



# MINUTES FROM FRONT RANGE ROUNDTABLE Q4-12 QUARTERLY MEETING

**Date of meeting:** Friday, November 30 2012, 9:30 am – 4:30 pm

**Location:** El Paso County Citizens Service Center, 1675 W Garden of the Gods Rd, Colorado Springs, Colorado

**Date minutes posted:** December 17, 2012

**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:** [http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/2\\_Roundtable\\_Q4-12\\_Meeting\\_Presentation\\_113012.pdf](http://www.frontrangeroundtable.org/uploads/2_Roundtable_Q4-12_Meeting_Presentation_113012.pdf)

## CONTENTS (IN ORDER OF AGENDA TOPIC)

Attendees.....	1
Welcome, Introductions and Announcements .....	2
New Findings.....	2
New Roundtable.....	5
Success Stories.....	8
Local Spotlight: Update on the Waldo Fire .....	9
Progress Updates.....	10
Strategy Decisions .....	11
Wrap-up .....	12

## ATTENDEES

**Table 1. Roundtable Meeting Attendees, November 30, 2012—Colorado Springs, Colorado**

Full Name	Organization
Rob Addington	Colorado State University (CSU)
Jill Alexander	Douglas County
Richard Alper	Private
Ron Archuleta	US Forest Service, ARP (USFS, ARP)
Gali Beh	Beh Management Consulting, Inc.
Gary Bostrom	Colorado Springs Utilities
Jenny Briggs	US Geological Survey (USGS)
Peter Brown	Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research
Jonathan Bruno	Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP)
Marti Campbell	Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP)
Tony Cheng	Colorado State University, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI)
Sallie Clark	El Paso County
Casey Cooley	Colorado Division of Parks and Wildlife (CDPW)
Megan Davis	Boulder County
Joseph (Joe) Duda	Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS)

Full Name	Organization
Carol Ekarius	Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP)
Paula Fornwalt	USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station (RMRS)
Hal Gibbs	US Forest Service, ARP (USFS, ARP)
Eric Howell	Colorado Springs Utilities
Jim Ignatius	Teller County
Don Kennedy	Denver Water
Paige Lewis	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
Kathie Mattor	Colorado State University
Sara Mayben	US Forest Service, PSICC (USFS, PSICC)
Connie McLain	Gilpin County
Patrick McLaughlin	Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE)
Pam Motley	West Range Reclamation, LLC
Jill Ozarski	Office of U.S. Senator Mark Udall
Brad Piehl	JW Associates
Andrew Sand	Office of U.S. Senator Mark Udall
Mark Shay	Colorado Springs Utilities
Val Snider	City of Colorado Springs
Diane Strohm	US Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Tammy Williams	US Forest Service (USFS)

## WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

**Speaker:** Jenny Briggs, U.S. Geological Survey

- Honored Chelsea Gunsalus (USFS, ARP) for note taking.
- Gali Beh (Beh Management Consulting) asked Ron Archuleta (USFS, ARP) and Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC) to go back to their organization’s leadership and consider offering a new note taker for the Roundtable (FRR). The cost to replace this would be expensive to the FRR.
- Thanks to El Paso County for the meeting room.
- Appreciated Jenny Briggs (USGS) for giving the introduction to the Roundtable today and for attending the most meetings since May 2009. Jenny Briggs gave the introduction to the Roundtable for new attendees.
- Jenny Briggs- presented “About the FRR” PowerPoint presentation for new members of the FRR. See packet for a copy of the slides from this presentation.
- Gali Beh explained the team goals and facilitation.

## NEW FINDINGS

Report on 2011 social and economic monitoring for the Front Range Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP)

**Speaker:** Kathie Mattor, Research Assistant with Colorado Restoration Institute. Kathie presented the PowerPoint “Report on 2011 Social and Economic Monitoring for the Front Range Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Project (CFLRP).”

- Reports to Landscape Restoration team.
- Worked with Kawa Ng (USFS), Julie Schaefers (USFS) and Tony Cheng (CFRI).
- Findings for social and economic results:

- Monitoring goals based on a scope of work developed from the FRR goals for Arapaho and Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland (ARP) and Pike and San Isabel National Forests (PSICC).
- Four key objectives (see website). Goal 1: Determine the economic contributors associated with the Front Range CLRP.
- 2011 - Project level monitoring of actual on the ground location based findings.
- Found six task orders, three completed, three partially completed, 1.8 mil
- Q. Is this the actual U.S. Forest Service task order value?
  - A. It is a component of the task order funding; response from 2010 data.
- Q. Was this county-level data?
  - A. Brad Piehl (JW Associates): We used county data where the work was being done, and counted the administrative impacts.
- Q. Did you look into why the subcontractors were from out-of-state?
  - A. Joe Duda (CSFS): I think the labor forces were there.
  - A. Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Some companies that are out of Washington and Oregon do this type of work, so it was more costly to use our own folks; the professional company has folks to move around.
- Q. Don Kennedy (Denver Water): Do you know what the value-added products were?
  - A. Kathie Mattor (CRI): Value-added materials included saw timber blue stained, small DBH timber, products other than logs, pallets, crates (see PowerPoint for details), PSICC. On ARP, materials were used for landscaping, pallets and crates, firewood and pellets.
- Found a large percent of folks support Prescribed Fire (RX).
- Q. Jenny Briggs (USGS): Do you plan to do a more local Front Range survey on this?
  - A. FRR is looking into this because locations and local factors will influence the local perceptions. How in-depth the survey is will be dependent on resources.
- Q. How many RX are based on CFLR projects?
  - A. None of CFLR projects yet, because the window hasn't happened in order to burn.
- Q. Are there implications from what happened last year on the federal level?
  - A. Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): Yes – we have a moratorium, except for piles that are needed for firefighter safety. We are focusing on pile burning for firefighter safety right now, so no RX beyond piles right now in Colorado on the federal level.
- Conclusion: Goals for the CFLR are to focus on economy and social aspects. Socially, materials are going to Colorado businesses. Recommend developing an outreach plan. Collaboration in the CFLR has been strong. Leveraged funds need to be incorporated into our economics part. For public perceptions we need to look at how public acceptance is for other non-RX fire options to compare and to identify perceptions specific to the Front Range region.
- Questions:
- Q. Sallie Clark (El Paso County): Are we going to be doing more public perception studies while the iron is hot? Can we use this timing to gather the information? We are getting higher voter turnout. Are there steps forward we can take as elected officials to help change the perception?
  - A. Paige Lewis (TNC): This can be addressed as we look at policy.
  - A. Carol Ekarius (CUSP): We are working to actually do an outreach event next spring about RX. Can use fire/fear tactic, which works initially, but later water etc. resonates. We should take care of this while we have heightened awareness.

- A. Jim Ignatius (Teller County): We use this at every board meeting to promote this. Slash removal presentations, keep it in the forefront and keep people engaged at the grass roots and government levels. Works well in Teller County at the County Commissioner's level.
- A. Tony Cheng (CFRI): We can do a better job cataloguing who we are reaching, what we are doing, and where the gaps are. Not sure of the value-added of an additional questionnaire, but maybe evaluate what we are doing and how it is working.
- A. Kathie Mattor (CRI): the FRR communication team will be looking at what we can do more effectively.
- Q. Jennie Briggs (USGS): Did you get negative or positive responses in real time about it and CFLR?
  - A. Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Have received positive and negative responses. People are frustrated in the short-term about closures.
  - A. Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): We are mostly getting thanks and positive, but there is some concern about larger trees going down roads, trails, and truck dust. We received one complaint about opening the forest up too much. It's too open, and not what they thought it should look like.
  - A. Carol Ekarius (CUSP): Hearing about the piles gathering. There is concern about not dealing with the piles.
- Q. Paige Lewis (TNC): Congressional delegation always asks about the economics and jobs. How can we make and strengthen that connection - jobs benefits to communities?
  - A. Hal: The model is very robust and has impacts to specific counties. The treatment model is easier but there is that balance, the overall economic picture. CFLR is just small, will need to watch for the income on the matching projects.
  - A. Carol Ekarius (CUSP): CFLR is a narrow look.
- Q. Diane Strohm (USFWS): I'm curious why there is a difference in the use of mechanical vs. handwork between the PSICC and ARP.
  - A. The difference is in where you can get mechanical into or not, slope etc.
  - A. Hal Gibbs (USFS, ARP): If we could get material out if we could – there are access issues with slope/road.
- Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): I worry about the study use for CFLR reporting. Every year we award task orders and logically work our way through them. We report how it is spent on just the task order being awarded, when you look at the report compared to that amount of money awarded. You don't see immediate production because the money is awarded in one year, and the work done in the next year, or not funded by CFLR.
- Kathie Mattor (CRI): Treat model allows for comparison nationally, this modeling allows a better picture on the ground. Treat model looks at the fiscal year and this model looks at the calendar year.
- Q. Tony Cheng (CFRI): Would it make sense to aggregate the data into a two-year window? Allows a better picture, this year we stood up to the model.
  - A. Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): In 2010 it was awarded, but didn't start work until later and no implementation; multi-year would help.
- Q: Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): Are we planning on adding to local models; not just matching, but others such as treasured landscape?
  - Q. Paige Lewis (TNC): What could you look at that shows what this project leveraging does?
  - Q. Jennie Briggs (USGS): Could you run it twice with and without? Maybe too complicated.

- Carol Ekarius (CUSP): FRR- leverage CFLR, trending this would be good. What are the jobs that are parallel to this process and not just what has happened with the contractor.
- Q. Sallie Clark (El Paso County): As you are trying to make the case to the federal government – how restoration brings jobs and stability back, because the risk is lower for disturbance to economy. Do we have opponents such as Sierra Club that prevent us from doing this work?
  - A. Kathie Mattor: We have some but a whole lot less in CFLR. Overall there is a lot of support, still need to look at the local level about the editorials, and see what is that local support.
- Jim Ignatius (Teller County): In 2006, Governor Ritter established that when all players were in the same room, things are better; more are sitting at the same table and trying to meet the same goals; it has come a long way.
- Casey Cooley (CDPW): Wondering if there was a way to look at the Forest Service NEPA process. Can we tease out and identify people who were supportive of these projects? Can we use that process to tease this out and what the public perception is? Should be data available on public perception beforehand versus now.
- Kathie Mattor (CRI): Good idea to use the comments from NEPA.
- Brad Piehl (JW Associates): Worked on the catamount; three public meeting and three people total showed up. There were very few comments. If we could take some of the economic piece and combine it with the perception piece, then we could have a larger impact than we think. Economy and market and nonmarket etc.; we could make a strong case for a public perception of bringing RX back on the land.
- Hal Gibbs (USFS, ARP): Thanks to Kathie Mattor, Tony Cheng, Julie Schaefer and Kawa Ng. They took on the challenge, and have done a good job to answer these questions and components.
- Ron Archuleta (USFS, ARP): Public perception: there is not a timber sale in USFS Region 1 that didn't get litigated. Came here and was surprised by the fact that we weren't getting appealed and litigated and people are more receptive to these treatments.
- Jill Ozarski (Senator Udall's office): The really important thing is to look at these treatments and what they think about these after they see them. Would like to see that data. Not just the local communities- the ski country, or Front Range constituents.
- Don Kennedy (Denver Water): The Forest to Faucets project only got one phone call. Impressed that there wasn't more; we are lucky to have a lot of support for watershed managements in this region. When folks are concerned, we need to remind them that we are only cutting a small percent.

## NEW ROUNDTABLE DECISION

Agree on one response to the required national reporting on our perceived quality of collaboration on the Front Range Roundtable CFLRP.

- Demographic questions Gali will answer. Group answers are in **bold**.
- **Question 4 - Organizations with a stake in our CFLR project are engaged or have been invited to participate in the collaborative group.**
  - Kathie Mattor (CRI): **Strongly Agree** based on collaboration interviews. Three questions, all interested in being involved. Everyone is invited, but may need further outreach in the development of the project proposal. Presentation group agreed, and smaller group put proposal together, then was approved by the group.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC) reached out to people we recognize as those needed to participate, they still are not.

- Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Could we add direct quotes?
- **Gali** will see if she can add these quotes in.
- Connie McLain (Gilpin County): Asked how we decided who to interview. Do we balance long-term and short-term interest in deciding who to invite to participate.
- Paige Lewis (TNC): When the group first started, they reached out to the FRR, then the monitoring group. Periodically we reach out to try and bring others in from outside the CFLR. Reaching out to other people that can contribute. The wildlife team is an example.
- **Question 5 - People in our collaborative are willing to work toward agreement on important aspects of our project.**
  - **Agree.** Based on the three questions, the majority agreed that people can work toward agreement, but still disagree on some items. There are concerns about seeing results, and that is frustrating people. High levels of trust identified. Most thought internal relations are strong. Some thought two forests being compared to each other unfairly.
- **Question 6 - People in this group communicate openly with one another.**
  - Between Agree and Strongly Agree. Interview question: strong agreement that there is lots of open communication. There is some informal communication going on that is not necessarily being confirmed to the main group. Some of the subgroup communication is good, and is usually reported back but not always. Somewhat inevitable when everyone can't be in the same room, some people unhappy.
  - **Gali:** We'll downgrade this to **Agree**.
- **Question 7 - The people who lead this collaborative group communicate well with all of the members.**
  - Who is this question about? The executive team? Facilitator? Considering that we meet four times a year we get a lot of emails about what is going on.
  - Carol Ekarius (CUSP): Agree.
  - Q. Kathie: Does a collaborative group have leaders?
  - Q. Peter Brown (Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research): Other than the facilitator, who leads?
  - **Agree.**
- **Question 8 - Our CFLR project is up to date on how implementation is progressing.**
  - Q. Peter Brown (Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research): Not sure what is being asked. Are we aware or is CFLR on track?
  - Strongly Agree or Agree.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): Agree – group.
  - **Agree.**
- **Question 9 - Implementation of treatments is in alignment with our CFLR project objectives.**
  - Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Proposes we agree. It's old NEPA, but there is nothing contrary.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): Add how much we need RX.
  - Carol Ekarius (CUSP): Challenge of disappearing acres when ground-truthing causes us to lose some acres we thought we could treat.
  - Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): Agrees that it becomes smaller once things are refined. Also we are still trying to identify desired conditions. We are not aligned in what we want for desired conditions.
  - **We Agree.**
- **Question 10 - Project implementation is moving the landscape toward more resilient ecosystems.**

- Carol Ekarius (CUSP): Still trying to figure out what the right thing is.
- Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Still trying to refine this.
- Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): It depends on how we define resilience. Have we reduced fire, yes.
- Paige Lewis (TNC): Agree with **Don't know**.
- Joe Duda (CSFS): Thinks there is more work to be done before we can answer.
- Tony Cheng (CFRI): Why are we defining? Hal, if you asked this question two years ago we would have likely agreed, but now I don't know because we got everyone together and now we are not as sure. We don't know, although we believe it will.
- Carol Ekarius (CUSP): I think the project is, but don't definitively know. The point is, are we moving toward resilient landscape? We are removing density from the landscape, and you could argue that we are removing stuff; the definition of resilience is still undefined. Even if Waldo burned toward them, we are conducting monitoring to assess treatment resilience. The question is very broad.
- Hal Gibbs (USFS, ARP): Don't answer question and ask them to define it. The answer "resilience" is in the eye of the beholder. There is no good definition.
- Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): At the landscape scale, have we done enough treatment to make a difference?
- **Don't know with comments.**
- **Question 11 - More restoration is happening on the ground as a result of the collaboration.**
  - **Strongly agree.**
- **Question 12 - CFLR project participants do a good job of following through on collaborative agreements.**
  - Based on gathering comments group strongly agrees about the commitment being very high, but commitments and workloads interfere. Some people have come and gone, and there are too many cooks in the kitchen.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): Prefer strongly agree because those who do participate are very committed, and may have been doing this for nine years. When we agree on something we have all followed through.
  - **Strongly agree.**
- **Question 13 - The collaborative group's participation improves the Forest Service's decision-making process.**
  - Hal Gibbs (USFS, ARP): The problem with the question is it doesn't improve process. Do we feel that the recommendations made by the Roundtable are resulting in actions by the Forest Service?
  - Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): We are moderating with a group and the collaborative is helpful and moves us in a direction to influencing decision.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): If you say enhance rather than improves it makes it better.
  - **We agree.**
- **Question 14 - The collaborative group's participation improves the Forest Service's project implementation.**
  - Has the collaborative process helped the attainment of the goals?
  - Some said agree, some not. There are more agrees. Those that don't agree said we need to use projects that existed, so don't know or agree.
  - Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): In the decision space we have from the past NEPA, we try to make it work but it doesn't always work.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): Has seen the Forest Service modify RX to help.
  - Peter Brown (Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research): Does not agree.

- Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): Sometimes we modify with paint guns.
- Jenny Briggs (USGS): On the smaller topic of monitoring, the Forest Service has accepted and adapted a method for monitoring that improves monitoring and implementation.
- **Strongly agree.**
- **Question 15 - Please add any additional comments.**
  - Peter Brown (Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research): More RX.
  - Hal Gibbs (USFS, ARP): Collaboration is really hard, and is slower.
  - Carol Ekarius (CUSP): If the Forest Service were given a million dollars, we would be done, but since this isn't the situation it takes longer. It is a long process, with no instant gratification. We don't know how the answer to this survey, or how our study, will affect the money flow. It is important that people know we are making good progress despite the difficult process. We aren't stuck as others are. We are luckier here, implementation input happens here, and is not restricted to monitoring. We can't self-report that we have solved all the world's problems, but we are working and moving forward.
  - Carol Ekarius (CUSP): Do you know if the other CFLR collaborative have just started or been around a while? We are just so good.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): Keeping the money flowing is important. Our success depends on getting our funding over the full ten years.
  - Casey Cooley (CDPW): The work that Peter and Greg did with the adaptive management process is very different than what the box is. We have this adaptive management process that is supposed to enhance, but which is still in development. It is promising and we are working together to approve the development of it.
  - Ron Archuleta (USFS, ARP): We are a good investment for proponents.
- **Question 16**
  - **Strongly agree.**

## **SUCCESS STORIES**

- Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Regarding biomass and the 10-year stewardship contract, Pam loves working with these groups on a landscape level. The projects are rich with lots of components. It is impossible to create harmony if we all sing the same note, so to identify these large-scale projects it takes us all coming together to address the common goal. If everyone were not here, the harmony wouldn't be as rich; if it was our only voice, then there would be no harmony. What drives these projects are the ecological needs. We prioritize our project to address problems. Economics are the driver, but we couldn't get this work done if we can't get the material utilized. If we do this we can offer cost, and produce what society needs.

Back to the harmony. What we love about this is while we try to restore the forest, we also create jobs, markets, products etc. The Long Term Stewardship Contract is such a great vehicle for this to occur and utilize the old standing dead. We remove about 60 tons of material every year. We remove 2,200 truckloads, and we try and keep the supply as steady a process as possible. We develop markets. The worst thing that can happen is to develop the markets and then not to get them to supply. These projects are complex for the Forest Service; I admire how they get this done.

As we move forward with new NEPA, keep in mind that once we have these product streams going, we now a success story. Last year the High Park and Waldo fires were tragic, but



because we have projects, 49,800 tons of wood chips to the High Park and to the Waldo Fire for use in the rehab. We have built trust with companies, and have been able to grow our contracts with these companies. We are able to deliver mulch and bark fines, 1,600 loads of biomass. We deliver to pellet plants. We are opening a small mill in Laramie and Meeker, mills that take only small diameter stuff. Lastly, we are very excited that they now have the White River, and can deliver to a new mill.

- Jenny Briggs (USGS): Has completed the first step on a grant proposal to the Joint Fire Science Program, a national funding source. They want things that translate in to work on the ground. Paula and Jenny and others are trying to link mechanical treatments to fire risk reduction, and broaden the scope of treatments we are monitoring on non-NFS. Jonas Feinstein on NRCS works with private landowners, pulling in extra sites that represent different approaches from the CFLRP. The proposal is diverse, non-federal lands added to the spectrum and monitoring how can we add this to other approaches. What can we learn from our neighbors? We received great support letters from the two Forests, endorsing this on what we can learn, and got support from joint regional fires science folks: 8-9 agencies are involved in different ways. Requested for three years. The plan of work is pre- and post-treatment modeling. \$100,000 per year for CSU student and field crews, vehicles etc.
- Megan Davis (Boulder County): Boulder County has purchased the land under the sort yard, and now can continually use that site. Increased our funding and we can keep it open more. Doing an internal commission to better coordinate how we work with partners and the community.
- Paige Lewis (TNC): Mike Babler is a grandpa.
- Commissioner Clark: Emergency Watershed Protection (EWP) funding is our good news. Having Congressmen Lamborn sign on is a good thing.

## **LOCAL SPOTLIGHT**

Update on El Paso County's Waldo Fire recovery effort.

- See PowerPoint
- Gary Bostrom (Colorado Springs Utilities): Utilities perspective on post fire challenges. The burn severity map depicts the fire was held with a utility corridor on the west side.
  - We're grateful Rampart Reservoir wasn't affected, but we weren't as prepared for the flooding. Now we have to manage drainages because of flooding in the area.
  - West Monument Creek drainage is a 1,000-foot drop over three miles. The July 30 rain event produced 1.7 inches. It was a one in two year event, and caused significant damages. We lost road and other infrastructure. 800 cubic feet per second came down through the valley. The Pine Valley pipeline, prior to the mid-90s, is the primary backup for the Colorado Springs. It is out of commission and won't be back in service for about a year. Cost is \$5 million to repair, and another \$5-6 million to do the sediment control work in sub-drainages.
  - Produced lots of sediment: two 6-foot culverts getting blocked. We are working with CUSP and USFS to address the sediment damage. We would like to have the work in place before the monsoon season.
- Sallie Clark (El Paso County): Funding the recovery role post-fire is not expected. Shake shingles are prohibited in Colorado Springs. Pre-disaster mitigation and recovery issues: After the wildfire the flooding concerns surprised folks, especially in the steepness of the terrain. Issues along Highway 24 include sediment flows that threaten Manitou Springs and Colorado Springs. The Manitou school and fire station that are in the flood plain are now a concern.

- Mitigation did help and the access helped; roads were built to county standards.
- Large debris on Highway 24. On July 30, more than half in an hour; near a 10-year flood. CDOT- seeing what they can do. Part of watershed assessment is to prevent this.
- Culverts buried, and a horse trailer blocked culvert and slowed water. Houses threatened, and school may not protect the homeowners in the flood plain.
- Developing a parks plan to rebuild and protect. The direction of the streambed changes every storm.
- Trails have washed out, but people still hike.
- Gary Bostrom (Colorado Springs Utilities):
  - All parties have agreed that regionally, we need an assessment on the long-term prospect for flood mitigation. Field collection of data should be collected by December, then work can begin in the Spring.
  - Emergency Watershed Protection (EWP) funding identification through NRCS. Funding: County and City are both sponsors, and we've identified immediate needs of \$9.6 million, which includes a \$2 million match. We have more need than this.
  - \$10-50 million of projects should be identified for costs, which will increase to get measures in place. The number will get more exact once you have the study.
  - Challenge is all the sub-watersheds that lead to the city, and values at risk.
  - Many areas are very hard to treat and do stuff; the study will help us understand where we can do stuff.
  - Glenery Castle is a concern and a priority. CUSP has been helping to reduce flow before it hits the castle. Camp Creek comes out into Glenery. For a 10-year storm, 100,000 plus pounds of debris headed toward the city.
  - Met with Larimer County to develop a more cohesive coalition among the counties in the Colorado Springs area. Congressional support from others on both sides on the aisle. Would like a letter of support for our efforts in Larimer and El Paso counties (Larimer protects Jefferson water supply), as we apply for EWP funding for immediate work. Attach it to a disaster recovery bill with Sandy if it works. Want to ask folks to remind to vote on this bill for Colorado. Also going to National Association of Counties and will also be asked for a letter.
  - Any word on pre-mitigation money? Post- has been put in for, but pre-mitigation is still in question.
  - Ron Archuleta (USFS, ARP): How about a letter of support from the Roundtable. Do we agree to do this?
  - Sallie Clark (El Paso County): Would like approval to do the letter, and then they will circulate for approval. Roundtable will do a letter.
  - Jill Ozarski (Senator Udall's office): When looking at policies, we maybe asking for an extended time for other events to be continued. Udall looking into this, and will take an alteration to the Stafford Act.

## **PROGRESS UPDATES**

Community Protection, Landscape Restoration, Biomass Utilization, and Fundraising/Budgeting

- Megan Davis (Boulder County): The Community Protections team is a new team formed to collapse a couple of teams in effort to meet the needs of our key areas. These include strengthening fire mitigation goals and ensuring local leadership in planning and CWPP in particular. Kicked it off with good turnout in representation and diversity: Larimer County, Boulder County, Colorado State Forest Service, Senator Mark Udall's office, United States Forest Service, Colorado counties including fire protections districts, Sheriff, Colorado

Office of Emergency Management, and insurance companies. There was a diverse range for initial input. Then we went back to 2006 goals to decide if they are they still priorities, then brought in the FRR discussion from our last meeting to see if anything emerged. We then did an external process, climate change forum etc. The whole group had opportunity to bring new stuff in. We identified 2-4 key areas that we could take action on in the next few years. Megan will send out notes to FRR. Priorities were:

- Limit growth of fire risk in the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI), forced efforts on working with local governments.
  - Funding for implementation of Community Wildfire Protection Plans (CWPP). Diversify the funding so CSFS isn't the only source- private, local.
  - Case study of the effective aspects of CWPPs to create opportunities to share and outreach those outcomes.
  - Other beyond the three top priorities included insurance as a tool to limit risk-standard insurance in WUI.
  - Real estate, land use codes that follow NEPA or WUI standards, use social science to learn more about what works and what doesn't.
  - Will narrow at January meeting. Will be back for input to whittle down if need, and if not, will share next steps.
  - Two goals for implementation and mapping are updating map then the other Healthy Forest Initiative (HFI), but didn't delve into if it is a priority moving forward.
  - Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): What needs to get done to help the HFI
  - Others: \$75,000.
  - Paige Lewis (TNC): Maybe a small group could meet and see where it is. Not sure if there is cohesion- have \$25,000 to tap into. Gali will schedule a meeting with Brett Haberstick, and those others interested from the original group to determine if they want to do anything. Paige, Hal, Megan, Carol or John. Alan Owen.
- **Landscape Restoration team**
    - Gali Beh (Beh Management Consulting): **See PowerPoint**
    - Paige Lewis (TNC): Fundraising – moving to a calendar fundraising year. Have a chart for who we are pursuing, a chart and a notice about how much of a contribution we would like, and then the option of how much they could give. Paige will be following up. Counties have been encouraging donations.
    - \$5,563 of bills from Gali, and invoices will be in the mail for 2013. Trying to raise a minimum of \$50,000. Need \$40,000 for Gali, then money for other things, like the field trip for the delegation. RMRS is giving money again, maybe go to city of Greeley. Gilpin County suggested other prairie counties, but they aren't part of the group. Other ways to contribute include sponsor meetings, lead groups, or in kind donations.

## STRATEGY DISCUSSION & POLLING

Review recommendations made to the Roundtable in August; agree on 2013 goals and strategy.

- Hal Gibbs (USFS, ARP): Policy working at the county level to try and enhance land-use codes to address the fire mitigation issue.
- Paula Fornwalt (RMRS): Large scale-planning; looking at effects of them affecting outcomes.
- Ron Archuleta (USFS, ARP): Outreach/organization issues: work to increase social acceptance of prescribed (RX) fire and smoke management. Start a smoke management/RX committee including piles.

- Rob Addington (CSU): Likes Ron's science-document and publish positive outcomes. Some assessment of outcomes of treatments are important to continue.
- Joe Duda (CSFS): Policy at a broader level. Support policies that stabilize funding level to meet organizations objectives.
- **Outreach:** Other 17/18 coherent, cohesive outreach that includes ready-set-go, home ignition zone into something we can all use regardless of our organization. Fire wise communities, fire adapted communities. Scientific preference for the treatments, more of an education item.
- Casey Cooley (CDPW): Science: do large scale treatments, and define it such as landscape-scale restoration.
- Sara Mayben (USFS, PSICC): Social science survey of the public: scientific survey to identify what works or doesn't work in communicating about smoke, treatments, smoke and how best to communicate.
- Kathie Mattor (CRI): Large-scale planning under outreach. There are a lot of parallel efforts that need to be coordinated. FRR can look at what efforts are out there for doing landscape-scale restoration across forest lands, the ways to get this done, good neighbor, NRCS. The FRR could identify and coordinate, then provide integrated outreach.
- Don Kennedy (Denver Water): Science implementation, large-scale treatment planning.
- Tony Cheng (CFRI): Adaptive management framework, use to inform the outreach.
- Carol Ekarius (CUSP): Funding: a number of fires have burned into our treatments. Do we have places that we can look at how our treatments impact behavior and cohesively how it impacted what happened? Should look at it more strategically, then use outreach.
- Sallie Clark (El Paso County): Funding: coordinated grant opportunities, understand them and who can apply for what. Implementation: reporting back to what is going on, who is using what grants or treatment, so we all know with everyone else is doing.
- Jenny Briggs (USGS): Investigate/identify science questions from senators, congressional delegation and state/policy makers. Understanding post-fire effects in a more multidisciplinary approach to how treatments could be implemented to prevent impacts. Mitigate post-fire impacts with pre-fire treatments
- Paige Lewis (TNC): Policy to strengthen the FRR role as an advocate for funding. Develop a 1-3 year policy agenda, with a few 1-3 issues RX.
- Megan Davis (Boulder County): Coordinate messaging in the WUI around RX and what homeowners can do.
- Eric Howell (Colorado Springs Utilities): An advocacy group to have conversations to provide that emphasis on how important RX is, so there is coordinated messaging to policy makers.
- Jill Alexander (Douglas County): Tell our story and fight for the use of RX, and the value of ecosystem services.
- Pam Motley (West Range Reclamation): Tell our story with success, get it out to more people and get out electronically.
- Peter Brown (Rocky Mountain Tree-Ring Research): Focus a team on RX fires. This would be a dedicated group advocating for it as a tool in terms of outreach, policy success stories, the 2012 wake up moment, fire adapted ecosystems; we should consider more.

## **WRAP-UP**

Next steps, 2013 Calendar, and thanks.