

# MINUTES FROM FRONT RANGE ROUNDTABLE Q1-11 QUARTERLY MEETING



**Date of meeting:** Friday, March 4, 2011, 9:30 am – 3:30 pm

**Location:** The Colorado Mountain Club, 710 10th Street, Golden CO

**Date minutes posted:** May 9, 2011

**Roundtable contact:** Gali Beh, c/o Beh Management Consulting, Inc., 1107 12<sup>th</sup> St., Boulder CO 80302, 303-499-1576, [gali@behconsulting.com](mailto:gali@behconsulting.com)

**Meeting presentation:** [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/Roundtable\\_Q1-11\\_Quarterly\\_Meeting\\_minutes\\_final\\_030411.pdf](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/Roundtable_Q1-11_Quarterly_Meeting_minutes_final_030411.pdf)

## CONTENTS (IN ORDER OF AGENDA TOPIC)

Acknowledgements.....	1
Attendees .....	1
Review of Roundtable vision and progress against 2010 goals.....	2
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) .....	5
Overview of Program: .....	5
Implementation at ARNF.....	7
Implementation of PSICC.....	7
Monitoring team and new Roundtable effort – Defining Adaptive Management Process.....	10
New Roundtable effort: Defining Ecological Restoration Objectives.....	13
Discussion.....	13
updates by working teams and proposed goals for 2011 .....	19
Mapping & Implementation Team .....	19
Outreach and Policy Team.....	20
Biomass Utilization.....	21
Propose, Discuss and Prioritize Goals for Remainder Of 2011 .....	22

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Chelsea Gunsalus who took notes for these minutes. Thank you also to the Colorado Mountain Club for hosting us in their facility.

## ATTENDEES

At the Front Range Roundtable Quarterly meeting in Golden, Colorado on March 4, 2011, 40 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](mailto:gali@behconsulting.com).

**Table 1. Roundtable Meeting Attendees, March 4, 2011—Golden, Colorado**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Kathy Andrew	El Paso County
Greg Aplet	The Wilderness Society
Mike Babler	The Nature Conservancy
Mike Battaglia	US Forest Service
Gali Beh	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Michele Bratschun	Colorado State University
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey
Peter Brown	Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research
Glenn Casamassa	US Forest Service, ARP
John Chapman	Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance
Jeanna Childers	US Forest Service-Region 2
Erica Churgin	Environmental Energy Partners
Jessica Clement	Colorado State University
Megan Davis	Boulder County
Joe Duda	Colorado State Forest Service
Richard (Dick) Edwards	US Forest Service
Jonas Feinstein	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Susan Ford	US Forest Service-Region 2
Cheri Ford	US Forest Service
Hal Gibbs	US Forest Service, ARP
Faye Griffin	Jefferson County
Chelsea Gunsalus	US Forest Service, ARP
Craig Hansen	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jim Ignatius	Teller County
Jeff Jahnke	Colorado State Forest Service
Craig Jones	Colorado State Forest Service
Don Kennedy	Denver Water
Paige Lewis	The Nature Conservancy
Ryan Ludlow	Boulder County
Jerri Marr	US Forest Service, PSICC
Andy Merritt	US House of Representatives
Dave Oettinger	Anchor Point Fire Management
Ben Pearlman	Boulder County
John Peterson	US Forest Service, PSICC
Todd Richardson	Bureau of Land Management
Rocky Smith	Colorado Wild
Carl Spaulding	Colorado Timber Industry Association
John Tighe	BOCC – Park County
Jeff Underhill	US Forest Service, PSICC
Scott Woods	Colorado State Forest Service

## **REVIEW OF ROUNDTABLE VISION AND PROGRESS AGAINST 2010 GOALS**

**Speaker:** Gali Beh, Roundtable Facilitator

- The Front Range Roundtable (FRR) formed in 2004 with the **mission** to “serve as a focal point for diverse stakeholder input into efforts to reduce wildland fire risks and improve forest health through sustained fuels treatment along the Colorado Front Range.”
- The scope included as many stakeholder groups into the discussion as possible. The FRR has four voting days a year.

- The **vision** was agreed on in 2006: 1.5 million acres require treatments to accomplish the mission. The acreage overlaps with Front Range Fuels Treatment Partnership, half of the counties of the Northern Front Range Mountain Pine Beetle Work Group (NFRMPBWG), and the Colorado Watershed Wildfire Protection Work Group (CWWPWG). The FRR should ensure the working teams have a member from each of the groups it works with.
- **Roundtable organization:** The FRR partners with three Front Range groups (including the Front Range Fuels Treatment Partnership (FRFTP), and contains five working teams: four are Roundtable-focused and one is focused on the Colorado Front Range Landscape Restoration Initiative (CFLRP).
- **FRR priorities accomplished:**
  - When the group got through the strategic planning process, lands were organized and prioritized by the level of importance and difficulty.
  - Four working teams were set up.
  - One of the 2010 priorities was to redefine the group's purpose, which was accomplished: The FRR decided to stay focused on lower montane.
  - Other accomplished priorities include: clarifying working relationships the with FRFTP, NFRMPBWG, and CWWPWG.
  - The FRR membership has also expanded as hoped.
- All of the **working teams' 2010 goals** are either completed or in progress:
  - Executive team led successful creation of CFLR proposal and improved / documented the FRR structure.
  - The IM team recreated the 2006 map and overlaid it with the maps of the NFRMPB and CWWPWG groups. It also sent out an RFI to communities and is now in the community selection process, seeking a long-term community implementation partnership.
  - The Outreach team held events shown in presentation and created all communications needed for the events. The team also reviewed progress against initiatives. When the FRR recommended 10 initiatives in 2006, those were broken down into 44 actions, The team assessed whether the actions were taken since then and if we are happy with the results. The team members also inform each other about outreach opportunities.
  - Biomass team wrote letters of support for grant applications and helped assess biomass utilization across Front Range.
  - SM team is now on hiatus because all members joined CFLRP monitoring team. They defined more than 50 terms and definitions that the Front Range forest collaborative use in common, and evaluated the progress of forest treatments in 2006 mapped priority areas. The group will figure out how CFLRP monitoring should work.
  - The initiatives from 2006 were broken down into 10 initiatives. The progress on these initiatives is under review. We need more work on #4 "Increase appropriate application of prescribed fire and wildland fire use as a management tool," and #5 "Increase utilization of woody biomass for facility heating." Try to increase biomass utilization in the 4 (of the 10 FRR counties) that have no bio-heating or bio-use facilities. Those using them are happy. Limiting growth of fire risk in WUI needs to be addressed also.
- **2010 priorities that were not accomplished** were:

- Acknowledge or celebrate progress (no time) and the incorporation into a nonprofit group (decided against). The fiscal agent for the FRR is the Arapaho-Roosevelt National Forest Foundation.
- **2011 goals** will be set today.

### Goals for 2011:

- Executive Team: No goals set yet.[correction since March 4: the Executive Team will lead the effort to form a coalition to recommend policy solutions for reducing risk in the WUI]
- IM Team: Select one of more communities to partner with on developing scopes of work and implementation roles for each partner; develop a project plan and attract funding for turn-key project around at least one highest priority landscape identified.
- OP: Come up with policy proposals to pass to state or county legislators, plan and implement visits to Washington, D.C. by FRR delegates; hold field tour of Fourmile fire in August for elected officials.
- BUSS: Update talking points. The group wants to hold at least one workshop this year. What do we all agree on about biomass utilization? Continue to track county status. Meet once per month by phone.
- CFLRP Monitoring: Developing ecological, economic, and social monitoring plan
- (Proposed) Process Team: Help FRR agree on collaborative management process that will guide Roundtable in resolving conflict. Other issues: Need to have a protocol for conflict resolution particularly during the IM Team community selection process. The team needs to know how to deal with disgruntled community members, if any.
- (Proposed) Restoration Metrics Team – Research target metrics for ecological restoration in lower montane. Looking for numbers to tell us what we're supposed to get through.

Currently there are differences of opinion resulting in conflict:

- What is ecological restoration in Lower Montane? Some believe that we should ensure varying age classes while reducing basal and crown areas even if that means removing some large trees, while others feel that we should always preserve old growth, and favor larger trees while thinning from below.
- What collaboration is required by CFLRP? Requires collaborative monitoring as well as implementation or just collaborative monitoring?
- What are the obligations of Roundtable members to one another and to Roundtable “consensus”? All partners have own missions and own needs. The group is looking to see where the zone of agreement exists. Organizations aren't always pleased with others actions. Do we have an obligation to each other or do we go home and do what our individual organization expects?
- What does landowner opposition mean? Boulder County was wise about Bald Mountain where landowners were originally upset. Could MPB in ponderosa show USFS was wise at Taylor Mountain even though landowners are upset?
- How should differences on the Roundtable be addressed? Some want to emphasize open dialogue at meetings and field trips while others prefer to put differences in writing, such as articles, press releases, and letters.

### Q&A

When you went through progress made, Goal #7 says “needs attention” – a lot of work has been done in reducing fire hazard but that particular point talks to risk and has more to do with houses and defensible space. There is difference between risk and hazard. What's the probability of something bad happening versus how bad is it?

- How will the FRR address this issue? **Recommended actions:** *include wildfire component in community land use plans and educational materials provided to applicants.*
- Conflict resolution needed? No time set to address? *Work has been done and new teams will try to address the conflicts. It can't be resolved talking in one day; research is required and the group can revisit.*

## COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION PROGRAM (CFLRP)

### Overview of Program:

**Speaker:** Paige Lewis, TNC

- CFLRP was established in 2009 under an omnibus bill; it was authorized at \$40 million a year for 10 years as a new program within USFS. The program is allowed to have 10 projects per year. In the initial year, \$10 million was appropriated.
- The purpose was to fund large-scale collaborative, ecologically based restoration projects. The intent was to drive funding to larger-scale restoration projects.
- The eligibility criteria included projects based on a landscape restoration strategy, which many projects didn't already have in place. This program favored groups like the FRR.
- The proposal had to:
  - Contemplate at least 10 years and 50,000+ acres.
  - Production of by-products with biomass
  - Maintenance of large/old trees with no new roads and decommissioning of old roads
  - Hazardous fuels treatments were to restore the landscape to ecologically characteristic fire behavior.
- **Funding restrictions** – The funds can only be used on NFS lands (no planning costs). 50% is covered for implementation and monitoring and the USFS must match costs.
- 15 year monitoring plan (5 years beyond project)
- 2010 project selection – FACA committee selected 10 projects – Colorado (2), Washington (1), Oregon (1), California (1), Idaho (1), Montana (1), New Mexico (1), Arizona (1), and Florida (1).
  - Although there weren't many proposals from the eastern states, there are many proposals from the eastern states for the next round.
- The FRR had many of the required criteria for the proposals already in place.
- The primary people who worked on the direct application were Sara Mayben, Hal Gibbs and Paige Lewis with a core team of people that would be engaged from CSFS, Denver Water, CUSP, Boulder County, Teller County, and from areas where the FRR has been focusing on the ground. The team came up with ideas to put into the proposal.
  - They looked at 800,000 acres in the FRR areas that were for ecological restoration. Two forests identified 32,000 acres that they felt could be restored through project proposal.
- Proposed treatments were focused in areas that were already existing focus areas for the FRR to continue to have a landscape scale impact. The team worked with the Healthy Forest Initiative and Boulder County to look at where NEPA-ready projects were within restoration areas.
- The team was also looking to maximize by-product utilization and job opportunities.
- The CFLR requires the proponents to monitor results and practice adaptive management strategies.

- The proposal was meant to build on the FRR foundation. The Long Term Stewardship Contract helped identify where restoration areas would be and the CFLR identified an additional 1,000-3,000 on top of the stewardship contract.
  - The FRR could leverage up to 100,000 acres on federal lands and 65,000 on non-federal.
- The FRR is a multi-party monitoring body.
- Objectives are scattered throughout the proposal:
  - Creating a more mosaic-like land pattern
  - Decreasing density
  - Increasing prescribed fire
  - Looking at invasive plants
  - Strategically placing treatments (metrics team now defining with #s)
  - Hazardous fuels
  - Ecological restoration
- In FY10, the Forest Service didn't receive the money until August, but four projects were accomplished on 3,500 acres.
- CFLRP helped Denver Water partnership with FS.
- The CFLR Coalition is trying to advocate for CFLR program at the national level. If the program only gets \$10 million in 2011, it won't fully fund the initial 10 projects. It will take at least \$20 million to fully fund the initial 10 projects and more money will be required to fund more projects. The CFLR Coalition can be contacted at [cflrcoalition@gmail.com](mailto:cflrcoalition@gmail.com). It is a good opportunity for Colorado because it has two projects.

## Q&A

The Long Term Stewardship Contract covers a lot of projects that are outside the CFLR. Do you know when the projects will be selected and the appropriations will occur? *There is no date set. With the 2011 Continuing Resolution, there is a good chance at least \$10 million will be appropriated as it was last year. There is movement in the Senate to try to get \$40 million in the Senate's version. The CFLR is proposed for full funding in the FY12 budget.*

Because the budget is so unknown, is there any chance of there not being more projects selected? *The Forest Service is still considering proposals as if they will be able to fund the projects. If only \$10 million is appropriated, the projects from FY2010 will get funded first and if there is money remaining, other projects will be added. It is easier to ramp down than ramp up.*

Are there any reporting requirements for the FACA committee? *The USFS has annual reporting requirements; The FACA committee created questions it would like projects to answer. The reports are available online.*

In terms of the outreach component to support appropriations, where is discussion/strategizing going on? *The team hasn't talked about it in a lot of detail except the D.C. trips. The outreach team is in place to have input on what gets said in D.C. This is the kind of program that should have broad appeal that we should be able to save in spite of the budget cuts, but it will require work. The initial effort for the FY11 Continuing Resolution, organizations contacted Senators to ask for full funding; both Senators in Colorado supported full funding. Local commissioners should contact their*

*local officials. The Pikes Peak Region has a coalition that hires federal lobbyists. This program made the top-ten list to take to D.C. to lobby for money. Keep track of who is sending messages.*

*How much is the delegation hearing to be more coordinated? The Nat'l Association of Counties is having a national meeting; local counties send delegation, which is on the radar of Colorado delegations.*

## **CFLRP Implementation at ARNF**

**Speaker:** Hal Gibbs, USFS

What contracts does USFS works under? Map of CFLR area – the boundary was established through the FRR restoration zone. When the proposal was put together, the map made it easy for consideration of acres. Proposed projects are identified on the map. Any projects beyond three years are difficult to predict and guess work comes into play; the estimated projects are subject to change.

**ARNF** – In the area near Red Feather Lakes, the FRR restoration zone doesn't overlap very well. The lower montane was cut off at 7500 feet in Larimer County, but it doesn't necessarily correspond to what's on the ground. This needs to be put into consideration by the monitoring group. There is ponderosa in the lower Montane that need to be considered. Southern Larimer County in the Johnny Park area was identified. Boulder County has a very scattered land pattern, but the areas the group is proposing to treat is south of Boulder, near Jamestown and Ward.

## **CFLRP Implementation of PSICC**

**Speaker:** Jeff Underhill, USFS

The proposed unit boundaries were identified, but it is still a work in progress. PSICC is trying to implement the Phantom Creek project area, which is part of Trout West through the Long Term Stewardship Contract. Another project is being worked on right now with the intent to award it next year and another for the following year. The work is anticipated to start up in June. The scale of all three potential task orders is approximately 4,200 acres. They include a range of removing saw timber size material, all products other than lumber, pole size range, and biomass. The task orders include mastication and some areas would only allow hand crew treatment (conifer removal in Aspen clones).

Two other project areas are just analysis boundaries. The Catamount project is a 100,000-acre analysis boundary. The decision was signed two weeks ago for 21,000 acres proposed with a full range of treatments. The South Rampart project is in its early stages. Started out with Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative. The intent is to include prescribed burning, but it is likely it won't occur until 2013. Once at that point, look at prescribed burning as a follow up treatment to places where mechanical treatment already occurred or in lower density areas as primary treatment mechanism.

**Q&A**

3 units north of Woodland Park? *There are treatments by experimental forest. Projects from EA – NNW of Divide. Phantom area – one project called Manchester.*

Recent decision signed for 21,000 area for Catamount project? *On public website. Jeff will get it out.*

- Slides that address process and data collection – Geared to stewardship contract Preparation: Prescriptions start during planning and get more detailed as the process moves along. Somewhere between analysis and post decision, site-specific prescriptions are developed.
  - Layout (exclude operable ground)
  - Cruising - specific to specifications in Long Term Stewardship Contract; it is not designed to capture the full range of attributes as with the stand exam. Look at service level and consistency with prescription as task order is developed with other data collection
  - Task Order/Contract Prep – compilation of data and writing task order, trying to implement through designation by prescription as much as possible. Once the task order and contract is turned over to the contractor, activity begins out on the ground.

## Q&A

Do site-specific look before prescription? *Site-specific look is during prescription. Begin looking at the beginning of the NEPA process. Even within one unit boundary, there are several stands with different conditions that need to be looked at/considered, which is part of the prescription. Cruising occurs during the process once the prescription has been developed. Determine what's out there, how many stumps per acre, volume (part of Long Term Stewardship Contract) because the Forest Service gets credits for value of saw timber. Stand exam before and after cruising. Stand exam does feed prescription work. Ahead of prescriptions, the NEPA process proposal development occurs, stand exam data is collected, and then the area is looked at from silviculture and fuels perspective but still at a course level. Closer to implementation, keep drilling down to more detail.*

Not relying on existing data, out there collecting site-specific data? *It varies; sometimes the database shows collected data and it can be used for some work, but some areas don't have anything.*

- Accounting & Budget: The budget uncertainty continues and the Forest Service/CFLR probably won't know until April or May what the final budget will be. It creates difficulties for planning because if our CFLR project gets \$2.8 million, we have to be prepared to spend the money. CFLR has specific requirements:
  - Have to track matching funds, which has never been done before.
  - Have to track CFLR funds as well.
  - Accountability: The Forest Service produced three reports in last three months to show what has been done. The numbers don't always match up well. Not data normally collected. FS doesn't track restoration acres, don't have reporting for restoration. Hazardous fuels reduction,



- fire risk, etc. but nothing about acres restored in reports. Pointed out to WO.
- Staffing – Difficult to get things done if don't know how much money. Other things going on with the forest. CFLR project only about 10% of total treated acres, even if go up to 1,300 acres, it's still not a large chunk. Two forests are at capacity unless increase workforce. Denver Water entered into MOU with Pike, WR and ARF in watersheds, bark beetle work, etc. creates constraints on ability to complete work.
- Prescribed fire – both forests working on – air quality constraints. Lucky to do the little burning done each year. Ownership patterns are an issue, people don't like burning next to property. Only certain times of year that appropriate to start fire. Meeting to discuss smoke in a few weeks.
- Mountain Pine Beetle is the real constraint on ARNF – If FS does something and something else happens that makes people wonder why, that's what FS hears. If choose wrongly, will hear about it. Showing progression of mortality. Most lodge pole stands had some level of activity in 2009. Infested ponderosa pine mortality had a significant increase in North. Ponderosa mortality is more 20-25%; concern bugs will expand outward. Extent of ponderosa effects if uncertain.
- **Monitoring considerations** – 40-50 trees per acre as a target from the Roundtable report? – Didn't achieve at Taylor Mtn. At what level? Landscape? Per stand? Metrics or Monitoring team needs to work on.

## Q&A

More large, old ponderosa spaced fairly far apart? What does “fairly far apart” mean? Another issue for group to deal with. Cut large trees in project, Does more mean higher percentage of trees? Needs to be defined to determine if moving in right direction. Done any fire modeling in prescriptive approaches? *Do fire modeling in planning stages; some projects more intensive than others. NFR have fire models that are really dependent on which way the wind is blowing. Monitored wind out of the West, met with volunteer fire departments, worried about SE winds. Different scales – looking how stand structures and conditions, crown/base height, density etc. Had effect to go from most likely active crown fire to surface fire – need to look at it.*

Maybe a way to answer to commissioners – tell what risk is, if don't commit to point of risk, will speak to stands. We need to stand up to public and speak to what the risks are within the forests. Address resolution of how to speak to risks.

*Showing what was in FRR report. Trying to avoid too much technical – look at landscape and stand levels. Scattered open meadows? May want to leave some trees, what size of meadows, how many, etc., need to be defined. “Rich understory”? What is that defined as? Mixed fire severity regime trending toward low severity surface fires? Can use fire modeling potentially.*

- **Economic and Social Monitoring** – increase biomass to offset costs. Need to see what impact having on biomass. Social issues related to removal of biomass.

Have to have area where gathered and hauled. Causes issues because of negative effects to lands. The more we process and utilize biomass, the more area needed to process on-site. Need larger areas for processing, utilizing almost all materials. If different products coming out, have to separate products. Transportation is different for chips than logs. Road systems have to be adjusted to economically get material out. Three different types of products in Taylor Mountain project.

- **Data Collection:** Data collected early in planning process for CFLRP going to do pre- and post-treatment plots. Cruising is based on specifications in contract, different sampling design than typical data collection
  - Common stand exam data – 1 plot per 10 acres usually. Collecting more data or looking at more attributes. For cruising, 1 plot per 5 acres.
    - Tree data – variable plots to measure larger trees, end result basal area
    - Vegetative composition – shrubs, grasses, for, seedlings. Can design different way, down to species level or much coarser
    - Down woody material – loading material.
    - Field verification – verification of veg. layers, generated through remote sensing, site-specific work if verified against veg layers.
  - Tends to occur ahead of planning for proposal development. Try to match up two efforts because designs are different. After implementation, looking at using stand exam – standard protocol, databases, growth and yield software to process.

## Q&A

Field verification – are you verifying GIS layers in database, are veg layers what they say they are? *Operating at coarser level, no basal area in layers, but have cover type and percentage of species. Not greatest gauge for structure out there.*

When have contractor or FS employees verifying it is species GIS layer says it is? Is composition correct? If it states certain size stand, is that true? *Canopy layer verification.*

Done at plot level? *As in stand, more walk through – traverse stand to do field verification. More judgment call than specific measurements. Specific measurements assist in determination.*

Feeding back into the system? *Frequent basis, not occurring, but when updating land-fire data, been going on over recent years. Use stand exam data to verify some data coming up with for land-fire.*

Density? *When looking on the ground, density comes down in smaller stands. Used to have area to enter data, don't know if auto yet, if geo-referenced can provide data.*

## Monitoring team and new Roundtable effort – Defining Adaptive Management Process

**Speaker:** Jessica Clement, CFRI

Update on Monitoring working group – next evolution of science and monitoring group – for FRR.

- Monitoring specifically in relation to CFLRP.
- Multiparty monitoring – collaborative landscape restoration program – how to implement. Brings people with different views and expertise together to deal

with broad landscape-level issues and reduce potential conflict over actions by providing a way for interested groups to discuss and reach agreement. ARNF and PSICC signed agreement with CFRI to convene, facilitate and document multi-stakeholder collaborative process to review relevant science regarding restoration and fuels reduction in ponderosa pine landscapes along Colorado Front Range and, based on this review, design eco monitoring plan.

- Oct. 15 – First meeting proposed process to be able to create monitoring plan. Discussed logistics.
- Nov. – Field trip, looked at past and future treatments, including Taylor Mtn. At each workshop, getting experts to come to table to bring presentations.
- On-going learning: have break-out groups to discuss what it means for CFLRP in terms of monitoring.
- Dec. – Draft of common understanding. Have to know objective of CFLRP. Language providing jumping-off point for metrics.
- Jan. – Presentations in the morning, started drafting. What are core values that come immediately to mind that can be core variables that can be measured over time. Taylor Mtn. illustrated to working group where there is room for increased learning. Based on discussions as result of Taylor Mtn. and based on fact that monitoring group bumping up against need for clarification.
- Gap between FRR and CFLRP how to translate FRR into CFLRP. What are metrics? Proposal created for two FRR groups in March. Suspend monitoring working group, go back to collaborative effort and ask for support to clarify – what Taylor Mtn. showed us, how can reaction of stakeholders feed into adaptive mgmt process, need to know how monitoring working group going to work with FRR over time.
- Feb. – proposed to FS that group was ready to hear from FS and TNC’s perspective, when CFLRP proposal was written, what were you thinking about what restoration means? What does sustainable restoration over time mean? What does collaboration mean? Hal, Jeff, Sarah, etc. presented to monitoring group and will use info to build on for new FRR break-out groups.
- Will the group assist the monitoring group with the following two issues:
  1. Understanding of what restoration means on FR lower elevation ponderosa pine? What does restoration look like? Calling this the metrics team, Gali will lead.
  2. Need process – difference of opinion brought Taylor Mtn. to light. Can be resolved, but need to know how to resolve them using monitoring data. FRR must support and trust collaborative process to resolve. Has to be effective and efficient to FS and CFLRA regulatory and time constraints/budgets. This will be process group. Jessica will lead. Starting on March 8<sup>th</sup>. People interested in talking about fuzzy process. Need as many on board as possible.
- **FRR Process Group** – establish communication framework based on FRR Collaborative. Fine-tuning needs to happen. Collaboration about joint risk-taking and risk-sharing, which allows collaborative learning to emerge.
- What process does the collaborative group agree is fair, efficient and feasible within agency and other constraints that will allow learning to achieve CFLRP objectives?
- Not watchdog over FS – FS is one of many agencies doing projects on Front Range; concerned too much focus on what FS is doing rather than all players.

Needs to be clear that not focused on CFLRP or FS, but collaboration across all lands.

- Showed Monitoring, Process group, Metrics group – What is monitoring group going to do? Place Monitoring group on hold? Monitoring group on hold for March – Monitoring work group can't go any further until receive advice from FRR. If collaborative FRR, monitoring working group is not place where decision takes place about objective of CFLRP. Collaborative must discuss. FRR assists in understanding CFLRP – April monitoring group will continue working on monitoring plan, organize implementation, etc.
- How does monitoring group feed into FRR? Under FRR other things are going on. How fit in with other agencies, working groups, and executive committee? Not sure anymore, don't know what process is and as long as controversies exist, can undermine trust. Proposal is to take March, based on completed work, retune process for what need to do now and clarify objectives of CFLRP.
- March – agree on language (what is collaboration, what is adaptive management, etc.), agree on long-term processes within constraints (decision-making space). Put first iteration of monitoring plan together in May. Under deadline, June or July because FS and partners have to do monitoring pre-treatment. In order to do that, have to have first iteration of monitoring plan completed, have to know objectives to achieve. As long as process is trusted, can go for it. Create something that works for now and then adapt over time. Unless done here, the monitoring group is having trouble knowing what the right variables are. Going to look at metrics simultaneously. Once better idea of how Front Range thinks about metrics and process, it's going to quicken process to put eco-monitoring plan together. Social & economic monitoring has to begin in April. CFRI doing research to start looking at variables.

## Q&A

Whenever have objective, supposed to prioritize to 51-49%, question whether priorities are stated clearly? Step 5 restoration is often in conflict with science. Are we speaking pre-European? Isn't defined any longer in piece of landscape with multiple objectives that counter each other? *Stakeholders in monitoring working group, addressing lower elevation ponderosas, within that restoration and fuels reduction restoring fire behavior are not mutually exclusive; considered to be objectives that can be simultaneously assessed. Taylor Mtn. showed it's more than restoration, residence because of MPB that adds complexity. Different perspective on what USFS should be doing, MPB has to be factored into different restoration prescription. There's no way to separate from MPB infestation. The CFLRP is subset of FRR activities. The CFLRP by authorization, focused on ecological restoration, meshes well with fuels reduction, agencies have other community protection objectives that are ongoing. The public disagrees – don't like the way visual corridors appear. Science means nothing if it affects view corridor, how to speak to that? Public engagement challenge – want to make sure we continue to bring people along and not make assumptions.*

Pueblo - Strong outreach program HWY 67, HWY 24 that changed what used to look like – meadows and more open space. With explanation that forest used to look that same way 100 years ago, it reduces wildlife. When that is explained, public gives

agencies a chance. Haven't received feedback, embracing because of outreach program.

Outreach before cutting trees – Boulder County disappointments because Allenspark engaged with strongly and thought had level of understanding and surprised to get resistance. Shocking to have public come back at level of frustration. Shortcomings in outreach, especially in an area where people seemed to support tree cutting.

Concern that there is capability and need to run groups at same time, detracting from effort to develop monitoring metrics. If simultaneous, the process discussion won't contribute to effort to define metrics. Discussing items without data to indicate whether problem or not. Continue to run on opinions and not data. Have to get to metrics of monitoring and figure out how FRR is going to be a collaborative effort. Not as time sensitive as metrics. There are limited capabilities to support both efforts. In two meetings, will the work of the Process Group be accomplished? FRR took two years to come to consensus.

## **New Roundtable effort: Defining Ecological Restoration Objectives**

**Speaker:** Gali Beh, Roundtable Facilitator

**Metrics team** – showed team members. Goal – define metrics for lower montane ecological restoration. All agreed to charter. Agreed to interview 15 experts – some have said no because they don't feel it's necessary. Collected 18 publications and have been distributed to reviewers. Timeline – agreed on categories of metrics (scattered open meadows) put numbers on them where we could from literature, scheduling interviews, posting publications, research on definitions (old growth and landscape), draft interview guide, looking for numbers to inform restoration, March 11<sup>th</sup> meeting to determine what reviewers read in literature ahead of time, synthesize into target metrics ranges, send to pre-read to interviewers, conduct interviews March 21-29, Metrics meeting in Denver 3/31, April and May meetings back together with CFLRP monitoring team. Deliverables will be documented agreed upon metrics, metrics not agreed on, provide more definitions.

Metrics – determine what metrics needed for desired conditions – tree density, tree sized, age classes (still working on).

## **Discussion**

- **Greg** – Try to not characterize as science versus uninformed public. Important to understand what happened so we don't get into this situation again as we further implement project. Consideration of process is key, but it might not be necessary to do now. Keep Hal's point on the table of other priorities constricting capabilities.
- **Jeff** – Not CFLRP focused. Support it, but focused on because of more land in lower montane. Want to be sure there is a good definition of what restoration is and what it looks like on the ground. If try to do it in a month, here when we did the good work that took 1.5 years, there an assumption that there will be agreement on the table. If range is too big definition doesn't mean much, if 2-3 metrics agreed on, then definitions don't mean anything. Questioning whether it

can be done in a month, based on experience. Rather than set target – carry on good work started from 2006 report and can influence CFLRP in the long run. FRR made up of a lot of people other than FS, more non-federal focus and make sure keep that in our minds.

- **Jonas** – Synergy and products come up – identify priority landscapes, figuring out what’s wrong where and what ought to do, but without clear vision of what “ought” is. Propose that as we move into a concerted effort toward implementing what ought is, what ought means needs to come first. Will probably be refined as adaptive management begins to take hold. When discuss what FRR priorities are, still murky what treatment is and many other definitions. What is desired forest condition? When public demanding to know what going to do on landscape? What are prescriptions? What are conditions? Safeguard entrusted resources. Come to relatively quick agreement with respect to budget and time constraints. What is restoration? Use to advantage in adaptive management framework. Trust FRR as collective to make decisions about desired forest condition that meets our needs and engenders trust toward doing right, not just today, but well beyond our years and sets trajectory toward something that’s sustainable and appropriate.
- **Jenny** – USGS does not have burden of managing lands. Interested in establishing monitoring plan and using data to inform modification of treatments under CFLRP program. Taylor Mtn. illustrated that might not have freedom to go through in ideal world. Local residents and public are going to have opinions – reactions come much quicker than projects. Some members of group receiving input from Taylor Mtn. work, is CFLRP going to be shot down at early stage before have chance to work through monitoring cycle? Focus on process for conflict identification and resolution, have to make an attempt at that. Could this happen where CFLRP program is derailed by adverse public response whether right/wrong. What is risk? If risk is low, proceed as planned, if risk is high, come up with a strategy. What do we do if big issue? Can we tell everyone we have a collaborative group that is adaptively managing and over 10 years have refined objectives.
- **Gali** – I do want to see the process team do its work, I’m concerned that in RFI process that someone is going to be unhappy. If community member comes to me, I would like to be able to tell them how to deal with that issue. Less concerned about long-term collaborative adaptive process.
- **Rocky** – Given Taylor Mtn., need to show process for dealing with negative feedback. Disagree that we can’t do it at the same time as the metrics team. Going to be doing implementation of CFLRP. What if another Taylor Mtn occurs? Have to be able to make sure if dispute happens that we can respond. Have to find a way to do it. It may take another dispute for us to talk about it. If we don’t, it’s going to hurt implementation of the whole program. When conflict happens, deal with immediately.
- **Mike Battaglia** – Assume many of these Roundtable’s across the country are dealing with implementation issues. Contact other groups to utilize their plan. Don’t reinvent the wheel, probably done already. Have probably already gone through growing pains.
- **Ben** – Always going to have these issues. The kinds of treatments we’re discussing are disruptive – ugly, loud, shocking visually. It’s the nature of the beast. Because of that, can’t imagine there won’t be significant public comment and interest as there should be. If going to continue doing these kinds of projects,

have to figure out how going to deal with opposition, legitimate or illegitimate. Make sure, when implemented, regardless of which players, need to be able to explain why treatment was done and that was done in accordance with established principles and contractors did it in accordance with plan. Then have a chance because can have justification for treatments and the way they look, what it will look like in the future. Discuss why didn't go correctly. Don't take presence of complaints as failure, but if have complaints, take them seriously and understand where coming from. Constant process. Allenspark area is always our most concerned, most engaged community, on every land issue done by agencies. Any project in Allenspark is going to get scrutiny. Obligation is to do it right, processes great step toward being able to define numerically and other propositions of what right means so we can defend what we've done correctly and modify when haven't.

- **Jessica** – Address constraint Hal pointed out and possible desire for process group to hold off – if process group happens, identify what needs to be discussed right now because maybe there are short-term issues that can be addressed in one meeting and firm up process to address place-based issues. If we can amend or enhance process enough to address those concerns then there can maybe be longer term issues that can deal with later.
- **Todd** – BLM hasn't had part in process. 28% landholder of Fourmile fire –we need to be sensitive toward what that community needs rather than what Uncle Sam needs. If we look at the state, Western Slope doesn't need these conversations to the same degree as on the east side. Micro-cultures within Boulder area, good neighbor agreements varied from place to place. People are willing to accept criticism is ok, but as a whole, FRR has to speak as one voice even when they don't like it. Suggest get commitment and focused on solving one thing at a time. A lot of people committed to a lot of other things. If can't commit to one, can't commit to others. Commit to BLM being part of problem solving process.
- **Craig** – 1983 thinned Taylor Ridge. Come up with prescription, reach consensus, speak with common voice. Consensus will not stop complaints. Legitimate versus illegitimate complaints – to those looking at disturbance all are legitimate. Group will come up with great consensus, practice on ground, but will never get out of realm of people going to Washington.
- **Peter** – In the FRR's 2006 report, restoration is not ever defined. Key to this issue because now landscape forest restoration. In lower montane, agree that fire mitigation can be equated to forest restoration in terms of timber harvest. Lower montane is easy to get to, ponderosa is tall and straight. All big trees brought out of forest, where does that fit into restoration? Creating greater diversity in forest. More large, old ponderosas are spaced far apart – no science behind statement. If it's a goal to have them spaced apart, definitions are required.
- **Jeff** – Looking at significant shift in role of FRR. FRR started out in effort to find where we all agree and expand that so could understand where we all agree and implementers could lower risk of decisions. Now discussing arbitrating disputes about treatments along Front Range. Have to understand that it's a big shift in what we've done in the past; if trying to arbitrate disputes, as opposed to identifying next step. The outcome of next step is to find out if we can agree on what restoration is to avoid conflict rather than arbitrate. Heading toward deciding what was good or not – it's unattainable. The FRR has been successful because of

the collection of opinions, philosophies. Very different though. Be careful how to go about next steps. If enter realm of arbitrator, we're going to be very different, concerned we won't be as successful. Not looking at areas of agreement, but disagreeing around table. Identified areas where can't agree. Would like us to evolve to place that need to agree to be successful.

- **Gali** – We should not arbitrate but should at least have the ability to air and articulate opposing points of views
- **Paige** – Exciting component of CFLRP effort, chance to strengthen level of agreement. These metrics should be something that all agencies can use. The FRR original work was very high-level; to change the context, do more treatment faster and more effectively. Bring policy focus down on the ground. This is a healthy evolution for FRR. We have monitoring participants from wildlife agencies and others that haven't been involved before. Hope not going toward point of being arbitrators or being that engaged in decision processes, but will allow us to be better advocates for partners in room. Get more specific of what want to see on ground and come around to support implementer. “Done with good science”—Difficult to do it currently without level specificity that would be needed to show support of implementers. Be stronger advocates for what individuals are doing but not going project by project to say it was right or wrong.
- **Ben** –Different role, being an organization that finds consensus on prescriptions and on specifics, which provides guidance to anyone doing project. Real value to having eyes and ears out there, whether monitoring team or members of the public. Ultimately, whatever land management agency is, they are the ones that have to set up projects and adhere to consensus ideas and norms. There should be a dose of political recognition of what the dynamics are. What ways there are of modifying projects to get to that. Can't impose regardless of public; leave a little bit to ease politics. FRR role, project role is another, way for FRR to offer suggestions or compile pitfalls to avoid these kinds of things.
- **Megan** – There seems to be a real need for FRR to play role of evidence-based practice for treatments on Front Range. Leave room for community or prescription to have some room for flexibility. Seems like good time to go to the next step to create best practices and have some recommendations based on what has already been experienced. Better communication, outreach plan, etc. Include in implementation.
- **Susan** – Stay on landscape/program level as a group. Interest is in community forestry, if don't bring social and economic effect, end up in situations where haven't engaged folks that need to be and come along later. Imperative as move along, talk about metrics or some ways in social, economic that have different kinds of benefits. Don't push it back, move forward with this piece and not get too hung up on it. Adaptive, make small scale, project type mistakes to learn from.
- **Greg** – The Forest Landscape Restoration Act specifies that project should be implemented through collaboration. FRR is body that project relies on for legitimacy and funding, up to us to specify what that means. Even though we say we don't want to get into the weeds, but have to define limits of what collaborative implementation means. Concerned about sequence and timeline, not its legitimacy.
- **Gali**: Executive team met Tuesday to discuss moving forward from here – two FRR events. FRR meeting focusing on CFLRP looking at project in queue and



figure out where participation can happen. Proposed field trip to Crystal Lakes/Red Feather Lakes CFLRP projects. If monitoring team wants to do process in terms of getting ready, marking trees, etc. to provide learning experience for constraints in implementation. Date for field trip? Ad hoc FRR mtg, two forests outline project work proposed for CFLRP talk more about what planning to do this field season, solicit input. Short term, set up process for future.

- **Mike** – As get more into the weeds as FRR, evaluating treatment by treatment – is that far below where we should be? Better define recommendations in report? Go down to saying disagree with cutting project? How far down?
- **Jenny** – Pilot study going on. Going to be complicated and messy for the first few projects, work out kinks and then get back to broader perspective. Specifics might matter because there is risk that if some details aren't paid attention to, the bigger program could be questioned. If details aren't smooth in early project, then the bigger program's future would be in question?
- **Hal** – Made CFLRP proposal to obtain additional funding to move more quickly to achieving FS and FRR goals. CFLRP is creating a lot of extra work, time and effort especially if funding is minimal. Not concern that it goes away or that program is going to end. Ability to do things faster will be reduced if program goes away. Think we should not adapt? We need to, but don't see issue, Taylor is not unusual business, all land management agencies deal with backlash from projects all of the time. Boulder ranger district has made changes to process. Three field trips beforehand – silviculturist showed what was going to happen. No one spoke up about concerns at the field trip.
- **Glenn** – Agree with everyone. Not saying Taylor Mtn. issues shouldn't be analyzed and that prescriptions shouldn't be changed. Controversy is on small chunk of what was treated. 400 acres were treated and 20 acres are the controversy. Would've left out controversial acres if knew it would cause such a stir. Limited capacity on forest. Want to get it right from the beginning – see value here and hesitate to say this is something that's going to get off axis. Something can work through; use FRR as forum to get after MPB epidemic in ponderosa right now. Whatever come up with, supportive of, but remember that perspectives differ greatly. Continue with idea of site-specific approaches.
- **Paige** – Risks to program; CFLRP program suited to FRR, fits with objectives of increase scale of treatments, fits Front Range really well. Nationally this program is at risk because of funding. Envisioned for 10 years, cycles 2-3 years. Groups like ours that are committed to it will keep program alive. What puts program at risk is if group isn't behind and supportive of the program. If get minimal level of funding, doesn't accomplish goals. If in beginning, in order for group to get to the point, need to get a better idea of project in the early stages. Up front specificity can help keep the program alive.
- **Jonas** – 400-acre demonstration site. Define what restoration looks like by marking. Aside of viability of CFLRP program, look beyond program, think that building capacity that transcends programs. What we want landscape to look like and how to treat it. Come out with something useful, we succeeded. If not funded fully, the program will still be useful.
- **Jessica** – If there was a component where folks could help think through what would most appropriate projects under CFLRP but under FRR context, what if CFLRP acres and projects wound up being demonstration sites for FRR or case

studies for FRR. Put more effort collaboratively to visit what likely candidate projects would be in the future and monitor them?

- **Hal** -There may well be restoration efforts didn't start last year. There are likely currently areas that we could visit. Looked at Woodland Park last year. The Pike has more opportunity because of larger area of ponderosa; there may be several areas down on the PSICC where people could agree it would be demonstration sites.
- **Craig** – managing ponderosa on Front Range for 40 years, there are probably 2-10 year old practices that are close to what going to come up with in terms of restoration. The acres are out there.
- **Gali** - The same conversation could be had for fire risk mitigation.
- **Jenny** – Don't know anything about theory of collaborative groups or how they work, lots of people in this group look at philosophies while others look at details of how to implement. Put different types of participants in group to work in different issues. Something of coordination effort to get details and different tasks accomplished. Have capacity to discuss both big picture and detail.
- **Glenn** – Need to get to place where marry up the broad and site-specific scale so all relatively aligned and speak in one voice in terms of supporting efforts on Front Range. Challenging, but possible. Things being done currently, transitional period, other things in queue that will be out for treatment. Not to say we aren't trying to get this group ahead of that. 2011 is going to be tough year to stop the train. Things are in motion that we already planned a year or two ago. Can't slow things down.
- **Rocky** – important to look at detail. FRR is and should be looking at overall program. Programs composed of a lot of details. Miss a lot if don't look at details. Can all learn from looking at projects – have as many as possible, very valuable. Individual members should do it, learn and report what was learned. All be better off and much more likely to come to agreement.
- **Jessica** – Uncompahgre CFLRP looking at landscape-scale restoration. Place to landscape scale – at some point there will be discussion about what variables do you measure, where and how often to gauge whether restoring landscape. What is your landscape? Would like input from the group? Area from border of WY or to Woodland Park? Can extrapolate at that scale of landscape or define landscape as district ranges to compare to that. There are questions regarding landscape scale. From accountability standpoint, have to answer those questions. Identifying core variables going to measure a lot of in order to have idea of what changes across landscape will be in next 15 yrs. Don't know if monitoring group or FRR is best place to have that conversation. It is the monitoring working group – informs scope of work.
- **Gali** – Another group, the Shortgrass Prairie Partnership, was trying to figure out how much land to be conserved to get species protected – CNHP identified how many acres are necessary to protect a species. We can use a similar process to define landscapes.
- **Hal** – Important that we continually remember that the UP Project and Front Range group started at different places. Our group already identified landscape goals. Our landscape may be defined but the question of landscape is that at that scale, are the effects we're going to have measurable? Over 1.5 million acres need treatment, 31,000 acres in CFLRP isn't much to show effects of wildfire.

- **Jessica** – Proposal for process team: Where concern is with monitoring group, can start talking about how adaptive management and monitoring group go together and conversation could occur in summer. On other hand, from FRR and communities issues, maybe need to talk sooner. One-day discussion on March 8 from 9-12 in JeffCo and get together for three hours to discuss how to approach process issue for FRR in the future. Leave it at that for now. Helpful conversation today, fine tune it and keep trucking on monitoring. For voting, there will be an alternative. Can vote on every goal without signing up for it.

## UPDATES BY WORKING TEAMS AND PROPOSED GOALS FOR 2011

### Mapping & Implementation Team

**Speaker:** Mike Babler

- Our goal has always been to identify one to three landscape areas that meet criteria for potential demonstration sites. We're currently in the process of selecting a community to work on demonstration site, once decision is made will start working with community to make plan, help folks get implementation on landscape. Looked at project areas identified by three different groups, FRR, Watershed protection, NFRMPBWG, 50,000 acres+. The more collaborative it was, the most interested the group was in it. Built map and started sending out RFIs to communities. Received responses from Larimer County (Red Feather, Crystal Lakes, Glacier View Meadows) and Boulder County (Allenspark, Coal Creek Canyon, Gold Hill, Nederland, etc.) Moving forward now after reviewing responses and communication. Reviewed all CWPPs, reviewed applications, spreadsheet of 10 criteria to rank different communities. Picked top three. Meeting with communities in April, will decide by May. Things we want to ask and discuss with communities are to understand capacity and concerns. In order to not overwhelm community, let Gali know if you plan to come to any of the three meetings in Larimer County, Nederland and Western Boulder County Healthy Forest Initiative.
  1. Three communities in Larimer County, restoration is lower elevation, higher elevation is more community protection than restoration. Working together – new group, all worked independently in the past, pulling larger geography together. 2,500 homes in the area.
  2. Western Boulder County Healthy Forest Initiative, originally 4 FPDs and now 6. (Boulder Rural, Boulder Mtn, Coal Creek, Gold Hill, Lefthand Canyon, and Sunshine Canyon).
  3. Nederland Group not quite as large, in process of finishing CWPP. Interviewing soon.
- Want to go through entire process before ranking all communities against each other. Have summer to get up and running after deciding on a community in May. BLM and CUSP very supportive of mapping effort.

### Q&A

Given where projects and areas lie, how does that intersect with land ownership plans in those areas? How much interaction have with land management agencies, most communities aware of projects in their area. *Still struggling with how to assess community capacity to accomplish; going to have to assess in interview process.*

Were there particular lessons from Woodland Park that were applied to this process? *Going to invite CUSP to meetings to present to communities the harsh reality and opportunities of what they are stepping into. Get a real understanding of what it's all about. Sending Woodland Park MOU to communities. We asked CUSP to motivate, inspire and caution communities. Larimer County sent back FRR a dozen questions in depth about what's in it for them. The team gave the communities the opportunity to ask questions in advance*

- Citizen involvement is critical to project. We looked at what citizen involvement was there originally and what has been done since CWPP was made. The worst critics at the beginning can be most sustained citizen involvement.
- Want to make sure sites understand what partnership with them means. A lot of effort on their part, want CUSP to come to explain. Concern for all 3 finalists, none have have a group like CUSP.
- Pueblo - When started CWPP, citizen driven process. CUSP was champion. Every fire dept., citizens from each area of county, drove the entire effort. CUSP took it and ran with it. CUSP was organized and have grown exponentially because window to community for assisting with CWPP. The success of plans isn't as great if a citizen or homeowner writes the plan. HOAs representatives were on CWPP committee.

## Q&A

Since all three lack entity like CUSP, is there ways for FRR to help create CUSP? Is that goal for RFI? Can you be a partner without having ability to have CUSP? When are we going to talk about what FRR is going to bring to selected community? Before go to community meetings, recognize CUSP is unique, if want more community organizations like CUSP, what is FRR going to do? *Set of questions that came from Larimer group, good starting point for what FRR is going to do to help. Have to show scope of work to justify funding. Find community, define work, then go get funding. FHAC came to executive team last week and asked if it offered grant money, what would we use it for? One idea was to build capacity for whatever community we select, part time coordinator or something.*

What if need help with organizing? Ask FRR members to assist? Prepared to help? *Prioritize projects next to theirs. Team going to help write grants and going to members of FRR for funding.*

- Critical to capacity is the spark, the one person who can, with a little funding, support coordinators to make things happen. If there's a purpose and it is provided and clear, to make it happen they will require someone to push it along.
- Local governments working on 2008 revenue for FY11. Reassessment in state of CO for property values for 2012 and 2013, next reassessment is 2013 when real values drop because of foreclosures. Local government hasn't been hit yet.

## Outreach and Policy Team

**Speaker:** Cheri Ford, USFS

- Trying to broaden focus to include policy as well as outreach
- 3 goals – agreed on earlier this week

- Continue targeted outreach to elected official, to highlight Front Range forest health - Fourmile Field Trip, focus on what to do with broad coalition of partners. Talk about potential state legislation, county regulations to discuss as group.
- Outdoor day at Capitol – will look into participating in that activity
- Colorado Counties Incorporated – would like to talk with them about some ideas of Team.
- Send ideas to any of the members and any way to meet with elected officials. Which official can focus on and meet one on one.
- Set up meetings to talk about policy proposals, reduce community risk, implementing more defensible space. Looking for feedback about how FRR feels about that idea.
- Lots of attempts at county and local level to deal with issues
- FRR trips to D.C. – never happened last year. Plan to go in September, objective is to try to get together with UP project, push CFLRP projects, more robust opportunity to talk about more topics, focused effort.
- Increase dialogue, potentially could take on roles.
- Timeline – Stakeholder meeting in January, Form policy coalition throughout the year.
- CSU Case Study – using FRR as case study for conservation collaboration. Focus on conflict resolution, how to move forward on issues.
- Lyceum – to discuss FRR.
- Next year, more participation or more involvement – need more ideas to go forward.
- Need to pick a place for our field trip – preview of Fourmile for elected officials or restoration view of Crystal Lakes or Red Feather or do both?

### **Discussion**

- Appreciate work on team – hope group doesn't feel they have to take the entire burden of outreach.

## **Biomass Utilization**

**Speaker:** Gali Beh, Roundtable facilitator

- Goals – Share info about biomass utilization developments across Front Range, Update biomass utilization talking points
- Different people on calls (Susan, Carl, Gali, Wade Yates, Dan Len, Jeff) Team is more fluid.
- Created map of where biomass utilization companies are on Front Range. Tracking in 10 counties (how many slash sites, sort yards, biomass processing facilities – buying biomass to sell, biomass consumption – using biomass for energy. Four counties of the 10 don't have any biomass consumption facilities.
- Created talking points – team will hold another session to update them; what do we agree on?
- Do not have same timeline or workplan or goals as other teams. Team struggling in knowing how to be effective. More of an interest group than a working team, developing relationships, heard from members they are frustrated due to lack of progression.

### **Discussion**

- What does FRR expect from team? Could be more outcome-oriented. Some of it is going back to what do we want in terms of social and economic aspects with this effort? How to articulate desirable outcomes? How to keep industry? Work with outreach group.

Biomass is coming from rural development. Have to work with rural development to find right settings to do those. Need some focused outcomes now that dilemma with biomass has been described.

- Suggest for outreach and BUSS group, pick brains about social and economic monitoring. Process group is less time consuming in March, so social and economic monitoring needs to get together with BUSS. Doodle for dates to get together. Pick your brain, go back to monitoring working group, hopefully by April will have sorted out more about social monitoring and can then start working on social and economic at the same time.
- Work with executive team, where do we want biomass to be? Want to define biomass or serve a function.
- More than Front Range issue, figure out how to deal with other entities in state to deal with bigger issues. Provide opportunities for utilization. Need to create new markets and maintain capacity.
- Question about members on team were having hard time with competitive conflict issues? Businesses on call competing for same limited supply biomass. Can't share all information.
- Team could help the IM team, help community solve biomass problem, encourage BUSS team members to join IM Team to see if start building relationships with the community. Look at what doing with four forests in Four Corners, looking at securing wood supply in long term. Bring investment business in, get zone of agreement that makes people want to come and make investment at right scale. What kind of economic landscape do we want to participate in? FRR could be working on a business enterprise level and work on planning and development.
- CUSP – running into situations where woody waste can't be used – differing regulations from county to county. Develop regulations for counties to consider adopting. Need to look at impact, and don't understand. Can get grant to put together model regulations, but would be helpful to have input from biomass or outreach committee to discuss concerns that landowners may have. County Commissioners have projects in counties that are already underway that would provide information to others. Regulations are completely different from county to county. Zoning/permitting process is expensive and difficult. Governor's office visiting with projects to discuss streamlining process. CUSP would like some help from BUSS or outreach team.
- Saw status in Front Range utilization – Park County elected commissioners are a big deal, do not understand biomass. If education doesn't happen, transfer station was denied because of it.
- Biomass utilization continually frustrating. If group wants to continue to move forward, a start would be to look at initial recommendations related to biomass. Look at one or two to focus on or something new to focus on. Move incrementally forward because it's a large task to tackle. Talking points – try to start making happen?

## **PROPOSE, DISCUSS AND PRIORITIZE GOALS FOR REMAINDER OF 2011**

- IM – Selecting community, make plan
- OP – Two trips to D.C., Fourmile field trip
- CFLRP – economic, ecological issues
- Process Team – Kick off discussion, make a plan to deal with process issues

- Metrics – reading literature, arguing amongst ourselves to define ecological restoration. Just discussing March.
- Proposal – Restoration field trip or restoration demo site.

Goals: Group votes, vote once for each goal

- IM: Continue with community selection. Will select community by next mtg. Must attend all three meetings if want to be a selector of community.
- Do we need to bring in more fire expert to determine if reduced fire risks? What criteria to determine fire risk? Need more science and practical background. That piece was about zoning laws, building material requirements; less about if treatments reduce risk. At policy level rather than treatment.
- OP: Want to focus on WUI risk
- BUSS: Clarify objectives to see if we can make progress there. Make sure right people are involved; more nontraditional players. CBBC has struggled with what group can do to move the whole idea of biomass utilization forward. Piece needs to be done at broader scale. FHAC rather than place-based entities. Need something at broader level such as at the state level. Are incentive programs necessary? Always looking for long-term sustainable supply that can work around. To locate something in an area it has to be at bigger level than areas we're looking at—individual place-based areas. The right size of industry is necessary to utilize the material. Monitoring can help inform discussion because can put monitoring plan together than can address those questions that can explain on what scales what is feasible and socially acceptable. Look at local policy at that point.

## REVIEW OF ROUNDTABLE STRUCTURE

- **Executive Team structure** – Welcome to Jerri Marr; The team has one spot for ARNF, 1 PSICC, 1 State Forester, Conservation NGO and County Commissioner North, County Commissioner South, Other stakeholder (WUI or fire). Executive team reserves right to choose members. Will make decisions as needed, approves agenda for FRR Quarterly mtgs,, propose strategic, organization, and operational priorities for FRR's consideration at quarterly meetings
- Facilitator – schedule, arrange and facilitate FRR quarterly meetings, executive team meetings and working team mtgs. Central point of contract; support working team to achieve goals.
- Working Teams – execute FRR's strategic goals, present progress updates at quarterly meetings attend team meetings and conference calls
- Members – Attend quarterly FRR meetings, vote to change or approve proposals, share relevant announcements, volunteer for working teams.