

# MINUTES FROM FRONT RANGE ROUNDTABLE Q3-10 QUARTERLY MEETING



**Date of meeting:** Friday, July 23, 2010, 9:30 – 12:30pm (followed by field trip)

**Location:** Woodland Park Community Center, Woodland Park, Colorado

**Date minutes posted:** September 15, 2010

**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)

## CONTENTS (IN ORDER OF AGENDA TOPIC)

Minutes from Front Range Roundtable Q3-10 Quarterly Meeting .....	1
Contents (In Order of Agenda Topic).....	1
Acknowledgements.....	1
Attendees.....	1
Welcome, Introductions, and Announcements .....	2
Results of Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative (WPHFI) Landowner Survey.....	2
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration (CFLR) Proposal.....	4
Roundtable Organization and Executive Team Recruitment.....	5
Roundtable Budget.....	5
Implementation & Mapping (IM) Team.....	6
Outreach to Elected Officials (OEO) Team.....	6
Biomass Utilization & Slash Sites (BUSS) Team .....	7
Science & Monitoring (SM) Team .....	7
Closing.....	8

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Carol Ekarius, Jonathan Bruno, the rest of CUSP and the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative for hosting the meeting. Thank you also to Chelsea Gunsalus who took notes and provided these minutes for Roundtable members' benefit. Thank you also to our guest speaker, Jessica Clements, CFRI. The PowerPoint presentation shown during this meeting can be downloaded at: [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/Roundtable\\_Q3-10\\_Quarterly\\_Meeting\\_072310\\_gb\\_v1.pdf](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/Roundtable_Q3-10_Quarterly_Meeting_072310_gb_v1.pdf) (or at the top of the website: [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Roundtable\\_Documents.html](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Roundtable_Documents.html))

## ATTENDEES

At the most recent Front Range Roundtable Quarterly meeting in Woodland Park on July 23, 2010, 36 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, July 23, 2010—Woodland Park, Colorado**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Justin Anderson	US Forest Service, PSICC
Robert Ayotte	US Forest Service, PSICC
Mike Babler	The Nature Conservancy
Gali Beh	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Brent Botts	Colorado State Forest Service
Jonathan Bruno	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Jeremy Buss	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Marti Campbell	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Glenn Casamassa	US Forest Service, AR
Jessica Clement	Colorado State University
Joseph Duda	Colorado State Forest Service
Carol Ekarius	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Jonas Feinstein	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Susan Ford	US Forest Service
Hal Gibbs	US Forest Service, AR
Shane Greer	US Forest Service, PSICC
Chelsea Gunsalus	US Forest Service, AR
Jim Ignatius	Teller County
Merrill Kaufmann	US Forest Service
Leon Kot	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Susan Linner	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Larry Long	Colorado State Forest Service
Mark Mathis	Confluence Energy
Sara Mayben	US Forest Service, PSICC
Mike McHugh	City of Aurora
Cody Neff	West Range Reclamation
Annie Oatman-Gardner	Office of US Senator Bennet
John Peterson	US Forest Service, PSICC
Mark Platten	Colorado State University
Steve Randolph	City of Woodland Park
Ken Reed	Bureau of Land Management
Dave Root	Colorado State Forest Service
Mike Smith	Colorado Renewable Resource Cooperative
Carl Spaulding	Colorado Timber Industry Association
Scott Woods	Colorado State Forest Service
Wade Yates	Jefferson County

## WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

- **Joe Duda:** The CSFS Assessment and Strategy was completed. The assessment was due on June 18<sup>th</sup> and is posted on the CSFS website. If anyone would like hard copies, contact Joe Duda at [JDuda@lamar.ColoState.EDU](mailto:JDuda@lamar.ColoState.EDU).

## RESULTS OF WOODLAND PARK HEALTHY FOREST INITIATIVE (WPHFI) LANDOWNER SURVEY

### Speaker: Jessica Clement, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI)

- The CFRI conducted the “Social Monitoring Study of Forest Management Preference and Values for the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative” ([http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/WPFHI\\_Survey\\_Report\\_v3\\_.pdf](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/WPFHI_Survey_Report_v3_.pdf)) or found at the top of the website: [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/External\\_Documents.html](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/External_Documents.html)

- Late last year, CFRI designed a survey that would help monitor the social aspects of forest management and find out what respondents felt in regards to the Woodland Park project. The study consisted of a onetime mailing to residents within the zip code of 80866. It was sent out to 4,000 households and CFRI received 563 responses back; this is a 14% response rate with a 3.83% margin of error.
- The purpose of the study was to find out the following: (1) how much knowledge people have of Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative (WPHFI), (2) the public's values regarding forests around Woodland Park, (3) beliefs regarding forest management, and (3) respondents views on biomass utilization as well as some demographic info.
- Some results from this survey include:
  - Those who have heard about WPHFI = No 60%, Yes 40%.
  - % Beliefs regarding amount and type of forest mgmt work = Overall, many said low or don't know.
  - % favor forest mgmt
    - a) For vegetation management forest products 62% in favor,
    - b) Fire prevention protection 91% in favor,
    - c) Salvage dead or dying 85% in favor,
    - d) Create/improve wildlife habitat 89% in favor, timber harvesting 11% in favor.
  - % favor for forest mgmt
    - a) Clear cutting 69% opposed
    - b) Patch cutting 43% favor,
    - c) Forest thinning 91% favor
    - d) Prescribed fire 65% favor
    - e) Product development 56% favor
    - f) No action 83% favor
  - Support for Local Woody Biomass Utilization = 39% strongly support
  - **Values** held in relation to forests in and around Woodland Park: There is broad array of values people have about forest issues. (Definitions provided to respondents and shown in appendix to survey results): Aesthetic (1), biodiversity (2), cultural, economic, future (4), historic, intrinsic, learning, life sustaining value (3), recreation, spiritual, and therapeutic. Values match up well with PSICC results.
- **Demographics:** Half of the respondents moved to the area within the last ten years, a majority of them are between 31-45 yrs, 42% were women, 67% had 4 yrs or more of a college education and 47% earned more than \$75,000/year.
- **Limitation:** This can be extrapolated, particularly to residents interested in forest issues in Woodland Park.
- **Conclusions:**
  - Respondents are comfortable with forest thinning on public and private lands, but there appears to be a need to provide more information. Respondents agree on preferred reasons to conduct treatments, which include: fire prevention, salvage, and to improve wildlife habitat, but there were many "I don't know's". The future, biodiversity, recreation and aesthetic values rank top. Respondents value forests for reasons that go beyond present or even human concerns alone.
  - There is support for current approaches, but there could be more. There's a need for more in-depth information, including trade-offs. It's about fuels, but also about the future and wildlife.
  - This survey showed the public is ready for more complex discussions. The subject is more complex, but people are interested in participating. For WPHFI, the respondents showed the residents of the Woodland Park area are ready for the next phase to get people involved.
- **Questions/Comments** (speaker responses):
  - ***Did the term "clear cut" get used in the questionnaire? Did you get a bigger reaction to the term 5-acres or clear cut? Sometimes we cut more than five acres; it can be beneficial to do up to thirty.*** The term "five-acres" is accurate enough to give respondents an idea of what we're talking about, but Jessica thinks they are ready for it. The response in Woodland Park is usually higher. People seem to understand that clear cuts aren't the way to go. ***ML: If this survey was conducted 6-7 years ago, different results would've come out. There has been on-going burning and thinning in visual areas and stories in the paper that expose people to forest treatment/management. There is a 25% turn over in population. A culture change has taken place because of wide amounts of efforts. Culture is also changing in reaction to fire.***
  - ***How would you suggest changing "don't know's" and neutrals to provide education?*** When there's more complexity and we want to talk about trade-offs, people are listening and have a chance to talk or collaboratively learn. WPHFI can do a Saturday tour for the public, show thinning sites with foresters and ecologists or show the difference after time passes after treatments. It is valuable to show why we're treating this acre this way and why another acre is treated differently. People often ask: what are

- the objectives for treatments? What they do know is suggesting that we're doing the right thing with treatments. There are opportunities in the WPHFI to take it to another level. Surveys raise awareness. Even a postcard that mentions wildlife can draw in more people. WPHFI created a monitoring site for schools to go view, so they can share with their families.
- ***Is there a sense from a group like this that they would be adverse to a special district tax to pay for projects?*** That might be a good motivator to get people to come to the table and look at trade-offs. Cities can form special districts after legislation just passed allowing this. Attempts at it though have failed 80/20 when there is talk about raising taxes for treatments. WHFPI is asking for private landowners to put money into the treatments and once they put it into perspective, people are more likely to throw some money in.
  - ***In conclusions, you mentioned there is opportunity for more treatment or more support?*** She intended to say support, which would in turn create more opportunities for treatment.
  - ***Is there any sense of the current, poor economy's impact on the efforts? Has it affected people's interest in fire mitigation?*** That has not been looked at. It is likely, but there are no statistics to show this.
  - We can walk into school, and talk about water or trees, but that's not so easy to get done in Denver. We need to help bridge that gap. CSFS has a program for kids and Forests to Faucets for teachers was created to begin educating students from all different types of schools (urban and rural).
  - This information gives indication of how people are thinking across the state. In Colorado, collaboration is a strength. Almost all collaborative groups are getting to the point of moving forward to talk about trade-offs. We need to talk more in terms of public and the future to create possibilities. More research is being done in Grand County and on the UP Mesa.

## COLLABORATIVE FOREST LANDSCAPE RESTORATION (CFLR) PROPOSAL

### Speaker: Glenn Casamassa, USFS-PSI Forest Supervisor

- **Background to CFLR Program:** The CFLR program was initiated in 2010 by the Forest Service to cast up projects across the US to compete for USFS dollars. The objective of the program is to have collaboration between a wide variety of communities and proposals to restore a landscape.
- **Available Funding:**
  - \$10 million will be awarded nationally in FY10. Up to 17 proposals can be selected. The allocation/distribution of the annual money is uncertain.
  - The administration's trajectory is toward restoration efforts with the purpose of restoring landscapes, watershed enhancements, and climate change. One way to shift the focus [toward restoration] was through this project.
- **Progress of the Roundtable Proposal:**
  - Sara Mayben, Hal Gibbs [from USFS] and Paige Lewis [from The Nature Conservancy] did the lion's share of the work associated with creating the proposal, which had rigid requirements. The proposal was sent up to the regional office, submitted to the Washington Office, and is now at the Department level.
  - All regions have sent up proposals. There were 31 proposals submitted nationwide: two from region 1, 3 from Region 2 (the Roundtable proposal, a proposal from South Dakota on the Black Hills National Forest, and one from the UP Project). R3 = 4 (one covers 4 forests), R4 = 6, R5 = 5, R6 = 6, R8 = 5, R9 = 2, R10 = 1.
  - The CFLR program established an advisory committee of 15 members from all over the country. There were 59 candidates. R2 proposals were recommended by the department. \$40 million will be allocated in FY11. If our project is recommended to the Secretary, it is likely we will get funding. We're supposed to hear in August. The Forest Service is ready to implement with a task order that's already in place. The money will need to be obligated in this FY, but we will start spending it next year.
  - There will be another call for proposals next year. A proposal can work through the program for ten years, but the proposer will have to submit in the mean time to keep the funding. The funding source was taken out of FS appropriations. As part of budget for FY2011, the administration collapsed narrow funnels of money into one pot of money into integrated resource restoration. The Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture went before Congress to testify why there needed to be a more appropriate way to allocate money. Congress wants to know how to track accomplishments. If collaboration is a serious desire, funding creates a barrier, restructure helps to make that possible.
- **Post-script: In mid-August, the Roundtable learned that the Front Range project was selected for funding, along with UPP** (see press release:

[http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/PR\\_LandscapeRestorationGrant\\_081710.pdf](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/PR_LandscapeRestorationGrant_081710.pdf) or the top of the website: [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Public\\_Letters.html](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Public_Letters.html))

## ROUNDTABLE ORGANIZATION AND EXECUTIVE TEAM RECRUITMENT

### Speaker: Gali Beh, Facilitator

- **Roundtable Organization:** Please see the updated Organizational chart ([http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Roundtable\\_Organization.html](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Roundtable_Organization.html)). The ARP Foundation is the new fiscal agent. Contributions to the Roundtable can now be made in care of “ARP Foundation” at PO Box 1443, Fort Collins, CO 80522. Jeff Jahnke on the Executive Team is serving as the liaison between the ARP foundation and the Roundtable.
- **Executive Team recruitment efforts:**
  - The Roundtable Executive Team is pleased to welcome two new members: Acting Forest Supervisor John Peterson from PSICC and Commissioner John Tighe from Park County.
  - Current Executive Team structure:
    - As a reminder, the structure of the Executive Team is that 3 seats are perpetually reserved for the CSFS State Forester, PSICC Forest Supervisor, and the Arapaho-Roosevelt NFs and Pawnee NG Forest Supervisor.
    - In addition, one seat is set aside for a conservation group (currently the Nature Conservancy, but may change on a rotating basis.)
    - A 4<sup>th</sup> seat is for a County Commissioner on a rotating basis. That leaves two non-reserved seats for other stakeholder groups. One of these is now filled by a second County Commissioner.
  - There is still a vacant position for the 7<sup>th</sup> seat. The Roundtable is looking for a fire expert and asking for recommendations from Poudre Fire Authority.

## ROUNDTABLE BUDGET

### Speaker: Hal Gibss, USFS-ARP

- Three counties have now offered to donate funds. Also the USFS (ARP, PSICC, RMRS), CSFS, TNC, USFWS, Denver Water, and NRCS. There is still a need of \$7,800 for the fiscal year ending June 2011. If have already committed funds, please contact Sue Anderson at the ARP Foundation at [Sue@voc.org](mailto:Sue@voc.org) to arrange transfer of funds. If you haven’t committed money, please contribute if you can. It may be a good idea to begin fundraising with the remaining seven counties. The gap is beginning to be closed as other counties are contributing. The current status of the budget is below:

Organization	Amount offered
Boulder County	\$ 1,000
Park County	\$ 1,000
Gilpin County	\$ 1,000
USFS-AR	\$ 5,350
USFS-Pike	\$ 5,350
CSFS	\$ 5,000
TNC	\$ 2,500
USFWS	\$ 3,000
RMRS	\$ 5,350
Denver Water	\$ 2,500
NRCS	\$ 4,000
<b>Amount identified</b>	<b>\$ 36,050</b>
<b>Target Roundtable budget (including fiscal agent)</b>	<b>\$ 42,800</b>
<b>Gap</b>	<b>\$ 6,750</b>

## IMPLEMENTATION & MAPPING (IM) TEAM

### Speaker: Hal Gibbs, USFS-ARP

- The IM team is trying to develop another landscape scale project. Several maps have been created with the idea of looking at where priorities overlap among Front Range groups. This map shows three main groups that are participating on this team: the Roundtable, the NFPMPBWG, and the CWWPWG.
- **Team re-created the Roundtable 2006 map:** The team wanted to overlap GIS layers from the three groups, but discovered the 2006 published table associated with the Roundtable map had 1.5 million acres of forest, but there were actually 2.5 million acres of fuels (forests, grass, shrubs) on the map. When GIS work was done in '05, another overlap/masking was done to get the map down to the right number of forested acres for the table in the 2006 report. Therefore, the map in the 2006 report shows fuels hazards and the table shows only forested areas w/o shrubs and other vegetation. Also, there was no record of what was masked to lose 1 million acres. The new map approximates what is in the table. All shrubs and grasses were removed from the GIS layer, which created a big difference. Treatment areas have remained pretty consistent. The new map with quality controlled records is at 1.4 million acres.
- Then, the team identified priority areas from the three main collaborative groups. NFPMPBWG only looks at five counties, so the team overlapped the CWWPWG and Roundtable layers priority areas first. An extensive amount of treatment work has already been done in Grand County, so the team is going to focus on Red Feather/Crystal Lakes in Larimer County, Boulder County, and Harris Park. The team will solicit for requests for proposals, much like what was done when Woodland Park became a demonstration project. They will look at which communities to focus the efforts on. The team is getting ready to identify communities within these three areas and will send out requests for proposals within those communities.
- **Questions/Comments** (speaker responses):
  - **Do you just select one community?** The team would like to select a 50,000 acre area to focus on, so it will depend on the size of the community.
  - **Woodland Park used focused resources to get grants to complete its CWPP. The desires for the funding this time might not be exactly the same, but the team will try to focus on an area that has all levels of ownership and can try to complete treating an area.**
  - **At the last WPHFI meeting, they discussed if the group should continue after all of the work is completed.**
  - **The Roundtable should consider doing all three areas [Red Feather/Crystal Lakes in Larimer County, Boulder County, and Harris Park] at once.**
  - **Communities have questions about what to do. Woodland Park is a good place to demonstrate how it can be done.**
  - **The Woodland Park project isn't all run by government entities, HOAs and the private sector's pursuit for grants has helped them continue through with the project.**
  - **The Division of Local Affairs in Woodland Park provided the city with a small grant to document lessons learned from the project and to create a how-to for other communities to engage local citizens. It should be published by the end of the year.**
  - **How is the team going approach communities without funding identified first?** Grant proposals are often due within a few months or less, so the group wanted to ensure they have a plan in place when the right funding opportunity is announced. The team will make sure it's request for information from communities makes it clear what the team's plans are in terms of helping to raise funding.

## OUTREACH TO ELECTED OFFICIALS (OEO) TEAM

### Speakers: Carol Ekarius, Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP)

- **Planned Field trip:** The team has been working on a legislative tour for this summer. It is scheduled for August 16 & 17<sup>th</sup>. Invitations have been sent out. On the first day, the group will look at the southern part of the Front Range, fire projects, fuels related projects, and discuss research. The second day will be in Boulder County and the group will look at 2-3 different places. There are currently seven confirmed guests from outside the groups, and both days have tentative guests. RSVPs have been received from the state house reps, congressional offices, county, local, and the NPS. The deadline to RSVP isn't until the week before the tour and the team will send out another reminder to the invitees.
  - **Post-script:** See photos from the field trips at
    1. Day 1:
      - <http://picasaweb.google.com/105590397696302350809/FrontRangeRoundtableFieldTripDay1WoodlandPark?authkey=Gv1sRgCJni67LD9OLhYg&feat=directlink#>

## 2. Day 2:

<http://picasaweb.google.com/105590397696302350809/FrontRangeRoundtableFieldTripDay2BoulderGilpin?authkey=Gv1sRgCN3rt7vr-5bphAE&feat=directlink>

- **Other events since the last meeting:** The OEO team has done a few BOCC planning meetings already and have found the commissioners are interested in what the Roundtable can offer, what the funding sources are and what money the Roundtable can bring to counties/communities. Some commissioners have been very involved and have a good concept of what's out there, but other commissioners are not aware. Commissioners have been shocked by the amount of work that has been done in counties lately.
- **Other planned events:** The OEO team is planning a BOCC meeting in Park and Jefferson counties. The team is also organizing a trip to D.C. by representatives of the Roundtable along with other Front Range and Colorado groups in Sept, 2011. Three roundtable representatives have volunteered to go (Commissioner Pearlman, Carol Ekarius from CUSP/WFHPI, and Jeff Jahnke from CSFS). The team plans to go to DC in the fall of 2011 to introduce the collaborative groups, and then revisit in the spring for follow up discussion regarding specific projects, policies, or funding proposals. The team wants to try to collaborate with other Colorado forest interest groups so that we all go with the same message to D.C.
- **Questions/Comments** (speaker responses):
  - **Recommendation:** *A typically acceptable time to go to DC is in February and March.*

## BIOMASS UTILIZATION & SLASH SITES (BUSS) TEAM

### Speaker: Mike Smith, Colorado Renewable Resource Collaborative (CRRC)

- The team is trying to make information available to the Roundtable that other groups can use for Biomass. The team is developing communications and advocacy steps. They hold conference calls two times per month.
- **Biomass supply studies:**
  - Joe Duda recently released biomass inventory. The team found it couldn't know about the true inventory of biomass because there are too many changes on the ground as far as supply and what's on the ground right now. Biomass utilization is about Stewardship. The team has questioned whether stewardship is possible with NEPA involved and who would fund it.
  - The team is trying to come up with as much information as possible for the Roundtable to use. The team has created a web page with links to publications on Front Range biomass supply recommended by team members: [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Woody\\_Biomass.html](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/Woody_Biomass.html).
- **Other biomass utilization progress:**
  - The team is continuing to work with Jefferson County to find a biomass utilization site that will use material from Jefferson County, the Front Range, and the "red zone." Park County is building a new school in which a biomass heater will be used. The project was furthered after the heat assessment was completed for county buildings. The county is now looking for money to help leverage a grant to heat the jail, county shops, county offices, and the city municipal building.
  - The county designated an area for a sort yard area, so it will be available for material. Governor's Energy Office offered money.
  - In Fairplay, there will be 5-6 buildings heated with biomass; the recreation center is already heated with biomass.
  - The Rocky Mountain Farmer's Union and Secretary, Tom Vilsack is helping Colorado to get funding for biomass.
  - The proposed Vail biomass utilization project failed to win funding by the Department of Energy; the DOE decided to go with other projects, so the Vail team is looking for private funds. The team is currently partnering with a private company in California that has a machine that will produce 12 KW per day and 3000 gallons of biodiesel; there is interest in a partnership. Once the project is going, the team/company wants to put the machine in all communities throughout the Front Range, so electrical production can be localized.
  - Colorado Springs Utilities should be able to take material in 2011 and start production in 2012.

## SCIENCE & MONITORING (SM) TEAM

### Speaker: Mike McHugh, City of Aurora

- The team has held two workshops to define 50+ terms that are used in common between all of the workgroups. The team started with 80 words; 53 have been defined, there are 12 more that need to be added, 9 are used only by individual groups and so will not be defined. There are some words/terms that the team would like to ask the Front Range groups not to use.

- The team evaluated progress of the forest treatments since '04. It looked at prioritized areas. Some treatment areas identified are part of the areas the NFRMPBWG has identified. The team will be working during the next year to get data from NFRMPBWG. The team will continue to monitor the number of acres treated.
- The team is discussing who will help form the monitoring group for various efforts (e.g., the Long Term Stewardship; West Range Reclamation's biomass utilization grant, or CFLR if won are currently being considered.)
- **Questions/Comments** (speaker responses):
  - **When is terminology review going to stop?** One more workshop is scheduled and it will probably be in September or October, then the review will be done. The team will notify the groups that there will be a cutoff date.
  - **Explain to group why terminology was important and why it was done.** The terminology exercise came out of a meeting in which discrepancies in terminology was hindering the progress of the meeting. The team wanted to try to create an understanding that the groups agreed more than it appeared they did.

## CLOSING

### Speaker: Gali Beh, Facilitator

- The next meeting will be on October 15, 2010 at a location still to be determined (likely Boulder).