



RESPONSES TO CFLR COALITION SURVEY ON COLLABORATION

1. **CFLR landscape name:** Colorado Front Range
2. **Number of people who participated in responding to the questions and what types of interests were included in the group that responded:** 36 people representing the following stakeholder categories – science/academic, county government, state and federal agencies, local governments, environmental and conservation organizations, the academic and scientific communities, and industry and user groups.
3. **Name and email of the person providing the collaborative's response:** Gali Beh, facilitator for the Front Range Roundtable, gali@behconsulting.com.
4. **Organizations with a stake in our CFLR project are engaged or have been invited to participate in the collaborative group. *Strongly Agree:*** We have strong and consistent representation from most of our target stakeholder categories, but we are light on representation from the following categories: planning, recreation, insurance, and fire response. We have reached out to groups in these categories, and sometimes members of these groups attend Roundtable quarterly meetings, but there is not consistent representation especially on working teams.
5. **People in our collaborative are willing to work toward agreement on important aspects of our project. *Agree:*** The people in our collaborative have high levels of trust and the collaborative has had a positive influence on internal relationships. However, there is some concern about philosophical differences and a need to see results.
6. **People in this group communicate openly with one another. *Agree:*** We strongly agree that we have open and frequent communications and regularly scheduled meetings and phone calls. There are also frequent informal side conversations between members.
7. **The people who lead this collaborative group communicate well with all of the members. *Agree:*** We meet four times per year as an entire Roundtable. We receive relevant news articles.
8. **Our CFLR project is up to date on how implementation is progressing. *Agree:*** We have had good reporting to the Roundtable on implementation progress, at Quarterly meetings and at sub-team meetings. Reporting documents are available online.
9. **Implementation of treatments is in alignment with our CFLR project objectives. *Agree:*** We have a challenge of "disappearing acres," which is when an area is designated on a high level map as a possible project area but when we get on the ground, it is not appropriate strategically or operationally. Another challenge is that our CFLR project is following previously approved NEPA plans, which have to be followed as written. Finally, we have a continuing desire to see more prescribed burning used.
10. **Project implementation is moving the landscape toward more resilient ecosystems. *Don't Know:*** We believe that project implementation is moving the landscape toward more resilient ecosystems, but we don't know for sure yet because the monitoring is in progress. It's still too early to know the results of the project as far as forest restoration goals, which are longer term, but we do believe the project is reducing the threat of uncharacteristic fire. This project will only treat 1-5% of the affected forest landscape, so

additional work is needed to have landscape scale impact.

11. More restoration is happening on the ground as a result of the collaboration.

Strongly Agree: We definitely see that more treatments are happening, but we need to do more monitoring to know that restoration is happening, especially since we are still defining desired conditions.

12. CFLR project participants do a good job of following through on collaborative agreements.

Strongly Agree: Members are very committed and productive, within limits due to workloads and time constraints. Some people "come and go" but there is a core group of dedicated members.

13. The collaborative group's participation improves the Forest Service's decision-making process.

Agree: Collaboration is helping the Forest Service make better decisions. USFS members reported at our last meeting that the Roundtable input "does change the decisions, and moderates decisions." The Roundtable is working on an adaptive management process. The input into the USFS is more robust.

14. The collaborative group's participation improves the Forest Service's project implementation.

Strongly Agree: The USFS is very willing to adapt monitoring methods, based on the recommendations of the Roundtable's Landscape Restoration team. Roundtable members do have an influence, within the decision space allowed (acknowledging that the USFS is bound to follow previous legal documents). Since most CFLR projects were previously NEPA-approved, the Roundtable can only start influencing implementation (such as where or how to implement forest treatments) until future years of NEPA preparation. The Roundtable members are and will be involved in shaping future projects through new NEPA processes.

15. Please add any additional comments: The Front Range Roundtable feels strongly that we're making good progress overall (although we'd like more prescribed burning). We feel the Colorado Front Range is a good investment for treatment funding. The CFLR project was planned as a long-term investment with the understanding that it would take years to learn the results of landscape scale efforts. This experiment was based on a 10-year plan; it shouldn't be stopped midway. Collaboratives are "hard, slow and messy," but they are worth it. There is no instant gratification.