

MINUTES FROM FRONT RANGE ROUNDTABLE Q4-11 QUARTERLY MEETING



Date of meeting: Friday, Nov. 4, 2011, 9:30 am – 3:30 pm

Location: Colorado Division of Wildlife, 4255 Sinton Road, Colorado Springs, CO

Roundtable contact: Gali Beh, c/o Beh Management Consulting, Inc., 1107 12th St., Boulder CO 80302, 303-499-1576, gali@behconsulting.com

A Front Range Roundtable Acronym Guide is available on the Roundtables Web site at:
http://frontrangeroundtable.org/Roundtable_Documents.html

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to the Colorado Division of Wildlife for hosting this meeting.

ATTENDEES

At the Front Range Roundtable Quarterly meeting at the Colorado Division of Wildlife on November 4, 2011, 38 members and guests participated. If you attended the meeting but your name is not recorded in the list below, please send an email to Kendall Slee at Kendall@behconsulting.com.

Name	Organization
Kathy Andrew	El Paso County
Greg Aplet	The Wilderness Society
Mike Babler	The Nature Conservancy
Gali Beh	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey
Peter Brown	Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research
Jonathan Bruno	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Marti Campbell	Coalition for the Upper South Platte
Tony Cheng	Colorado State University
Casey Cooley	Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife
Richard Edwards	US Forest Service
Leslie Ellwood	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jonas Feinstein	Natural Resources Conservation Service
Paula Fornwalt	USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station
Pam Froemke	US Forest Service
Hal Gibbs	US Forest Service, ARP
Chelsea Gunsalus	US Forest Service, ARP
Craig Hansen	US Fish and Wildlife Service
Jay Heeter	Colorado Mountain Club
Jeff Jahnke	Colorado State Forest Service
Dennis Jaeger	US Forest Service, ARP
Craig Jones	Colorado State Forest Service

Don Kennedy	Denver Water
Paige Lewis	The Nature Conservancy
Kathie Mattor	Colorado State University
Sara Mayben	US Forest Service, PSICC
Patrick McLaughlin	CDPHE
Andy Merritt	Congressman Mike Coffman's Office
Don Moore	American Planning Association
Pam Motley	West Range Reclamation, LLC
Kawa Ng	US Forest Service
Felix Quesada	Forest Service-Pikes Peak Rd
John Ring	Bureau of Land Management
Julie Schaefer	US Forest Service
Pam Shaddock	Senator Mark Udall's Office
Kendall Slee	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Carl Spaulding	Colorado Timber Industry Association
Jeff Underhill	US Forest Service, PSICC

ANNOUNCEMENTS

- John Bustos is retiring December 31, 2011
- Paige Lewis – CFLR, Dear colleague letter circulating in Congress to try to get the program fully funded. Hazardous fuels funding – Senate proposing 25% cut to program 500,000 acres not treated. Push to get funding for next year. If you want to make contacts about issues, please let Paige know.
- Craig Jones – Biomass short course is taking place on December 8-9 in Wheat Ridge. If you are interested, please talk to Craig for registration information; Due Dec. 5.
- Tony Cheng – Joint Fire Science interagency funding program for knowledge transfer between agencies. Going to discuss treatment effectiveness. Overlap between monitoring questions and joint fire science call. Chad Hoffman, principle investigator, Mike Battaglia and Tony Cheng co-PIs. Finalizing proposal and need letters of support. Asking FRRT and Exec Team to provide letters of support. Letter from agency and from collaboration FRRT. Will submit by end of next week (11/11) Fire behavior model is spatially explicit and has a time component – most data collected on projects are usable in spatial model.

MEETING NOTES

Background of Roundtable:

- Fire season of 2002 sparked the need for a collaborative effort, such as the Roundtable. It included the Front Range Implementing Agencies: USFS, BLM, RMNP, USFWS, & CSFS. Partnerships broadened in 2004 to TNC and TWS
- In 2006 the Roundtable vision document was created.
- The RT selected the lower montane where fire risk mitigation = ecological restoration because the historical range of variability were understood and conditions at high risk for

ignition and fire spread. The RT believes there should be ½ mile of fire risk mitigation around three forest types

- Understanding of values at risk
- Land base spans Larimer to El Paso Counties – share Grand and Park Counties with CBBC
- Mission: (in presentation packet)
- Vision: Treat 1.5 million out of 4 million acres; 400,000 eco restoration, 400,000 fire risk, 400,000 of both
- Successes:
 - Woodland Park, CFLRP, Stewardship Contract, new funding from FS and ARRA, biomass utilization improvement, and the approval of 75 Front Range CWPPs.
- Change local policy to limit growth of fire risk hasn't made progress, but all others have
- ARP Foundation is fiscal agent to RT
- Executive Team: Welcome Dennis; USFS (ARP), USFS (PSICC), CSFS State Forester, Conservation NGO, County Commissioner, 2 seats open to stakeholder groups
- 2011 Goals: (in packet)
- CFLRP Monitoring – turning into ecological and economic monitoring teams

CFLR:

SM Team met last week – agreed on 4 goals

1. Join CFRI-led team on collaborative monitoring
2. Revise Monitoring Plan finished in June (habitats, wildlife, aquatic insects, broadcast burns)
3. Recommending adaptive management together – refine priority treatment areas to potentially focus treatments on smaller acreages.
4. Assemble and inventory GIS and other data (CFLR monitoring and fire history research) to facilitate information sharing
5. If capacity allows: track research done on Front Range, share findings, prioritize future research agenda (Southern Rockies Fire Science Program)

CFLRI Implementation Update (ARP & PSICC)

Task Orders Awarded to long-term service contracts: Estes Valley 5, Walker Black, Walker Red, Thompson River 2, Phantom Creek 2, Phantom Creek 3 (treated 2100 acres on ARP, 3 projects on PSICC short of 1900 acres total) spent \$2.7 million of \$3.5 million to implement

Treatments Completed: Phantom Creek – 597, Taylor – 391, Phantom Creek 2 – 600, Estes Valley 5/Walker Black – 65, Walker Red – 220, Thompson River 2 – 455

Treatments: 60% of total w/ product removal of saw and non-saw timber, pole sized material. Manual chainsaw work. 40% manual Treatment types - Thinning, all crown classes; thin from below; patch cutting. Biomass not removed is piled or lop and scattered. No broadcast burning to date.

Products removed: 70% of products removed sawtimber and non-saw timber. Biomass (30%) removal includes landing material only - Biomass that ends up on landing is by-product of processing timber (tops, limbs, bark)

Project Areas – Red Feather 1 (2012), Red Feather 2 (2013), Cache La Poudre Rx Burn (2012), Estes Valley (2011), Thompson River 3 (2012), Walker Red/Black (2011), Boulder Heights (2012) added due to West BLX Healthy Forest Initiative, Kelly Dahl (2012), West Magnolia (2012)

PSICC – Phantom Creek (2010 & 2011), Ryan Quinlan (2011), Phantom Creek 4 (2012), HyBrook (2012), Long John (2012) part of Trout West Phase 1 NEPA, decision on Catamount in March prep activities in progress.

Add other treatments into maps so group can see areas that have been treated outside of CFLR

Variation in project areas

In pine stands looking 40-60 sq. ft basal stand area. Mixed conifer, higher density. Aspen/Spacing cut out majority of conifers particularly smaller trees variable spacing, “clumpiness”

Shooting for same range of basal area – introduce more variation – if install plots get consistent basal area. Shift for operators to have anywhere from zero-100 basal areas in stands.

Demonstration plots w/ operators have been used

Once installed a few have areas to show to simplify process.

Mechanized units have been lop and scattered. Have mastication operations on other parts of forest, but not on CFLR project.

Found a way to describe type of treatment – each contract will have write up (Rx) including what to leave behind. Contractors have been able to work with prescription, but variable spacing hasn't been as successful. If marking, it is limited because it would change production. Allow operator to follow criteria; mark older trees or trees attached to wildlife goals. Each contractor goes out with FS rep and begins cutting small area to see desired result.

When implementing through long-term stewardship get different crews, but same contractor. Worked with some same operators. Felling and saw operators work closely with FS to get desired results. Over time have to work w/ different operators.

Productivity rates and costs – Cost/acre has been stable. Treatments haven't changed much

ARP has described patches and different prescriptions to achieve different things.

Pre-treatment conditions basal area, size class, and regeneration results – Starting w/ 100 sq ft to 120 (southern aspect) broken up with draws pick up aspen and spruce which can have 150-200 sq. ft. basal area. The understories are not that thick and can contrast with older regeneration treatments that have a whole new stand coming up.

Plan for prescribed burning in recent and older treatment areas. Many older treatments set up well for Rx burns. Some treatments will create new trees coming in – will have to maintain those. Fuels reduction objective goes away if maintenance isn't done.

4,000 acres is only 1% of goal – will it take 100 years to complete? 4,000 just what was done with CFLR, acreage is larger than 4,000 acres. RT estimated it would take 40 years to accomplish all treatment if receive \$15 million of funding/year @ \$400/acre. Some NEPA has restoration component, but primarily fuels reduction, treatments centered around Woodland Park. Scale of treatment may not be as important as location.

Funding:

2010 funding - Received \$1,000,000 of CFLR between 2 forests, 70% went to task orders and contracting. All CFLR work has been done through LTSC. 20% contract prep, 2% monitoring, 7% carried over to 2011. 2011 funding \$3.5 million 20% went to contract prep/admin, 75% to task orders, 5% to monitoring (CFRI agreement) May carry over \$7,000 to 2012.

Monitoring - \$23K FY10 Agreement w/ CFRI, \$115K FY11 Agreement w/ CFRI, \$108K estimated partner contributions to monitoring plan, \$5K to RMRS, \$46K stand exam contracts (collected data 600 plots, will collect data on 400 plots pre-treatment, FY12 focus more on post treatment) \$35K wildlife monitoring through grant. No analysis done to date

Matching funds: 2010 - \$834K task order costs, \$142K contract prep, 20K pre-commercial thinning, 25K noxious weed treatment \$34K CUSP Hayman restoration,, \$10K CFRI contribution, \$350K other partner contributions. 2011 - \$1,938K million partner contributions, \$813K contract prep, \$278K task order, \$288 Hayman reforestation...etc.

FY12 Potential Projects:

Red Feather 1 – 559 acres

West Magnolia (CFLR and matching acres) – 306 acres

Kelly Dahl (CFLR and match) – 174 acres

Boulder Heights – 491 acres

South Zone Chipping? – 927 acres

Phantom Creek 4 – 970 acres

Long John – 294 acres

HyBrook – 569 acres

Total – 4,290 acres

Burning piles hasn't been done as well as treating – air quality restrictions and snow inconsistency make it challenging to burn. Have been chipping piles that equip. could reach. After Fourmile review emphasized slash must be dealt w/ to successfully restore site. Still undecided if use CFLR \$ for mastication.

PSICC – operating in same general area in Woodland Park HFI area. Looking at next project (Catamount) Will put contract out in 2013 but dependent on activity contractor has going on elsewhere. Continue to work in Trout West area but will not be at the level that has been done.

Lessons Learned:

Late arrival of funds in 2010 and 2011 has created contracting challenges. Hard to get task orders awarded when \$ doesn't arrive until June w/ contracting cut off dates

Multiple partner commitments creates matching fund opportunities and challenges (Denver Water, LTSC product mix, WBCHFI, CWPPs, NEPA ready projects, BB theatre hazardous reduction) make management complicated

No common understanding regarding “restoration” treatments/objectives in terms of desired future conditions which drove strategy. Wanted Rx grade cover and stand type level info and had to take step back to agree to move things in right direction

As result final, monitoring plan target conditions were less specific than originally intended.

More variation in project units than expected

Treatments have not yet included some restoration goals such as creation of large opening due to NEPA constraints. Component hasn't been incorporated in projects yet. Transitional stage – restricted to ¼ acre opening on older projects, can have larger opening on newer project (Catamount)

Opportunities to new NEPA – South Rampart (plan to begin initial project layout w/ acreage this winter/next spring) good opportunity for RT to look at project area for input. CWPP included support for CFLR in Teller County

Next Steps:

Complete implementation in Trout West Phase 1 and 2 Project Area

Working on prep for 2013 project. Forsythe project in SZ area is major CFLR project. Scoping just began. Collecting additional pre-post treatment monitoring data and finalize social monitoring.

CFRI Monitoring Process:

In 2011 larger contract set up, has agreement with USFS

Many were part of CFLR monitoring team, surfaced broader questions around eco restoration.

Monitoring plan will be on RT website soon.

Includes indicators, measures, etc. part of indicators implemented based on stand exams. Variables have been identified through Tier 1 (has to be collected) and Tier 2 process.

Research and monitoring work fall into Tier 2 category.

The funds that came out of CFLR to CFRI to implement monitoring plan and provide assistance in analyzing data to coordinate adaptive mgmt process.

Social/Economic Monitoring Plan – part of plan and part of goals of CFLR Act. National set of outcomes and indicators that have been developed for entire program. National Forest Foundation came up with outcomes and indicators. Much implementation of monitoring designed to contribute info to national reporting program.

End of developing plan meeting held June 2011 – had discussion that refined initial indicators. 7 topics identified w/ measures. Further validated by National Forest Foundation process. Core Team decided to go forward w/ effort (Julie, Kawa and Kathy) Scope of work result of conversations among core team. Kawa helped develop TREAT model that went into CFLR proposal to create jobs, etc.

Measures on jobs/local economic activity, wood utilization (what kind of product, values), community protected (ecological), wildfire severity (ecological), public acceptance process (start w/ existing social science research on using Rx on NFS lands to reduce hazards and risks), reducing costs of fire fighting and operating costs (Kawa taking lead RCAT model), collaboration measures tier to national indicators. Scope of work has things intend to accomplish this coming year, made headway this fall, looking at data and how organized, build models, etc. Working w/ West Range Reclamation to get fine scale information to ensure analysis is accurate.

Not that far along w/ Uncompahgre w/ social/economic monitoring for that project

Status of National Monitoring Plan – at the WO submitted in Sept. but hasn't moved forward

May want to make info request to WO

Julie working w/ other social scientists across regions – best thing would be survey so trying to get OMB approval to get CFLR survey across all projects. If can get model that works for this project may try to make work for all projects.

Ecological Monitoring Scope of Work: Added items beyond CFLR , SoW negotiated with Hal/Sarah. Other funds that came out of WO for all 3 restoration institutes to supplement work on restoration driven by large fires in AZ. SoW shows unaddressed issues that came up during meetings among CFLR monitoring team.

1. Historic stand reconstruction - Reference conditions - Using historic stand reconstruction and look at historic fire regimes to get better evidence about stand structure (basal area, size class) and kinds of disturbances stands have seen over time to self regulate and function. Opportunities to engage RT to go into field to do stand reconstruction work. Chad Julian committed some staff time to help collect/manage data on Hall and Heil Ranches. As finalize method kicking around ideas, send e-mail for anyone that wants to participate once plan field days. Includes spatial. Stakeholders recognize broad need for restoration, not sure what looks like. Historic reconstruction became basis for NEPA work on Uncompahgre project, which treated about 17,000 acres.
2. Broader project to come up with basis for stands
3. More quantitative study of variable spacing sampling example. Look at different designations what is ecological and economic outcomes. How compare to increase efficiency to get larger pace and scale of treatments potentially.

4. Body of pre- and post-treatment analysis. Start building database to have quantitative and visual picture of effects and if effects are meeting desired conditions. JFS Program \$ would help w/ fire component
5. Landscape monitoring is more open ended. Process design question about what landscape and coordinating databases to coordinate treatments across landscape. Looking at if landscape patterns create resilient, sustainable forest that also meets social needs
6. Can engage broad group of stakeholders in RT.
Identify steps, tasks and schedule – create workplan after new year. Just finished search process to find 2 people to work on CFLR monitoring, making offers today. Agreed to start in January.

Land Conservation Collaborative Monitoring:

Monitoring restoration treatment impacts on ponderosa pine ecosystems STRLCC pilot project

Started last field season to answer questions to get collaborative efforts started on ground

Primary objective: assess impacts of forest restoration treatments on PP ecosystems through collaborative monitoring. And test monitoring methods in discussion by CFLRP/RT Monitoring Team.

SRLCC call for proposals – landscape scale conservation and mgmt – 1 of 4 that was funded.

Oct. 2010 – April 2011: Monitoring team mtgs, CFLRP monitoring plan in development, led by CFRI, June award announced, June-July common stand exam on treatment units. Add tier 2 monitoring methods that CFLR Team had been discussing. Worked full time from July-August 15 and part time August 18 – September 23

Grant was for 2 years, so will hire similar crew and set up plots for season

Pike provided seasonals to get oriented

Sites are in Phantom Creek area (2 units), Boulder County Parks and Open Space, (3 units) Estes Valley area (3 units)

Prescriptions:

Phantom units have been treated in last few months w/ mechanical thinning

Estes Valley should be thinned in early 2012

Boulder County units should be treated early in 2012, 1 treated w/ Rx burn

Assessed whether CSE had full or partial coverage. # of pretreatment plots put in and identified control plots. 79 total plots

Control plots w/in 1-2 miles of treatment areas.

Boulder County Parks and Open Space have been doing treatments for many years.

Hall Ranch Rx Burn occurred on Oct 5 –

Pre-treatment – combination of CSU and/or new plots b/c units were variable

Control plots – established in areas not slated for treatment nearby that matched as closely to over and understory to treatment plots

Plot selection – random and target approach

Plot density – 1 per 10 acre – 1 per 50 acre

Pre-existing CSU plots served as foundation in treatment areas for data on overstory tree data, saplings and fuels. Pike include understory cover by life form and tree ages for site and growth trees

Would do Browns fuel transects

1. Understory/Wildlife: fixed radius plot on top of fixed center radius plot (used BAD 10 prism to pick up additional trees on plot and took cores from “old” “site” and “growth tree”)
2. Wildlife use: survey using same fixed plot size
 - a. Recorded wildlife use in all in-plot trees, snags and stumps
 - b. Conducted 2-minute broadcast call surveys for goshawks at each plot
 - c. Recorded any animals, scat, tracks, sign, bones, etc present in 1/10 acre plots
3. Jonas: clumpiness transect measurements
 - a. Groups + clumpy = Grumpy
 - b. Developed a Spatial Aggregation “Clumpiness” Transect (categorized whether single story or multistory group)
4. Paula: Understory measures
 - a. Percent cover of species along 4 transects, made 100 observations document plants and trees by species and size class at breast height and below to look at what is happening in more dominant species in each plot
 - b. Complete species inventory – generally more rare species or of interest (weeds)
 - i. Trends –
 1. understory at all 3 agencies was a lot of litter
 2. Common juniper and kinnikinnik
 3. Phantom creek – shade tolerant species
 4. Heil/Hall ranches – lots of cacti and open ponderosa pine species
 5. Not a lot of weeds – more common at lower elevation
5. Variables to be analyzed
 - a. Overstory (treatment affect basal area, tree density, species composition, regeneration)
 - b. Fuels (total fuel loading, fuel loading by classes)
 - c. Understory (total species richness and cover, species richness and cover by functional groups, cover for species of interest)
 - d. Wildlife (total # species, use individual/groups of species)
 - e. Within-stand forest heterogeneity (opening/clump length, number of openings/clumps, # of single storied versus multi-storied)

Lessons Learned:

Good crew members, collaboration and input from partners, data sharing w/ USFS and NCPOS, funding CSE plot markers.

Budget – Approx., \$100/plot, 4-person crew, 6 weeks work. \$35,000/season total (+ matching)

Next Steps:

Compare data

Evaluate effectiveness of methods (provide any input, scattered plots effective)

Repeat data collection on existing 79 plots in 2012

Analyze all data to evaluate short-term post treatment changes

Prepare final report to SRLCC

Coordinate future work with CFRI

Try to add additional sites

Re-examine and expand future sampling strategy

Consider other forest types/land ownerships

Coordinate with CFLRP and FRRT

Fits well with what CFRI published in late June – not as specific on how to select plots, cut-off for in or out-trees. Honed in some methods but CFRI plan has Tier 1 and Tier 2 variables, measure most on both tiers. Can figure out how to move forward with more crew and area w/ CFRI.

Working on report – could help get others involved. May contribute to next addition to CFLR monitoring plan. When design methods went in line with what was determined by monitoring group. Species monitored was pulled from wildlife species that came out of monitoring mtgs. Stated in guide that 3 transects would be completed, randomly located – might be where study can add what worked and didn't for more specific measurements and methodologies.

Discussion CFLR:

Relationship between CSE and study – both forests started CSU inventory surveys in June of 2011 or started in 2010. 200-300 plot locations scattered across units that data collected on for understory, overstory and seedlings. Units to be treated this year had to focus on. Picked random subset of existing CSE plots and collected additional data for understory, wildlife, etc. In some places, treatment units and control areas had to create new CSE+SLRCC plots b/c places plots fell within unit weren't catching ponderosa pine or would have beetle kill. Tier 1 attributes (debris sampling, life forms, veg comp in understory, but mostly tree data) in CSE, but in this study looked more at tier 2 attributes in CSE sites. New plots looked at both.

CFRI might be able to use in the future, modify, change completed? Serves as pilot study but feeds into future efforts.

SM Team –SM team mtg in December can see what SM team can do to help. Anyone that wants to be on SM team, sign up by e-mail Kendall or Gali. 2 meetings/month (2 hr phone call, 3 hr mtg) Trying to figure out how to do goals together with CFRI CFLR monitoring efforts.

Try to keep looking for new grants every 2 years to keep current strategy or coordinate with whoever is interested in continuing to collect data. First must analyze data to determine if methods effective. CFRI work plan and scope of work driven by needs assessment of stakeholders and cooperators, if needed would be integrated into workplan and scope of work. Could add more sites into bigger body of work. USFS would like to continue to support getting monitoring data – unsure how much money will get each year, more money for monitoring, then less \$ for treatment. Try to figure out ways to leverage money, put up CFLR money which makes people more competitive for grant, etc.

Wildlife monitoring at landscape scale currently being done with regard to treatment? *Yes, there is big-game population monitoring and depending on species it is piece-mealed. Deer, elk, big horn sheep, some overlaps with lower ponderosa pine. Difficult to draw conclusions, monitored with data analysis unit (GMU) and whether can attribute change to treatment it is unlikely.* Do you measure production? *Just cover* Treatments increasing forest production,, something to tie into population modeling as far as production and available forest. *Will be clipping to look at cover to biomass, but might be more course scale*

Qualitative estimates of cover – take photographs? *Took 2,000 photographs, took series at each plot to look at plot conditions at each site. Took pics of everything of interest, have photos documenting anything unknown or unusual. Organized everything in folders for each plot*

CSE crew took basic data of understory - specified life form; contractor will collect species level data they are familiar with

Pam Shaddock, Sen. Udall's office – Just saw Dear Colleague letter – would love to hear that group supports effort. Jill asked Exec Team putting Fourmile report to find out what scientists had to say. Tony mentioned federal grant proposals, congressionals can do letters of support. Good causes in CO to get money into state to do job.

Executive Team Update: (Jeff Jahnke)

Roundtable relies on funding to continue to operate. CSFS funded in past, continue to fund with contributions from cooperators. ARP Foundation manages receipt and payment of money. Would like contributions from any other partners.

Jenny Briggs took over for USGS (ensure donor contact is correct on list)

Budget went up from last year.

Outreach & Policy Mtg (Fourmile Canyon Tour, report on CFLR)

Goals of outreach – continue doing targeted outreach for elected officials, trip to Washington, D.C. available to help for WBCHFI, helping exec team to form policy coalition to work on WUI issues, willing to help out with outreach for CFLR

Started w/ stakeholder meeting with Senator Jeanne Nicholson, went to RMNP for Lyceum, case study for CSU, OMB, meeting w/ commissioner Donnelly (Wrote letter to Poudre Valley Rural Electric Association (PVREA) to save \$4,000 for biomass collection site), Fourmile Canyon Fire field trip (22 elected officials), D.C. visit in September, helping exec team form policy coalition.. (Don Moore agreed to join policy effort.). OP Team meeting in November (email communicate to elected officials to provide info.)

DC Trip: CFLRP Coalition trip (Pam Motley, Carol Ekarius, Ben Pearlman, Jeff Jahnke) Breakfast briefing w/ members and staff, series of visits to both Senate offices and house delegation, met with Harris Sherman (under Secretary at USDA), met w/ staff at FS in charge of CFLRP implementation, better understanding of Uncompahgre Plateau and Roundtable.

Possible 2012 goals complete for this team:

- Annual field trip during summer and annual trip to D.C. Combination between industry leaders and elected officials.
- Accomplishment document after each year.
- Also communications team.
- Follow up document for vision document in 2006.
- Field trip for elected officials. Make it targeted with a goal in mind.
- Series of events associated with 10 year anniversary of Hayman fire. Hoping to have science symposium that brings managers and researchers together for lecture series and field trip. Mary Mitsos (executive of effort). Committee specifically dealing with science symposium and other activities around 10 year anniversary. Roundtable should be part of effort because FRFTP formed after Hayman.

Team will meet in November to complete e-mail blast.

Replacement for John Bustos's position to continue to be involved in team.

IM Team:

Since 2009 – outline has barely changed. Wanted to create 2nd RT demonstration community. Focus on resources w/ NFRMPBWG & CWWPWG. Picked 3 areas that were priorities. Sent RFI to communities. Selected community in May. No \$ guarantee to West Boulder County Healthy Forest Initiative (WBCHFI), help with fundraising and grant writing. IM Team went to community meetings in 3 locations (Larimer County, Nederland, WBCHFI). WBCHFI in overlap area 100,000 acre landscape, 60,000 acres need restoration, many values at risk. Not making enough progress defining partnership (needed project outline, map proposed projects, values at risk, organization chart, high level work plan, budget). Gali met

with leader of coalition – coalition having disagreements. Exec team wrote letter to community, by Nov. 30 deadline for previously mentioned items. National Forest Foundation grant proposal will be written for a community in January. Letter from Fire Protection District Boards to authorize representation of FPDs in WBCHFI. Timeline on hold.

BUSS Team:

Continue to meet – goals for year were to share info about biomass utilization,, update talking point, track biomass by county. New BUSS talking points – agreed on 3 new ones in June. Federal bill on transportation to allow higher weights on highways. Andy Merritt (Congressman Mike Coffman’s office) will try to work on getting highway bill moving forward. New developments of co-firing and commercial pellet pilot projects are in the works.

Possible Goals for 2012:

- Continue sharing information, continue sharing why things aren’t moving forward or working the way they thought,
- Help with highway bills, people come in with questions.
- Hold talking points meeting again next year.
- Bring guest speakers to meetings.
- Biomass tour for RT (sites of facilities)?

Andy Merritt: Congress not sure where to send people or how to answer questions on biomass. Send them to CSFS *Colorado CO-Wood*.

Opportunity for outreach and BUSS team to work together and coordinate.

Biomass Working Group Forum last year – presentation of outcome at short course

West Range Reclamation utilization of material from CFLR projects

Biomass utilization technologies are still 10 years away. Give thought to moving to other audiences – high school science fair.

Next RT meeting at Environmental Energy Partners showroom in Lakewood.

2011 RT Goals

Exec Team – Fundraise at least \$40,000; forming coalition to recommend policy initiatives to limit fire risk in WUI (join with Water Partnership), decide whether to add scientist to vacant position

Doodle to go out Monday to all that have shown interest in SM Team to determine when to meet in December.

IM Team – Consolidation of GIS data (discuss Nov. 17 at TNC)

OP Team – Got new goals, need to decide new goals for the year

BUSS Team – Keep goals

SM Team – adaptive management process, revise June 2011 CFLR monitoring plan, refine RT priority treatments, refine in December roles w/ SM and CFLRP teams

- CFLRP – Economic and ecological for adaptive management process
- Beyond CFRI job code, allocate resources for Front Range – look at where other projects line up geographically
- Reporting of progress to RT
- SM/CFLR Monitoring Team meeting to determine if it's 1 or 2 teams and if it's 2, what goals go to which team.

Next Meeting – February 2, 2012