



**MINUTES FROM FRONT RANGE ROUNDTABLE Q1-14
QUARTERLY MEETING**

Date of meeting: Friday, January 10, 2014, 9:30 am – 4:00 pm

Location: Colorado Parks & Wildlife, 4255 Sinton Road, Colorado Springs, CO 80907 (see below for room and parking information)

Date minutes posted: 1/16/14

Roundtable contact: Gali Beh, c/o Beh Management Consulting, Inc., 637-B South Broadway, #134, Boulder CO 80302, 303-499-1576, gali@behconsulting.com

Meeting presentation(s): Available at http://frontrangeroundtable.org/Meeting_Materials.php

CONTENTS (In Order of Agenda Topic)

CONTENTS (IN ORDER OF AGENDA TOPIC)..... 1

ABOUT THE ROUNDTABLE..... 2

PARTNER UPDATES..... 2

BLACK FOREST UPDATE 2

STRATEGIC PLANNING 4

BIOMASS THERMAL ENERGY DISCUSSION 6

FUNDRAISING & COORDINATOR WORK PLAN..... 7

COMMUNITY PROTECTION PANEL DISCUSSION..... 8

POLICY & LEGISLATION FOR 2014..... 10

CFLRP PANEL 12

WRAP UP 15

ABOUT THE ROUNDTABLE

Speaker: Gali Beh, Roundtable Facilitator

- The Roundtable has been implementing its mission “to serve as a focal point for diverse stakeholders input into efforts to reduce wildland fire risks and improve forest health through sustained fuels treatment along the Colorado Front Range” since 2006.

PARTNER UPDATES

Speaker - Local Host’s Spotlight – Casey Cooley, Colorado Parks & Wildlife

- Casey gave an update on CPW.

BLACK FOREST UPDATE

Speakers - Commissioner Darryl Glenn (El Paso County), Keith Worley (Forestry Development), and Chuck Dennis (West Range Reclamation)

- Commissioner Glenn gave an overview of Black Forest since the fire June 11. After seven months, community is coming together and trying to take care of one another after two years of destruction. In the June 11 Black Forest Fire, 490 properties were lost, two lives, and 14,000 acres were burned. As far as first responders, he said they need to work on command and control. People want to know what happened, and understand the timeline. Another issue he pointed out is there are over 20 fire districts. Need to look at it from an operational standpoint, to a consumer, tax base standpoint; asking as a community how efficient are we being? Are first responders getting enough resources to do their job? Important to have a way to communicate with people. Following the fire, they had maps and press conferences twice per day. Need to let homeowners know what to do; need ability to communicate and not feel isolated. He said it’s like a death for some people (who lost their home). Glenn said they put together a communication network and were really pleased with it. Disaster Assistant Center – need to have that. We had legislation people at the table; regional building people as well as debris and removal people. People are concerned about their trees; they identify with their trees. Two big issues they have dealt with: People ask if the county is going to change fire codes? They’ve had to weigh if it’s going to impact people’s ability to rebuild. We made a decision that adopted 97% consensus opinion. Issue they are facing now is with the trees. Lots of hazardous trees. Also dealing with the role of FEMA; community asking do we embrace FEMA at this point? Do we use a company that has experience with FEMA? When we have to put forward that 20% match – for them it’s \$380,000 – are those hoops that are worth jumping through? They want local money kept here. He said the community is debating these issues, evaluating community concerns whether they can do this locally. Or do they need the federal assistance? That’s the debate we are having now. He mentioned Judy von Aflefeldt (an

attendee that day who lost her home in the fire) and said they had worked with her.

Commissioner Glenn said to pay attention to El Paso County – as they are setting the standard on how to do this.

- Keith Worley (Forestry Development) – His organization is 21 years old, started by state, local and federal resources. Worley went over the Black Forest Fire Assessment Team Report to the Governor, Prepared by Pikes Peak Wildfire Prevention Partners. He explained they have learned that those mostly impacted by wildfire are not getting the message. Heard from people who did restoration and they are upset that it doesn't work. Residents are asking why mitigate – it doesn't work. In a meeting with Kevin Kline, Keith's board volunteered to take that on that task. 30 people from 18 organizations went out 7/22- 7/24 to assess the situation. The five things they looked at were:
 1. Cathedral Pines Community – story of good fire. One home lost. About 2/3 of the community experienced fire with 40-45 mph winds.
 2. State School Land Section 16 –90% of fire here was “good” fire.
 3. Firefighter survey assessing if mitigation works. Surveys from 46 firefighters who were there on the front lines.
 4. Structural assessment.
 5. Black Forest had a program working with homeowners – didn't find enough of that sample or anything conclusive. Talked about the concept of “willful ignorance.” Huge pink elephant; looking at social science concepts. Still taking comments. They are tired of having firefighters lives on the line. The scary part is the ignorance. Sent this to Kevin Kline's office and Tony Cheng (CSU-CFRI). This corroborates the governor's task force.
- Chuck Dennis (West Range Reclamation) Presented the “Hat Trick” Project – Dennis is a forester and recently completed a contract on the North Fork project. He was then asked to work on the Black Forest. Said it's a challenge because of the small size. He shared pictures of what treatments they are doing and the equipment they are using. Slides show that not everywhere burned: some scorched trees; others not burnt. Showed a graph on scorch height. Said that trees are very important to people and the possibility that some of them won't make it is tough. Could be hazardous if they're partially burnt. Mechanical – rubber tired feller/buncher being used. Felling hazards – mechanical felling aids used because they can pull trees down safely. Felled trees are bundled for the skidder. It's very efficient. Machine can cut low stumps; people don't want to see the stumps. They also do a mastication treatment. Using a track feller buncher and John Deere skidder near Black forest Road. Also

use skidders for hauling back onto the land to masticate to develop a chip/mulch layer to reduce erosion. Some material goes through a flail. They have also hand-felled some properties that could not otherwise be accessed. Log loader stacks logs to be ground for mulch or biomass. Showed manufactured logs ready for mills. Logs are very heavy in this area. Horizontal grinder used for mulch. Chip material goes mostly to a company in Fountain for landscape mulch. One of final steps is mastication. First they reseed the area before mulch. Showed a tree marked for wildlife. He has seen a lot of friendliness with the homeowners. Someone asked about the basal area. Chuck said it's in excess of 140 – sometimes as much as 240. Showed erosion and flooding following intense fires. Showed pictures from Cheesman from 2003 and 2004: bright green healthy areas that were mechanically treated. June 2005 the area had good grasses. What's smallest area that can be mechanically treated? Need at least 2-3 acres but they've done ½ acre parcels. Long term plans? Have talked to many folks, referred them to the state forest service. Someone asked why some property owners want to save some trees and others want to leave some? From what he's seen, it seems like if they have a lot of devastation then they want it gone. But if they have some trees scorched, they want to save them. Mulch is coming from on-site mastication. Layer size is variable.

STRATEGIC PLANNING

Paige Lewis (TNC) provided an overview of prescribed fire issues. Paige explained that the Roundtable from its beginning has identified “increasing prescribed fire” as a priority. There is a statewide prescribed fire council that the Roundtable has been part of. In our recent assessment – we've identified that we haven't made enough progress. Because of the Lower North Fork fire, this issue was put on hold. As a result of the Lower North Fork, the responsibility for prescribed fire within the state was moved from the state forest service to the new Colorado Fire Prevention and Control, and launched a new rulemaking process started. That rulemaking process submitted a draft at the end of December. They are taking comments now. There is an emergency set of rules now for broadcast burning and a separate set for pile burning. Trying to finalize those rules by January 21 (hearing). Question for practitioners and those interested in increasing prescribed fires. Another factor after the Lower North Fork is the state's special immunity in relation to prescribed fire was taken away. Determination that if there's not willful negligence there's some immunity protection. Still TBD. Is that enough protection? Rocco Snart said our rules dictate what state employees have to do, but they don't cover federal, local, or county jurisdictions (unless state is assisting on county lands then those rules apply). That's the big thing that gets missed. Local agencies don't always know if these rules dictate what they can or can't do. If they

deviate they make them tougher and more stringent. Paige encouraged if someone is interested in the rule-making let her or Rocco Snart know, and attend these meetings.

Paige explained a big concern for the Roundtable is the potential for major loss of prescribed fire capacity. There have been conversations with Department of Natural Resources, and others, to express these concerns. If people have thoughts about that; many of those folks have an interest in hearing them. Mike Lester (CSFS) said there's a lot of expertise. There is a lot around the state that need attention. He said that state is stuck in a static boat, but he thinks there's a whole lot to be done, potentially more work then they can handle. Going to keep pushing forward.

Paige said they've also talked about smoke management and air quality and how the regulations related to that might influence the number of prescribed fires around the state. Southern Rockies Fire Science Network currently led by Tony Cheng (CSU-CFRI) is pursuing the idea of demonstration areas where smoke regulations may happen. The Air Pollution and Control Division has been doing some experimental permitting on the AR to allow them some more flexibility. Southern Rockies Fire Science Network hosted a smoke modeling science and managers meeting. A number of things going on. We as a body of stakeholders need to continue to talk about how we can keep moving this forward and continue to look for capacity for building. How can we increase the use of prescribed fire as a tool?

Carol Ekarius (CUSP) brought up that it's a bit ingenuous for the state (agencies) to say they are not affecting other agencies. CUSP has a burn crew and lots of small piles. Our insurance coverage was dropped for any pile burning. This was partly because of the state's regulations. We did get our insurance reinstated for pile burning. Need to define who's the negligent – needs to be clarified.

Lyle Laverty (SAF) echoes what Carol Ekarius said. He said how these laws are crafted affects everyone in this room. Prescribed fires are absolutely critical. Governor's Wildfire Task Force is discussion the growth in the WUI. We'll probably see more than 2 billion acres of growth in the WUI in Colorado by 2030, we have to start doing some proactive management right now of these landscapes.

Pat McLaughlin responded to the question that someone asked about if the Roundtable should submit comments on the rulemaking. He said it is an emergency rulemaking and the timeframe is pretty short. He's not sure this group could come up with comments as a whole– but suggested different groups represented here could make comments. Some of these regulations are there

because they are in the legislation. They can't change the legislation. They have to do the best they can with what is legislated.

Gali handed out the Roadless Rules map created by Mark Martin (USFS). Shows the Roundtable's vision map with Colorado's new Roadless Rules. Hal Gibbs (USFS) is working on updating the treatment areas. We've also asked Mark to update the maps with the more recent fires (map shows fires through 2009).

BIOMASS THERMAL ENERGY DISCUSSION

Paige Lewis (TNC) said this discussion is an overview of the Roundtable priority of increasing the use of bioheating. She said there's been some legislative pushback in this area and it has not always succeeded due to unknown impacts and constraints. Rob Davis (Forest Energy Colorado) suggested we have a Roundtable discussion about that. We asked Mike Eckoff (USFS) to talk about how biomass is being used as heat in Colorado, and to inform a policy discussion.

- Mike Eckoff (USFS) presented Forest Thermal Energy 101. He explained what "Forest energy" is. It can be used to make power, heat and liquid fuel. Forest Thermal Energy in CO – conversion of wood or wood with other materials to produce heat. Colorado consumes modest quantities of thermal energy. He explained Thermal vs Electric – varied use. He said there are Biomass facilities at the Boulder County Parks & Open Space (heat) and Boulder County Jail (heat and water). He also went over the Gypsum Biomass Power Plant. He talked about the pros and cons of biomass. Biomass can offset our demand for fossil fuels. Emissions are cleaner than wildfire smoke. Europe is ahead of us. Negatives include that removals can be prohibitively expensive. Fuel supply requires onsite space. CSU doesn't do the on-site storage. Boulder County has the onsite space. Lower value use (as an energy use). Forest thermal is not as easy to use. Natural gas is cheap. Challenges: Natural gas is cheap, lack of parity (equality), lack of public understanding/support for industry, and wood used for energy can't be used for other products. For Colorado's Renewable Energy Standard – Colorado legislated that renewable sources have to be part of the equation (30% by 20/20). Forest biomass is included in Colorado's RES(RPS) but only for electricity. Other incentives include tax based and cost share programs, grants, rebates. Forest Service is issuing next round of woody biomass utilization grants. Mike will let us know when that is issued. Also financing and Policy (Renewable Thermal Standard, Energy Codes/Planning, Purchase Agreements, etc). Other strategies – foster greater public-private partnerships, education/outreach, greater public inclusion.

Joseph Hansen (Jefferson Conservation District) discussed the saw logs and the subsidies in Boulder County. Small diameter material – has to be processed. There’s operational costs to do that. You can heat a building with the “Ferraris” of boilers. We need to think more strategically about getting this off the ground; these projects are being designed at the top with no communication on the ground. Gali Beh (Beh Consulting) talked about a project in Park County by Mark Smith – he’s a logger. You can get a grant to get this boiler. Mike Eckoff mentioned the low natural gas prices. What’s the alternative? There was a suggestion that instead of saying it’s so successful, figure out how to make it better; the non-successful projects are doing us a disservice. We need to make these boilers fit with what is being processed. In Europe they’re doing it. We need the right equipment that uses the right materials efficiently.

Don Moore (American Planning Association/ Jefferson County Conservation District) said that they went to Germany to see some of these.

FUNDRAISING & COORDINATOR WORK PLAN

Gali Beh (Beh Consulting) said the Roundtable has \$20,000 available, which is more than normal. She explained that we switched to a January-December fiscal year. We are doing well; all of our counties provided support, as well as others such as Colorado Springs Utilities, but others did not support. She said maybe we do some pre-discussions with these groups for next year. Maybe we ask for some smaller amounts and let them know the benefits. Paige Lewis (TNC) brought up that we need to do some outreach to some of those whose staffs have changed. Some Executive Team members planning to do some fundraise planning. With Gali tightening her belt, we have some breathing room again. Recommend going in same direction as we are now. Gali gave a report on costs for 2013. The National Forest Foundation grant ran out at the end of January 2013. CSU took over funding LR team Mar-July, and now the cost of LR team is back in Roundtable’s hands. The real savings was because we didn’t have two Roundtable meetings last year. It would have cost more. Gali and Terra Lenihan (Beh Consulting) now work part time for TNC. Paige and Gali went thru a conflict review, so Paige won’t make decisions about retaining Gali. So Gali reduced her hours and Terra has taken over the day-to-day work. Terra and Gali left the meeting at this time. The Roundtable agreed to retain them for another 1-year contract.

COMMUNITY PROTECTION PANEL DISCUSSION

- Jonathan Bruno (CUSP) presented on Fire Adapted Communities (FAC). He explained there are FireWise and Ready, Set, Go but these different programs were not necessarily working together. So they decided to create FAC as an umbrella for FireWise and Ready, Set, Go. Showed the first eight pilots (see yellow on the map). We were selected as the FAC Hub. All FAC's are doing different things. Some do more outreach and education, CUSP does more implementation. There are many FW and RSG communities. With FAC we're thinking about the work in the woods and the community. It's a program to help solidify getting out to the communities, and educating the population on cutting trees and where to build homes, etc. FACs have many elements – forest management, fuel reduction, Firewise, RSG, fuel buffers, etc, etc. Community Wildfire Protection Plan's sometimes get put on the backshelf. FAC is focused on communities where fire has played a big role. What about Prescribed fires? We have to consider prescribed fires; but the coordinator is really working on pushing prescribed fire. Working with Lake Tahoe now which has been using prescribed fire for years. All of the pilots said they need to talk about it. What they are doing is scalable. They are now working with Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative. So a new community can get all the info. Receiving \$12,000 grant to get new pilot communities going on the Front Range. Their work plan includes creating a steering team, introducing FAC to communities. More information at www.wphfi.org. Working on getting the steering committee formed.
- Community Protection Team Update - Megan Davis (Boulder County) asked Carol Ekarius (CUSP) to give a Community Protection Team (CPT) overview since she was unable to attend. She said the CPT will start ramping up to an every other month meeting. The team is starting to get more knowledge of what's happening post-fire. Where will the roads become impassable because of flooding, etc? Maybe we need to start having that in the Community Wildfire Protection Plan's. We should starting thinking about that.
- Governor's Wildfire Task Force - Carol Ekarius (CUSP) was appointed on the Governor's Wildfire Task Force and their first meeting was last April. Very tight timeline to report. Lyle Laverty (SAF) was also on the task force. Three groups represented – insurance industry, forest and fire people, and key stakeholders (CCL, realtors, mortgage brokers). One of the key things that people agreed on was to take the Corap mapping and have it refined to an even higher level, so people could understand the risk of a property. The map now shows a lot of red. Map needed more development. Need better mapping and decision tools. Everything else was not as agreeable. Property owners keyed in on a WUI fee of some sort. Talked about \$25/fee if you live in WUI, which would go back to counties to provide

matching funds for grants, etc. Fee would be waived if you do mitigation. People thought it was an unfair tax burden. That was a big focus. Lyle added the importance of disclosure when buying/selling property if you live in a red zone. Another idea is if you live in a red zone, there would be a property tax assessment, fairly significant, but could we waived – objective was to get people to mitigate their properties. People becoming more conscious – people supporting suppression costs. Jenny Briggs (USGS) asked if there was input from other hazard programs insurance. Yes, Florida has a flood program, hurricanes, etc. Carol learned a lot about the insurance industry. They looked at implementing fire insurance but it doesn't make sense now. Mike McHugh (City of Aurora) talked about how if you pull out the risks then coverage goes up. Carol said the work we've been doing – people's insurance companies are showing up either dropping them altogether, or making them do mitigation. And they may be sending the wrong people out who have no knowledge. They talked about – and we need to push for – making sure HOAs don't have rules that are counter to Firewise. At a state level we need to say that covenants cannot endanger. Keith Worley (Forestreet Development) said SB100 says you can mitigate – it does work. He's worked with homeowners on that process. Jonathan Bruno (CUSP) also said they have been getting requests on how to show something is certified. JeffCo and Boulder have been working with AllState and other bigger property insurers to address creating consistent recommendations. There's a willingness for Rocky Mtn. Insurance Institute to do that. JeffCo and Boulder projects could lead to a path of consistency. Tony Cheng (CSU-CFRI) thinks there's a window of opportunity with FAC and he suggested that CUSP be the Colorado study – thought they could really take this forward. In the forest community, it is connected. Doesn't matter what the fuels are. We are in a loop of false expectation. With the center, the Roundtable, and the agencies and front line people, doing the firefighter interviews, that's probably one of the most important pieces. We need to bring in all this knowledge, to create a more unified voice. Carol mentioned what we learned from Waldo: Mtn. Shadows (development) became its own fire. The houses became the ignition. Most citizens in Mtn. Shadows didn't realize they were in a fire zone. At least in Black Forest people knew they were in a forest. We know defensible space helps a house, but it's not fire proofing. Judy von Ahlefeldt (Black Forest Conservation Forestry Association) noticed in studying the spotting that happens that a lot of houses had some defensible space. Jonathan said he thinks the most important interaction is to the community. They are looking at the ember issue. There's a program out of the Nevada office called Ember Aware. On June 2 CUSP will be hosting the next FAC in partnership with Fire Learning Network in Colorado Springs, good opportunity to get out the word on the Front Range level. Glenn Casamassa (USFS-ARP) asked about the Community Wildfire Protection Plans: looking at a component of the plan – some post fire

assessing. It's a significant part of finishing the loop that has not been addressed. Look at the reports for Hayman and Lower North Fork – assessments are coming up with relatively the same findings. But what happens is when there isn't a significant impact from the fire – they have to start from ground zero on how to reconstruct their communities on all levels. That's inherently missing in these discussions. That could be a clearinghouse on what to do after an incident. Or start to talk about communities about the adverse impacts first, and then talk about how to mitigate. But the model we're using right now isn't resonating with the communities. Jonas Feinstein (NRCS) mentioned that defensible space is great if you have someone defending it. Your house is insured, but your forest is not. He tells people spend your money on your interior forest. Mike Lester (USFS) said with Corab – taking it to the parcel level, not the structure level. Sounds like we need a two-pronged approach – how to take it to the parcel level, and what materials do we need. Defensible space increases the chance of survival of your home. You do the things you can do to protect your home. If you have a home with wood siding, or shingles, thousands of dollars will help fix that. Defensible space helps but not if you have shingles. Carol said at the parcel level data that starts to give you a better understanding. Glenn mentioned that the report may not have gotten as much grip because it came out during the floods. Chuck Dennis (West Range Reclamation) observed in Black Forest and Lower North Fork the psychology of people who have suffered loss. The fact that after an event has occurred people start understanding why it happened. Need to communicate an aspect of this. You do what you can because it can help with the guilt that you didn't do anything. People who haven't been in a fire don't realize the impact because they think they are covered by insurance.

POLICY & LEGISLATION FOR 2014

- Paige Lewis (TNC) handed out the current bills relevant to the Roundtable. She mentioned that a lot of our goals take changes in policy. We don't have the core group right now that wants to push some of these issues to our policy makers. Paige is willing to coordinate these and said we have the ability to bring consensus among diverse stakeholders which could be powerful to those decision makers. The Roundtable at this scale – influencing policy could be powerful. State issues include funding – CFR Grant Program, and Wildfire Risk Reduction Program. Legislation including Wildfire Matters Interim Committee, Governor's Wildfire Insurance program. Also other policy topics dealing with community protection, prescribed fire, and biomass/utilization. Paige passed out all the bills that have been forwarded by the General Assembly 2013 Wildfire Matters Interim Committee. The Wildfire Matters Committee heard about a lot of issues. The bills they put forward are pretty small in scale. Nothing too groundbreaking. They will meet again next year, and we could bring back

some of these issues from WUI Task Force and ask them to consider them again. List of possible actions (see presentation). From writing letters, to testifying, meeting with state agency leaders, media. At the federal level – the Roundtable routinely (in the past) sent a delegation of folks to meet with staff, we could think about doing that again. CFLR funding, hazardous fuels funding, emergency wildfire protection funding. Senator Udall has a bill for FEMA funding mitigation. Field trips for congressional staff in state, Paige would like to know how people are feeling about policy engagement. How can the Roundtable support these. Keith Worley (Forestree Development) asked about timing the draft idea on Black Forest Fire assessment – idea was more to tie it to the Governor’s Task Force. He asked if we should strategize on timing. Paige thinks because the legislative session has already started, it will be hard for them to take on a new bill. For the next session of the Wildfires Interim Committee – could take it back to them and ask them to address it, they can create a bill out of it. Don Moore (American Planning Association/ Jefferson County Conservation District) – Colorado Chapter of the American Planning Association actively lobbys and is happy to be at disposal of this group. They have people testify on these things. He thought the EWP grants – on the Hayman and Douglas County work sat for months until money was appropriated was added on. There should be a better way of doing it. The system is not there yet. That is something that should be fixed. Paige asked what is the interest of the Roundtable. Randall Johnson (Larkspur Fire Protection District) said to advise policy makers that the Roundtable is here and we can advise. Asked if that is that widely known. Paige said we have done that in the past, but legislators change. They can come to us and we could function well in that capacity. In the past we have given a fact sheet out to legislators at the beginning of a session. We also need to do some outreach with legislators. Lyle Laverty (SAF) thinks it’s critical to keep the policy issues – we’ve got to do this. Lyle would be happy to do this. Tony Cheng (CSU-CFRI) mentioned working with Colorado DNR and with collaborative groups around the state. Tony said the Roundtable is one of the largest but there are many more. We’ve talked about having a forestry day – hosting a reception at the legislature – get some of these other collaboratives to do it with us. Because of term limits in Colorado we have turnover. It would be beneficial to have those low key events. The currency is information with these guys. If you provide valuable information they will come back again and again. Mike Lester (CSFS) talked about the impact we can have on just several people talking to policy makers. Policy is critical. As a group, this would have the most long-lasting impact. Carol Ekarius (CUSP) said this group has had that impact over the years, like CFLR, our being here and the discussion we’re having with people. Jill Alexander (Douglas County) also agreed that personal interaction can make a big difference. We could send out to the list

to the group on what issues we want to be involved with, and what are the key issues. We could be missing opportunities.

CFLRP PANEL

- Sara Mayben (USFS-PSICC) Provided an overview of the CFLRP field trips in July, particularly the PSICC projects. Sara gave a presentation which included the following stops:
 - STOP 1 - Messenger Gulch 2: Review a post-treatment ponderosa pine site. Clumpiness was a component of the prescriptions.
 - STOP 2 - Long John Project: Review a post-treatment ponderosa pine & dry mixed conifer site that included “clumpy” demo areas.
 - STOP 3 - Catamount 1: Review a post-treatment dry mixed conifer & mesic mixed conifer site to look at openings and variable residual density.
 - STOP 4 - Upper Monument Creek Project: Review an untreated ponderosa pine, dry mixed conifer, & mesic mixed conifers sites to discuss openings and wildlife objectives.

- Peter Brown (RMTRR) showed a slideshow of photos from the field trip and gave an overview. Said it was great to get out and see some of these from the ground. Said the group really appreciated the input from Forest Service staff, as well as Sara and Hal; good team on Landscape Restoration, and provided very productive input into implementation strategies, fuels treatments, into much more restoration perspective: groupy/clumpy, etc. He said it was nice to see a temporal progression in some of these areas. Good to have the Contract Administrators there and see their work. Good turnout at field trips. The LR team had a post-field trip session feedback. This is the Adaptive Management part of what we’re seeing on the ground. Peter has some 360 degrees tours he will post to the CFR website. Panaromas can give a better idea on how it fits on the bigger landscape. We saw West Range Reclamation working on the AR. The before and after pics were good to see the work and what’s been done. Mentioned that with some of the EAs there is regulations on size of openings. Got to see some of the longer term vision of what’s happening and appreciate the implementers starting to see the landscape perspective.

- Tony Cheng (CSU-CFRI) presented Social and Economic Monitoring results from 2012 (Kathie Mattor was unable to attend). CFLRP is a competitive funding program administered through the Forest Service. Successful projects were collaboratively developed – treatments on 50,000 acres, and also a social/economic impact, and demonstrated a robust multi-party monitoring. CFRI has taken the lead on monitoring, compiling and analyzing the data. Very

robust monitoring program. All collaborative work. Torsten Lund Snee an economist and Kathie Mattor (CSU) did all the legwork. Showed FRR Social and Economic Goals – 1) Enhance community sustainability, 2) Improve local restoration business. The LR team decides what they want to measure. So for 2012 – determine economic contributions associated with the Front Range CFLRP, measure types of amount of wood utilizations. Economic Impacts – West Range Reclamation gave data. Funding sources \$3.8m in appropriated funds – also \$4.6m matching funds (Tony described that this is building capacity; snowball effect!). Measured economic impact from task orders and from actual monitoring. Model outputs show 74 jobs created, labor income (\$3.7m) and value added GDP \$2.4m. Showing real data is good. Showed 2011 v 2012 economic impacts – ramping up. Wood Utilization – survey completed by West Range for AR and PSICC projects. Most work on Pike was mechanical, most on AR was hand work. 99% of materials were entered into a value-added market. Majority of value added materials purchased by 12 companies – 10 of which are in Colorado. Public outreach: Kathie and other grad students – did focus groups along the Front Range. Keith helped with one after the Waldo Canyon Fire. Most effective approaches they found - knowing the audience and information, interactive methods and personal contact, use multiple outreach tools, coordinate with local organizations, positive message framing. How can the Roundtable assist outreach efforts? CPT group benefited from these. Continue to get this annually, collect and analyze task order and monitoring economic data. Collect information from communities post-fire. They have a method that tracks the collaboration every 5 years.

- Rob Addington (CSU, CFRI) Presented an overview of the ecological patterns we're observing so far, as part of the CFLRP, with emphasis on restoration beyond fuels reduction. Showed monitoring variables that were important. Talked about the top three that was gleaned from the CSE – plot based approach conducted by Forest Service crews. Pike data from 2011-2012 so pre- and post- treatment. Phantom Creek. Removals focused on smaller diameter trees. One of objectives is to increase quadratic mean diameter by removing the smaller diameter trees, shifting amongst size classes. Favoring ponderosa pine over other species. For the AR – five projects in this area. Very similar trends in both forests. Reduction in basal area and trees per acre. Increase in QMD again like in the Pikes. Summary – seeing the decrease in tree density and increase in QMD. Next Steps - fuels variables, wildlife monitoring, understory vegetation, etc. Adaptive Management process – we are at a point where we have some post treatment data that we can use. We are trying to understand the analysis/evaluation box and go through the series of white boxes on the left. Are we moving in the right direction? LR subteam will be meeting next week on that.

- Jenny Briggs (USGS) gave an overview of the regional CFLR conference she and several others attended in the fall. The purpose was to compare notes on five regional CFLR projects from Colorado (2), New Mexico, and Arizona. Colorado is the only state to win two contracts within the state. Partnership grew out of something that had been around for awhile, like the Roundtable. Those histories helped them be successful. She said there were a few takeaways – Lauren Marshall from Washington – representing the Forest Service office perspective spoke on how to take all these results over the last few years and find common topics, metrics, challenges, etc, to take back to the Forest Service. We were part of first cohort funded. Everyone who is receiving funds is expected to report back. Everyone is doing restoration and so Washington wants results. But begs the question how are groups evaluating their work, and objectives. The reporting is mandatory. Groups can do some tailoring. One challenge for us and others – hard for all stakeholders to collaboratively agree what treatments are best. That is challenging for other CFLRs as well. Some other collaboratives are having pretty bad differences of opinion. Each CFLR has approached the challenge of monitoring differently. Our approach to monitoring here has been non-linear, very diverse, lots of sub-groups and teams have evolved, getting different grants. Other CFLRS have done more open sourcing – allocated to monitoring. Then they take bids from all different types of groups who could do different types of monitoring. A common consensus is they have a more streamlined approach in presenting monitoring data and having evaluation and decision making process. What does monitoring data tell us? We have more informal updates, etc, it may make sense for us to make it more transparent and regular. Stakeholders have a more formal and accessible role.
- CFLR Panel – Peter Brown (RMTRR) talked about restoration as a process, particularly prescribed fire. Tony Cheng (CSU-CFRI) said on the Uncompaghe, pairing regular timber sales with the restoration that is going on. There is some controversy. If you really want it then how are you going to pay for it? By opening up some non-restoration timber sales – at least it went to “0.” Tony directs the Southern Science fires Science Network and they are undergoing looking at their oak brush state of knowledge to blend this knowledge. Also the Wildfire Risk Reduction Grant from DNR – several are in the Colorado Springs area – compiling a list of projects where we could do some applied work. We know very little about how oak brush responds to management, etc, at a systematic level. Also not a lot of agencies are funding knowledge of gambel oak. Also we need to have a conversation about herbicides. Peter doing a vegetation assessment of Zion National Park and oak is one of their areas of concern. There is data but no follow up. Chuck Dennis (West Range Reclamation) said in the

Black Forest they are looking at treatments that happened in the past – he’s curious if areas treated with the clumpiness have gone through wildfires? Jonas Feinstein (NRCS) says not in Colorado but in Arizona – R3 had demonstration sites and performed. Glenn Casamassa (USFS-ARP) said their regional leadership team was at the Red Feather site and they were very impressed on the work on the CFLR project, and the level of skill and knowledge that was brought into the project. They said the bar was set so high that they probably couldn’t meet it elsewhere at this time. Looked at highly from a regional perspective. As we get more surgical with our prescriptions, starts to get very difficult to implement. Mark Platten (CSU) asked about the psychology of taking action in the Black Forest: what works to motivate people to take action? Tony thought people aren’t asking those questions. Fire isn’t as important an issue for most people. Humans are terrible at risk management. We learn from experience, not a probability analysis. Mike Lester (CSFS) said what we’re doing is great science, it’s great data for him. He’s trying to motivate people and tools are so good to have. Agreed we are horrible at risk and measuring risk. People still smoke and don’t wear seat belts. Part of our roles as leaders is to broaden our role. Jenny said the challenge is to create chaos out of chaos (groupy/clumpy/etc.) and not order out of chaos. The people Joseph Hansen (Jefferson Conservation District) talked to that thought the restored areas looked so natural. Judy talked about monitoring if there’s a market for the saw mills – where’s the wood going? That’s what we’re running into. She shared part of the report from the Forest Service (see previous). Would like to see more work using these concepts for Rob Addington (CSU-CFRI).

WRAP UP

After thanking speakers and attendees and reviewing the 2014 calendar, the meeting was adjourned around 3:40 p.m.