus on contributions to the Roundtable's goals, making 2016 the year of planning for larger successes.
- The goals identified in the 2006 report have not all been realized; perhaps these goals should be incorporated into the long-term work plan.

Considering the above points, the Executive Team will work to tee up a conversation regarding larger FRRT goals for the June Q2 meeting.

Front Range Roundtable Name

Members have stated that the current name of the FRRT is not descriptive of what the group actually does and makes raising awareness about the work of the Roundtable difficult. Before the meeting, participants were asked to electronically submit suggestions for new names; submissions are listed below.

- Southern Rockies Managers United for Resilient Forested Systems (SMURFS)
- Colorado Forest Health Improvement Project
- Front Range Forest Roundtable (FRFRT)
- Fire Resilient Front Range (FR2)
- Front Range Forest and Community Resilience Roundtable

Participants indicated their name preferences using sticky dots, and Front Range Forest Roundtable received the most votes. However after discussing the suggested names, members did not support any of them without further discussion; the group was divided if the name should reflect an overall focus on forests or on fire. Participants will continue to think of new name ideas and will discuss the change again at the Q2 meeting in June. Heather Bergman will send out another online survey asking for name ideas before the Q2 June meeting.

Logistics

NFF Field Trip

The LRT, on behalf of the FRRT, is organizing a field trip as part of the upcoming Collaborative Restoration Workshop in April. The conference is focused on collaboration with the Forest Service, as well as other actors. Non-USFS employees who would like to participate in the workshop can sign up at <https://www.nationalforests.org/collaboration-resources/collaborative-restoration-workshop>. The workshop will address many of the ideas with which the Roundtable is currently grappling.

Membership Lists

At the 2015 Q4 meeting, participants agreed to begin signing membership agreements if they wish to remain involved in the Roundtable. Members of the Roundtable will now be on a separate email list that will receive meeting agendas and summaries as well as documents still in a draft form. They will also be able to participate in decision points, should they arise. Participants who have not signed a membership agreement will only receive meeting agendas and summaries and will not be able to participate in decision points. Anyone interested in becoming a member can contact Katie Waller at Katie@peakfacilitation.com for a membership agreement.

Protocol Changes and Executive Team Membership

To reflect current practices, the Executive Team decided at their last meeting to clarify that to be eligible for Executive Team membership participants must represent an organization that has been active in the Roundtable for at least one year, but they do not have to have been personally active for one year. This change will be reflected in the protocols document going forward.

At the end of the 2015 Q4 meeting, Pat Gayner of Markit! Forestry volunteered to serve on the Executive Team as a representative of the general membership. Roundtable members approved his nomination, and he will serve on the Roundtable going forward.

Legislative Updates

For a full list of legislative updates, please see attached Legislative Updates provided by Boulder County.

HB16-1019 – Broadcast Burns Watershed Protection

This bill allows Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS) grant funding to be used for broadcast burns. It was passed on 3/3/2016.

HB16-1052 – Wildfire Mitigation Income Tax Credit

This bill would have changed the wildfire mitigation income tax deduction to the wildfire mitigation income tax credit. It did not pass.

BH16-1255 – Manage Forest to Improve Water Supply Condition

This bill directs the CSFS to work with the USFS to implement forest management treatments to improve forest health and supply forest products to Colorado businesses that target a Colorado watershed and also creates a forest health advisory council within the CSFS. This bill has passed the House of Representatives and will move on to the Senate.