

# Proceedings

## Community Wildfire Protection Plans: Lessons Learned

November 28, 2007

Holiday Inn, Golden, Colorado

---

The Community Wildfire Protection Plans Lessons Learned Workshop is part of the **Community Wildfire Protection Plans: Enhancing collaboration and building community capacity** project funded by the Joint Fire Science Program, or JFS (<http://www.firescience.gov/>). The goal of this project is to understand the factors that influence effective collaboration in community wildfire protection plan (CWPP) development. Case study research was conducted on CWPP development in thirteen communities in California, Colorado, Florida, Montana, Minnesota, Oregon, Virginia, and Wisconsin. The team is composed of researchers from Colorado State University, University of Minnesota, Southern Oregon University, the USDA Forest Service Northern Research Station, and the USDA Forest Service Rocky Mountain Research Station. A full project description and case study profiles are available at <http://jfsp.fortlewis.edu/>.

A key element of the JFS project is knowledge transfer. On November 28, 2007, the JFS team collaborated with Colorado State Forest Service to facilitate the second of several knowledge transfer workshops to share some of these “lessons learned” about the contexts, processes and outcomes of collaboration. The primary goal of this workshop was for participants to leave with effective strategies and tools to develop, enhance, and sustain collaboration for community wildfire mitigation. The meeting focused on three themes:

- Factors that get community collaboration off the ground
- Sustaining collaboration and long-term implementation
- Coordinating CWPP collaboration and implementation across the region.

The workshop brought together thirty-seven participants from community, governmental, and non-governmental organizations involved in CWPP development and implementation. The following proceedings provide a summary of the presentations and participant discussion. The meeting began with introductions of the JFS team and the meeting participants. This was followed with presentations and group discussions of each of the three themes stated above. The Narrative from the presentations and PowerPoint slides can be found at <http://jfsp.fortlewis.edu>.

# Proceedings

## I. Introductions

The meeting began with **Judy Serby**, a JFS Advisory team member and Colorado State Forest Service Conservation Education Manager, introducing the JFS team and welcoming the workshop participants. **Dan Williams**, from the USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station and JFS team member, provided a brief introduction to the JFS project entitled, “Community Wildfire Protection Plans: Enhancing Collaboration and Building Community Capacity.” Each participant was then asked to briefly introduce themselves, to describe what they wanted to learn during the workshop and what their main CWPP stumbling blocks are, as listed below

### Participants’ CWPP Learning Interests

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How have others have dealt with limited funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to expand CWPPs to a larger scale (i.e. watershed)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New approaches and tools from other CWPP processes / the best way to craft and implement CWPPs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn how to get effective public involvement through both CWPP planning and implementation</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How do you get people to come forward that have CWPP information (e.g. local government and fire department officials)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tools for working with different levels of community interest and awareness</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The best methods for sharing information with the community</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to better guide staff through the CWPP process</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn about roles and responsibilities of different government agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to facilitate CWPP meetings</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How is the wildland urban interface defined</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to coordinate multiple efforts at multiple scales</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to build local capacity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To learn about and compare CWPP experiences in different states</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn how others are addressing animosity between local communities and federal or state agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to effectively use collaboration within budget limitations</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to expedite and increase the efficiency of the CWPP process</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To get a better picture of what is happening in CWPP processes statewide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to base the CWPP in a scientific background</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To learn about the learning network approach to developing CWPPs</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to get through implementation and complete fuels projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to address access issues in the implementation of CWPPs</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To learn more about the technical aspects of fire fighting and forest health</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to bring implementation strategies down to the community level</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What to do with biomass resulting from fuels treatment projects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn if there are barriers to treatments in roadless areas and how to address them</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How meaningful implementation is done without federal funding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How others define CWPP standards</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to find the community sparkplug</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to make contact with other people doing CWPPs</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To share what they have learned while developing CWPP processes</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to build regional support</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How others have dealt with limited local government and local volunteer fire department involvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn what the future of CWPP planning and implementation is</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Learn how to build capacity of community to address CWPP</li> </ul>	

## Proceedings

### Barriers to CWPP development and implementation

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWPPs are not being used to influence the location and priorities of treatments</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Implementation schedules are not specific enough to be effective</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involving the public at a significant level</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficulty finding and/or obtaining funding</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Communities are intimidated about prospect of working on CWPP with state and federal agencies</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Animosity between private landowners and federal agencies prevents involvement</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Models for public involvement in CWPP process differ across state and between states (e.g. Top-down versus grassroots)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local government representatives aren't involved or are hesitant to be involved for political career reasons</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Process is often inefficient</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of agency involvement</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Unequal Department of Local Affairs support across the state</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of community involvement in CWPP planning and implementation</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of community commitment to implement the CWPP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community members want someone else to do the implementation</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Keeping the process going through implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Different capacity levels across fire districts</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political barriers within and between counties</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Every CWPP situation is different</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWPPs create a lot of work for a lot of people who aren't ready for it</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Difficult to monitor the success of implementation of CWPPs</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of community capacity to do a CWPP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Biomass utilization issues</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Finding community champion to lead the community and keeping them energized</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Involving new partners and keeping existing participants in the implementation process</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Developing CWPPs with communities that are not centralized (e.g. scattered homes)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USFS bureaucracy creates barriers to implementation</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• USFS is unable to implement plans because they do not know where CWPPs exist and do not have easy access to information on them</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many counties don't have digital data or maps to share WUI, CWPP, or risk priority information with forest service or other agencies for implementation</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of coordination to ensure seamless integration of CWPPs with other community efforts (e.g. risk assessments, mapping projects, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inefficiency of process -There is no one stop shopping for information and there may be overlap between community information needs</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How to incorporate local CWPPs into broader state and federal processes (eg. Statewide wildland fire assessment , state initiatives, national forest planning, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of clarity on how counties should proceed (example: Counties often go to the federal agencies to ask what to do but the federal agencies are providing money for counties to do what they want to do)</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Political changes can bring CWPPs to a halt</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building regional support for CWPP</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lack of funding to promote public involvement (e.g. hiring public relations consultant, information dispersal)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Volunteer fire departments are limited in time and money but are an integral part in motivating the community</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Counties are asked to build capacity but are not provided with the tools to do so</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some groups (e.g. HOAs) are frightened away because of liability issues</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some counties don't have legal counsel staff or money to consult on legal issues</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key personnel and community members have limited time to attend meetings</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CWPP timeline is usually very short – it is difficult to get the community involved and get information out to people in a short period of time</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Private landowners who do not want to participate in CWPP create gaps in otherwise comprehensive community plans</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colorado Roadless Rule use in CWPP implementation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for regional CWPP organization effort outside of Front Range</li> </ul>

## Proceedings

<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Areas with biggest fire risk have the least public involvement and capacity to develop a CWPP</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• State and federal agencies are unavailable during fire season</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• How do you define "community"?</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Need to better facilitate efforts in order for the CWPP structure work at the state, federal and local level</li></ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Lack of funding for volunteer fire department efforts</li></ul>	

# Proceedings

## II. Theme one: What factors get community collaboration off the ground?

**Tony Cheng**, a JFS team member and Colorado State University professor, presented “Community Collaboration for CWPPs: Key Lessons Learned.” He described scale, strategy, and skills and resources as the three critical factors influencing the effectiveness of collaboration in CWPP processes.

### Discussion Questions and Participant Responses:

#### 1. **Scale: What scale are you working at? What scale do you think you should be working at?**

##### **What would you do differently?**

- *It is important to build a collaborative process slowly, to **build small projects and treat what you are able to treat** at that time and go back to get 100%. Be patient.*
- *We need to consider **different definitions of ‘capacity’** – different levels and scales – because every community and situation is different. Determine what you can accomplish at your scale and start there.*
- ***Monitoring determines the scale** at which the risk and values issues occur.*
- *Larger scale plans **require the specificity of smaller scale on-the-ground implementation projects.***
- *Community defined values inform the scale of the CWPP – what they need and what the community can get done.*
- *It is important to have **all partners**, from multiple action scales (federal, state, and local), **on the same page.***
- *Key to actual implementation is ownership and getting people to redeem their responsibility at a small scale. **Expectations need to be in sync with the scale.***
- *How do you get at specificity? In Jefferson County the CWPP is specific to the communities and the areas with **treatment recommendations go right to that community.***
- *Our county **identified fuel breaks on the polygons.***
- *The stakeholders identified thirty treatment areas across the county, which each could have its own CWPP but were **all included in one county plan.***
- *Capacity is important for collaboration and **can vary across scale.** Does the community have capacity – lack of conflict, leadership, and resources? Does the agency have capacity? Do you have the capacity to get resources at every scale? What does it take to build the necessary infrastructure?*

#### 2. **Strategies: What strategies have you used to get more community collaboration? What strategies would you want to learn more about?**

## Proceedings

- We began by using the fear tactic. i.e. “There are going to be big fires and your house is going to burn if you don’t do a CWPP. **The fear tactic didn’t work.** The doom and gloom created a sense of hopelessness in the community that resulted in people planting more trees next to their houses because they figured they were going to lose their house anyway. We changed our strategy by learning what the community values through community assessments and surveys. **We found people value the wildlife and the forest as a whole.** We were then able to correctly frame the issue and build a sustainable plan. This approach has worked with multiple communities since then.
- We conducted a values survey in Lake County and the entire Pike San Isabel National Forest. It was very informative for the CWPP because **we learned why people choose to live there and the values people place on the forest.**
- We found it was important to have federal participation in the CWPP process so the community could also have input into the federal side of fuels planning. This **helped increase both public and federal agency participation.**
- The development of **slash disposal programs** has been successful as an incentive for private landowners to implement fuels reductions on their properties.
- Lake County **held living room meetings** to address forest issues and treatments. We were able to discuss issues and come to agreement on what vegetation treatments to apply to different areas of the forest and then **wrote those actions on the map together.**
- **Develop a common understanding and agreement** on the definition of ‘community’ and ‘stakeholder’ at the start of your CWPP process.
- Make it easy for community members to participate. Hold meetings at the end of the work day and provide dinner and babysitting. **If you feed them, they will come.**
- We **created a database of all the property owners in Clear Creek County and sent surveys to all of them.** We also inserted a questionnaire in the local newspaper. The responses are recorded in the community input part of the CWPP. This method worked well for Clear Creek County because it is very rural and not integrated.
- Large disturbances like fires or beetle outbreaks **increase public awareness and interest.** Take advantage of these situations to get sparkplugs involved.
- The end user isn’t ‘buying’ the CWPP project. **There needs to be a marketing effort to sell fire in order to get the message across.** It may be time to bring in a marketing or business plan aspect to the development of CWPPs.
- To enhance community collaboration **we need people to buy into CWPPs as an emergency plan that is necessary.** New homeowners in WUI have unrealistic expectations of the feds being their fire department. The myth hasn’t been dispelled and so people don’t want to make the effort when they’re going to be ‘saved’.

## Proceedings

- *Every county and the state itself has fire protection in their emergency plans. **Link CWPPs to other hazard plans** at county and state level. Utilize information that is already available in these plans and elsewhere. This strategy is being used in Idaho and California.*
- *Build off of success. It is critical to **use places where there has been success to demonstrate and effectively promote implementation in other areas**. When people haven't seen action they get impatient.*

### 3. Skills and resources

#### a. What skills and resources helped get community collaboration off the ground in your work?

- *The sparkplug in our community was a CEO who brought up the issue of **forest health being the selling point** rather than just a single goal.*
- *We **sent out requests for stakeholder input** (a 1 page mailer) for people to attend meetings to look at maps and voice their concerns. We held two types of meetings (held on both the east and west sides of the county) – one for their initial input, which we then analyzed, and then another for people to review our findings and provide additional concerns. What we do with those comments will impact the implementation. Even though it is a county-wide plan we utilize their comments to keep the plan at the community level and gain buy-in for implementation.*
- *We had people **use map books and large maps for them to mark** their areas of value and concern. This is a good way for people to share comments on specific areas and to start discussing treatment options for these areas. You can then use Google Earth to incorporate their comments.*
- *A 'knowledge community' is created **through pilot programs, community work days and demonstration sites**. This motivates community members to become involved.*
- ***Identifying the community sparkplugs** to involve the community.*
- *The FRFTP Roundtable **estimated community capacity** across the Front Range **by discussing community needs in small public meetings and making key contacts** across the counties and communities. In response, the Roundtable is holding several workshops on methods for building various skills and resources within communities.*

#### b. What skills and resources are needed to enhance community collaboration?

- *It is very important to **work with the bridge builders in the community**. You need to work with county, forest service, and state representatives to point out various*

## Proceedings

*reasons for the need to develop a CWPP. Each provides a different frame of reference from the community and can sell the idea to different parts of the community.*

- **Getting the right knowledge base assembled early is crucial** because it needs to be embedded in the CWPP at the beginning (e.g. FRFTP roundtable). There is a need to address the ecology of the vegetation communities and the types of fire behavior and fire history in the area. It is time consuming but very important to get all areas of science and everyone involved on the same page.
- The knowledge base needs to be mapped out **so roles are understood and the goals and course of action are agreed upon.**
- Gaining a common understanding of the situation, developing the base knowledge to make decisions, and coming to common agreement is necessary. But have we addressed the risk to forest and values associated with it? The community is involved but do they really understand the situation to the level that the conveners understand it? Is the reason CWPPs don't get implemented because communities don't understand the situation or aren't buying into it – How do you determine **who owns the plan?**
- **An indicator of capacity is ownership.** Ownership of CWPP implementation is important. It is more difficult to get ownership on large scale projects because you need to create linkages between the large scale strategy and the ownership at the smaller scale for project implementation.
- **People are often motivated but do not have funding support** to take action on their private land. That is often the limiting factor to private landowner cooperation.
- The FRFTP Roundtable capacity assessment **found funding to be the largest barrier to CWPP processes and implementation.** New strategies for locally-generated funding are necessary (e.g. local tax base, county level ballot initiatives). A recent forest health bill in Colorado directly addresses barriers to funding by building the capacity of counties to provide implementation funding.
- **Be specific** when defining implementation projects. CWPPs should be detailed and mapped out with recommendations directly related to the conditions and values; Show polygons on a map to locate treatment areas.
- It is important to **be patient** while working through the CWPP planning and implementation processes.
- It is important to **understand the community's existing capacity** prior to the CWPP process.
- **Skills in resource management, conflict management and human resources are essential.** How do you bring these skills to the table?

## Proceedings

- *How do you determine what the community' capacity is? It **differs to each person, at what scale, and to each situation.***
- ***The capacity to plan and the capacity to implement are two different things.** There is a horizontal component – can you get the whole community involved and can you get the process going; and a vertical component – can you get to the point where you are actually dropping a tree on the ground. You need to have both to get the implementation done.*
- *People are not willing to grab ownership of the process when there isn't an immediate threat. Threats call people to action - 2002 fires, beetle kill. But **once the threat is gone people are apathetic** because they don't understand the ecological context of defensible space or forest health. The leadership of CWPPs needs to share ecological context to motivate people to stay involved.*
- *There is a critical need for **a broad-based, standardized plan that will allow for operational effectiveness** to occur. There needs to be a long-term plan that can be used across various emergencies in the community.*

# Proceedings

## III. Theme two: Sustaining collaboration and long-term implementation

**Sam Burns**, a JFS team member and Director of the Office of Community Services at Fort Lewis College, presented “The Challenge of Long-term Implementation: Sustaining CWPPs.” He described common challenges to long term collaboration and project implementation and key methods for addressing these challenges.

### Discussion Questions and Participant Responses:

#### 1. What steps has your community taken to sustain your CWPP?

- *Our community has created a **slash disposal program**. It is very popular with community, **they are addicted to it**.*
- *I have seen a variety of solutions. **The solutions depend on the opportunities** to build programs within each community. For example, the Cheyenne community is using a fundraising approach to implement their projects and is making good progress. But in Trinidad it is just the opposite – the HOA formed a fire mitigation group and they were able to drive the process with minimal funding from outside the community.*
- *Jackson County is overseeing all the CWPP development across the county by using their extension agent in Walden as a **key contact**.*
- *Jackson County just held its first **CWPP annual meeting with all the communities who had completed CWPPs**. They reported out what was accomplished this year and communities were able to share information on challenges and successes, methods for implementation and the like. As the CWPPs are being completed they set the date for an annual review by the communities across the county.*
- ***Whatever hook you need to use, use it**. In Lake County the commissioners were not initially involved in the CWPP. We ignored them and **just kept going** because we had an energetic team and funding and eventually the county commissioners couldn't be kept away. If you wanted to be visible in the community you needed to be a part of the CWPP so it became a wise political move for the commissioners to be involved.*
- *If you can **find a specific project for each CWPP member** to actually do then it gives them something to be part of and implementation moves forward.*
- ***Give people tasks**. The San Juan Mountains Association hosts a **fire awareness month** every April. In addition to demonstrations and field trips they have created a neighbor to neighbor based **fire ambassador program** where ambassadors are trained and share information with other community members.*
- *We used **maps as a learning tool at community meetings** to share what projects have been implemented and what still needs to be done.*

## Proceedings

### 2. What are the biggest challenges you face in sustaining your cwpp and how can those challenges be overcome?

- *The community doesn't want to make the effort if it's only for the short term goal of creating a plan. You need to **keep the long-term goal in mind**, whether its 20 or 30 years.*
- *There needs to be **open communication between different land owners** – the federal, state and private landowners. A lot of times it doesn't occur to us that the BLM wants to do treatments at Point A, the USFS at Point B, and the HOA at Point C. By communicating, each entity can share resources and work together on the ground to coordinate projects, share resources, and increase the scale of the treatments.*
- *People put a lot of time into meetings and **want to see action on the ground immediately**. We need to do some work on the ground as soon as possible so people see it and the movement grows. Immediate implementation gets other HOAs and landowners excited and the process is sustained.*
- ***Implementation builds trust and buy-in from other landowners and communities**. It is easier to achieve success by implementing small scale projects to start.*

### IV. Theme three: Coordinating bodies- Linking, coordinating implementation and revising CWPPs

**Tony Simons**, a JFS advisory team member and Larimer County Wildfire Safety Coordinator, and **Dick Edwards**, the USFS Canyon Lakes District Ranger and Larimer County Wildfire Safety Specialist, presented “Coordinating bodies – lessons learned from the Larimer County Coordinating Group.” They described how the Larimer County coordinating group has addressed challenges to large-scale implementation of CWPPs. The first step the group took was for each party involved (Larimer county, the National Park Service, the US and Colorado State Forest Service) to define their roles and responsibilities, as well as their expectations for the other partners. This exercise resulted in a common understanding between all partners and developed trust between all the partners to the point that one member of the group can speak on behalf of all of the members at meetings across the region. As a result, over 80% of the land in Larimer County is currently covered by a CWPP.

After this presentation the participants were divided into four groups. Each group was asked to discuss the role that coordinating bodies play in long-term implementation of CWPPs and were guided by the following questions:

- Do these exist in your area? Who in your area can play these roles?
- How could a coordinating body help with sustaining community collaboration, long-term implementation, and ongoing planning?
- How can they be developed?
- How can follow-up learning continue across regions of the state?

Small Group Discussion Summary - The workshop concluded with each of the small groups reporting what they had discovered in their small group discussions.

# Proceedings

1. **The Lodgepole Pine Group** (Jim K., Rocco S., Mike B., Chuck D., Crystal T., Jodi H., Chris C., George G., Jessica C., and Emily S.)
  - a. Existing coordinating bodies
    - *Jefferson County has an emergency management group. The CWPPs are assigned to each fire protection district and the district leaders bring in other stakeholders from the community.*
    - *The USFS doesn't have a CWPP point player – this would be helpful.*
    - *Coordinating bodies vary between counties*
    - *Lake County CWPP task force is the core team with multiple stakeholders from CSFS, local fire departments, the USFS, and the community college.*
    - *Delta, Montrose, Ouray, and San Miguel counties formed a fire council and were able to apply for and receive a \$30,000 grant together.*
    - *The CSFS is the link to private land implementation in Lake County (grants and good neighbor program)*
    - *CSFS WebDet – CSFS will be using for reporting forest management plans, spatial maps, etc.*
  - b. How can a coordinating body sustain long-term implementation?
    - *Partnerships are key*
    - *Funding*
    - *CWPP clearing house can recognize accomplishments by tracking CWPPs and acres treated, access to forest management plans, GIS maps and spatial data*
    - *Success builds further success*
    - *Lead by example*
    - *Institutionalize mitigation requirements into local policy; might be politically difficult to achieve*
    - *Staff assigned to tracking and coordinating CWPP activity and website statewide*
    - *Work with communities to focus on projects that are smaller scale and don't need outside funding to accomplish*
    - *More local responsibility for funding and implementing projects*
  - c. How can coordinating bodies be developed?
    - *A state-wide standard template for CWPPs might be useful to coordinate CWPP efforts across the state but would have to grandfather in existing plans*
    - *The CO State Forest Service is one of the most capable for state-wide coordination but they might not have complete information available*
  - d. Follow-up learning across the state
    - *Determine how criteria for distributing funding would affect statewide coordination of sustaining CWPPs*
    - *There needs to be a central repository for state-wide CWPPs*
    - *Opportunities for networking, such as this workshop, are very helpful*
    - *State fire marshal*

## Proceedings

- *Agency staff dedicated to CWPPs – leadership should start at the state level*
- *Governors Forest Advisory Council is proposed – this group could oversee CWPPs and give direction*
- *Department of Local Affairs and Department of Natural Resources need to be more locally involved, need more funding and more staff support.*
- *The Nature Conservancy is looking to establish a state-wide fire/forestry network which could pull together information from other groups across the state.*
- *Continue to cultivate community sparkplugs*
- *CO Forest Restoration Institute – may become state-wide resource for relevant science to use with communities; Needs more funding to provide scientific support role*

### 2. **Pinon /Juniper Group** (Lisa D., Dave R., Allen G., Lynn B., Merrill K., Doug P., Rich H., Kathy K., Jerry B., Tony C., and Alex B.)

#### a. Existing coordinating bodies

- *Do not exist in Jefferson, Park or Clear Creek Counties*
- *Summit County Fire council coordinates funding and involvement*
- *Glenwood coordinating group represents a variety of HOAs*

#### b. How can a coordinating body sustain long-term implementation?

- *What should the composition of the coordinating body consist of? Should private landowners be part of the coordinating body?*
- *Develop a standardized form of basic information*

#### c. How can coordinating bodies be developed?

- *There should be two scales – one at the regional or state level to prevent duplication and provide coordination, another at the county or local level to develop the CWPP*

#### d. Follow-up learning across the state

- *There is difficulty in getting information on CWPPs; There needs to be a framework for sharing information across the state and a clearinghouse website to prevent duplicate efforts*
- *Basic standards should be developed for collecting CWPP information – involve parties such as the local water districts, various fire councils, etc.*
- *Develop an easy way to share information, including a state GIS clearinghouse, links to local contacts*
- *Governor's Advisory Board would provide a unified voice to report on efforts*
- *Need to create an ecological context for CWPP monitoring at a statewide level*
- *Use a learning network approach*
- *Need to develop biomass infrastructure across the state*
- *Need to develop coordination between forestry and emergency management efforts*
- *Develop a standard for monitoring CWPP effectiveness*
- *Annual meeting to share work plans and CWPP efforts from across the state*

## Proceedings

- *Coordination of funding resources and grant writing assistance for communities*
3. **Ponderosa Pine Group** (Kristen G., Damon L., Pat M., Dick E., Jeff K., Jim W., Keith W., John C., Dan W., and Kathie M.)
- a. Existing coordinating bodies
- *How you define a coordinating body depends on the situation - is it an information exchange or peer to peer learning, who is available to play these roles. The situation and the community defines who the coordinating body is*
  - *Larimer County has a coordinating body – both grassroots and at state/federal level*
  - *Douglas County has small community coordinating groups at the low level, not the county level*
  - *Boulder, Clear Creek and El Paso counties have small community core groups*
  - *Jefferson needs more involvement from the federal and state levels*
- b. How can a coordinating body sustain long-term implementation?
- *The coordinating body is essential for information exchange, information on funding opportunities, tracking plans and actions, and providing smooth transitions in turnover*
  - *Develop a network of professionals and interested community members*
- c. How can coordinating bodies be developed?
- *By HOAs or subdivisions*
  - *County*
  - *Forest Districts*
  - *Through people who have energy and are motivated to act*
  - *Communication*
  - *A legal framework for development*
  - *By motivating people to act through education and funding*
  - *Who plays these roles? – Fire departments, county office of emergency management, CSFS, USFS, County commissioners and community sparkplugs*
  - *They can be developed through community interest in CWPP and resources from the feds or state, etc.*
- d. Follow-up learning across the state
- *Sustain and implement coordinating groups by starting with small projects*
  - *Biomass utilization resources – need to resolve utilization issue (i.e. develop a database of fuel loads and projects so that mills or other biomass utilization can be assured of resources)*
  - *Need funding to implement plans*
  - *Depends on the level you are working at*
  - *A network between smaller communities needs to be built*
  - *Develop a webpage that is linked to CSFS website that is a resource that lists all CO CWPP contacts, provides descriptions and links where available*
4. **Oakbrush Group** (Tony S., Kathleen G., Larry L., Denise W., Elise H. Maggie M., Chris W., Carl D., Sam B., and Judy S.)

## Proceedings

- a. Existing coordinating bodies
  - *Used to be a statewide mitigation group (1992-1996) that met quarterly and influenced legislation*
  - *CCI used to play a large role*
  - *Need to have a statewide strategy and coordination*
- b. How can a coordinating body sustain long-term implementation?
  - *You can't build something until you define the problem*
- c. How can coordinating bodies be developed?
  - *Struggled with several questions: What needs to be coordinated and at what level? At what level should the group be coordinated – who needs that information? What need is being addressed? Everyone needs different information. Who is responsible for gathering information?*
- d. Follow-up learning across the state
  - *We need to inventory the existing models, groups and entities across the state*
  - *Define the common denominators for successful groups, coordination, and implementation*
  - *Until we know what the need is for coordination, it is difficult to determine who and what the coordinating body should consist of?*
  - *GIS needs to be coordinated to make sure every county has that data*

# Proceedings

## Appendix A: Evaluation Summary

At the conclusion of this workshop the 37 participants were asked to fill out the following evaluation of their workshop experience. Of the 37 workshop participants 20 submitted their responses, providing a 54% response rate. These responses can be reviewed on the following ten pages.

### Evaluation

1. Were the homework questions helpful to you in preparing for the meeting?  
*Please circle one:*    **Not helpful**    **Somewhat helpful**    **Helpful**    **Very helpful**

Comments:

2. Overall, how was the meeting organized and facilitated?  
*Please circle one:*    **Poor**    **Fair**    **Effective**    **Very effective**

Comments:

3. Was the meeting structure and "flow" effective?  
*Please circle one:*    **Yes**    **No**

4. In general, what worked best about the meeting?

5. What did not work so well?

6. Are you likely to (*check all that apply*):

- Share the proceedings from this meeting with other groups?
- Use tools developed through the Joint Fire Sciences project?

7. What follow-up activities should take place?

- Email exchanges with information resulting from the meeting
- Other:

## Proceedings

Response	Q1. Homework					Q2. Meeting organization & Effectiveness					Q3. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?		
	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Comments	Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
1	0	0	1	0	n/a	0	0	1	0	Better defining specific objectives would help.	1	0	n/a
2	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	1	0	0	Our small group found the final exercise went in circles - No facilitation - dominated by 2-3 folks - would not allow new ideas.	1	0	n/a
3	0	0	0	0	Did not get questions	0	1	0	0	Fair but effective	1	0	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q1. Homework					Q2. Meeting organization & Effectiveness					Q3. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?		
	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Comments	Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
4	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	1	n/a	0	0	Should think about doing the interactive group work right after lunch when energy is low. Small group interaction would really have kept people awake and interactive
5	1	0	0	0	n/a	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	0	so-so
6	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	1	0	0	Needed to put meeting in context. Too many levels of individuals	1	0	n/a
7	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	1	0	n/a	1	0	n/a
8	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	1	0	0	n/a	1	0	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q1. Homework					Q2. Meeting organization & Effectiveness					Q3. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?		
	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Comments	Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
9	0	0	1	0	n/a	0	0	0	1	Opened up people to good sharing & exposure to common issues	1	0	n/a
10	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	1	n/a	1	0	n/a
11	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	1	0	0	n/a	1	0	n/a
12	0	1	0	0	It was good to hear other ideas. But didn't really pick up any new ones that were working well.	0	0	1	0	n/a	1	0	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q1. Homework					Q2. Meeting organization & Effectiveness					Q3. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?		
	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Comments	Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
13	0	0	0	0	what homework questions??	0	0	1	0	Tony was an effective facilitator. Judy did a great job putting it together. Great job at involving a diversity of players. Not sure how USFS involvement was solicited, but at our regional office, the two of us who attended found out about this by accident.	1	0	n/a
14	1	0	0	0	?	0	0	1	0	n/a	0	1	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q1. Homework					Q2. Meeting organization & Effectiveness					Q3. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?		
	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Comments	Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
15	1	0	0	0	Never got them!	0	1	0	0	Hard to hear some people at the other end of the room, hard to see powerpoint screen; agenda & desired outcomes should have been more clearly at the registration process - seems like we did not hit goals/outcomes & shared lessons & strategies	0	1	Needed more discussion time; less "down" time (see below on "did not work well")
16	0	1	0	0	Didn't get them	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a
17	1	0	0	0	I dropped the ball on this one, I did not know their were homework questions.	0	0	1	0	n/a	1	0	n/a
18	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q1. Homework					Q2. Meeting organization & Effectiveness					Q3. Was the meeting structure and flow effective?		
	Not helpful	Somewhat helpful	Helpful	Very helpful	Comments	Poor	Fair	Effective	Very Effective	Comments	Yes	No	Comments
19	0	1	0	0	n/a	0	1	0	0	n/a	1	0	n/a
20	1	0	0	0	n/a	0	0	1	0	n/a	1	0	n/a

Response	Q4. In general, what worked best?	Q5. What did not work so well?	Q6a. Are you likely to share the proceedings?		Q6b. Are you likely to use tools developed through the JFS project?	
			Checked (1=yes)	Comments	Checked (1=Yes)	comments
1	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	0	n/a
2	Good outline and prep	not many new ideas; see #2	0	n/a	1	n/a
3	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
4	Introductions were very informative, comforting and dialogue provoking	See item #3	1	n/a	1	n/a
5	Tony and Dick's presentation - the only part I found valuable	Found out how disorganized the State of Colorado is. - Need more direct sharing of experiences.	0	Don't have anything to share	0	Don't know what they are
6	n/a	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a
7	Discussion from research findings; Sharing of ideas and lessons learned	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q4. In general, what worked best?	Q5. What did not work so well?	Q6a. Are you likely to share the proceedings?		Q6b. Are you likely to use tools developed through the JFS project?	
			Checked (1=yes)	Comments	Checked (1=Yes)	comments
8	n/a	Like most meetings there was too much broad general talk & information. I did pick up a few tips but a lot of it had previously been discussed when originally learning about CWPP. I want new information & lessons learned that I can apply tomorrow. I expected a little more conversation & sharing of solutions and techniques between non-presenters.	1	n/a	0	depends on what these tools are
9	Understanding the planning, coordination & ??? issues & and that they are similar across the board	Enough break out time to narrow all ideas down & synthesize	1	n/a	1	n/a
10	Open discussion as well as group breakouts which allowed greater focus.	n/a	1	n/a	0	?
11	The break out groups	Sam after lunch - a presentation	1	n/a	1	n/a
12	Good introduction with diverse group of folks	The weather had a lot to do with running long on time	1	n/a	1	n/a
13	Subject matter; subject matter experts; allowing appropriate amount of group sharing; excellent presentations	At times it was hard to hear those who spoke in quiet voices.	1	n/a	0	n/a
14	Facility	Too much lectures. More networking!	0	n/a	0	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q4. In general, what worked best?	Q5. What did not work so well?	Q6a. Are you likely to share the proceedings?		Q6b. Are you likely to use tools developed through the JFS project?	
			Checked (1=yes)	Comments	Checked (1=Yes)	comments
15	Range of agencies, groups, areas of Colorado represented; Theme one Discussion	"Lecture" right after lunch - speaker too quiet, took too long to go through powerpoint (we could have just read it!); Round-robin too long; Ask group to throw out their answers to questions; people left early; productivity	1	within ??	1	if something is distributed
16	Liked group discussion time	n/a	1	n/a	1	n/a
17	I thought it was helpful to hear from others in the meeting what was going on in their counties. I thought it was very informative to hear about the view point from the USFS and BLM above the District level.	I think perhaps too much was on the agenda. That is a tough one, you guys did good.	1	n/a	1	n/a
18	n/a	n/a	0	n/a	0	n/a
19	Exchange of ideas and experiences	The fact that some participants seemed to feel one answer or approach would fit all circumstances. Situations surrounding the progress, or lack thereof, of some efforts couldn't be explained or covered adequately in the time allotted and it wasn't possible to have meaningful dialogue in those cases. But that wasn't the predominant theme by any means.	1	n/a	1	n/a

## Proceedings

Response	Q4. In general, what worked best?	Q5. What did not work so well?	Q6a. Are you likely to share the proceedings?		Q6b. Are you likely to use tools developed through the JFS project?	
			Checked (1=yes)	Comments	Checked (1=Yes)	comments
20	Really good to bring together people involved with CWPP's. I hope the notes will reflect all this discussion about issues or problems; and that an action plan to address them is formulated.	I felt we were being pushed towards a "one-size-fits-all" methodology for followup. Colorado and the plans themselves are so diverse I don't believe such a methodology is possible. The session will have failed if no action steps come out of the discussions re issues raised. (See #4, above.)	1	n/a	1	n/a

Response	Q7a. Email exchanges with information resulting from the meeting should take place	Q7b. Other follow up activities should take place:	Additional Comments
	Checked (1=Yes)		
1	1	n/a	
2	0	The inputs from the final exercise should be compiled - set up a working team to develop the "next step"	
3	0	n/a	
4	0	An attendee list with everyone's title/agency/business and contact info	
5	0	Not sure that I really got anything out of the session.	

## Proceedings

Response	Q7a. Email exchanges with information resulting from the meeting should take place	Q7b. Other follow up activities should take place:	Additional Comments
	Checked (1=Yes)		
6	1	n/a	
7	1	Meet again next year or network with homework info	
8	1	n/a	
9	1	Follow with another meeting in 6 mos or so with specific follow up on issues	
10	1	Follow-up meeting	
11	1	More meetings toward getting more state activity	
12	1	n/a	
13	1	Mail the contact info list to participants	Are there any states that have good models for state-wide coordination of cwpps? If not known, follow up.; Excellent job - Thanks to all who helped put it together.
14	1	n/a	
15	1	State CWPP coordinating group w/ all agencies & representatives from local counties/ cwpp - provide info	
16	1	n/a	
17	0	Not really sure, would need to brain storm with others.	

## Proceedings

Response	Q7a. Email exchanges with information resulting from the meeting should take place	Q7b. Other follow up activities should take place:	Additional Comments
	<b>Checked (1=Yes)</b>		
18	0	n/a	(submitted by email) Thanks for the effort...the session was valuable in the sharing and discussions...I was reinforced in the stumbling blocks and needs that I have seen working as I do with communities. The overall CWPP program is new enough that people are now seeing the same issues confronting them especially as to initial community involvement and developing the community buy in to keep plans moving into the future with real mitigation actions after the plan is done. Connected to that is the need to have a workable system of two way communication between communities and their counties, state and federal agencies so that good planning and actions take place without the communities being told by the agencies what their priorities should be. These aspects need to be fleshed out and discussed at a future meeting, and perhaps it would be good at that time to pick a few communities with completed plans and have a representative of the community CWPP team attend.
19	1	n/a	n/a
20	1	We really need to establish a central clearing house and repository for plans. CSFS is trying to do this, I believe, but it obviously is not yet working as it should.	n/a

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation	Contact Email	Phone Number
<b>CWPP Lessons Learned Participants (11/28/07)</b>				
Marilyn	Gally	CDEM	<a href="mailto:marilyn.gally@state.co.us">marilyn.gally@state.co.us</a>	
Doug	Paul	BLM/FS	<a href="mailto:douglas_paul@blm.gov">douglas_paul@blm.gov</a>	
Lynn	Barclay	BLM	<a href="mailto:lynn_barclay@blm.gov">lynn_barclay@blm.gov</a>	
Maggie	McCaffrey	BLM/FS	<a href="mailto:maggie_mccaffrey@co.blm.gov">maggie_mccaffrey@co.blm.gov</a>	
Richard	Edwards	USFS	<a href="mailto:rsedwards@fs.fed.us">rsedwards@fs.fed.us</a>	
Tricia	Roller	BLM	<a href="mailto:Patricia_Roller-Burkhardt@blm.gov">Patricia_Roller-Burkhardt@blm.gov</a>	
Jeff	Kitchens	BLM	<a href="mailto:jeffrey_kitchens@blm.gov">jeffrey_kitchens@blm.gov</a>	303-234-3752
Elise	Harrington	AWWA	<a href="mailto:eharring@awwa.org">eharring@awwa.org</a>	
Kristin	Garrison	CSFS	<a href="mailto:kgarr@lamar.colostate.edu">kgarr@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	303-275-5616
Crystal	Tischler	CSFS	<a href="mailto:ctisch@lamar.colostate.edu">ctisch@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	719-539-2579
Jodi	Hohenstein	CSFS	<a href="mailto:jmhohen@lamar.colostate.edu">jmhohen@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	970-249-9051 x132
Denise	White	CSFS	<a href="mailto:denise@lamar.colostate.edu">denise@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	970-491-8660
Kathy	Kurtz	USFS	<a href="mailto:kkurtz@fs.fed.us">kkurtz@fs.fed.us</a>	303-275-5083
Jim	Krugman	USFS	<a href="mailto:jkrugman@fs.fed.us">jkrugman@fs.fed.us</a>	303-275-5228
Kathleen	Gaubatz	CCCOEM	<a href="mailto:kgaubatz@co.clear-creek.co.us">kgaubatz@co.clear-creek.co.us</a>	303-679-2330
Chris	Crouse	Clear Creek Watershed Foundation	<a href="mailto:ccwfoundation@clearcreekwireless.com">ccwfoundation@clearcreekwireless.com</a>	303-567-2699
Allen	Gallamore	CSFS- Golden	<a href="mailto:alleng@lamar.colostate.edu">alleng@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	303-279-9757 x 302
George	Greenwood	Walsh	<a href="mailto:ggreenwood@walshenv.com">ggreenwood@walshenv.com</a>	303-443-3282
Rocco	Snart	Jeffco Emergency Management	<a href="mailto:rsnart@jeffco.us">rsnart@jeffco.us</a>	303-271-4902
Pat	McLaughlin	CSFS- Golden	<a href="mailto:pmclaugh@lamar.colostate.edu">pmclaugh@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	303-279-9757 x304
Carl	Douhan	Wildland Fire Associates	<a href="mailto:pcd9053@msn.com">pcd9053@msn.com</a>	303-550-5145
Jerry	Barker	Walsh Environmental	<a href="mailto:jbarker@walshenv.com">jbarker@walshenv.com</a>	303-443-3282
John	Chapman	Southern Rockies Conservation Allianc	<a href="mailto:john@cecenviro.org">john@cecenviro.org</a>	303-650-5818 x113
Merrill	Kaufmann	TNC and RMRS	<a href="mailto:mkaufmann@fs.fed.us">mkaufmann@fs.fed.us</a>	970-282-0163
Damon	Lange	CSFS	<a href="mailto:dlange@lamar.colostate.edu">dlange@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	719-539-2579
Jeff	Jahnke	CSFS	<a href="mailto:jjahnke@lamar.colostate.edu">jjahnke@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	970-491-9270
Lisa	Dale	Front Range Roundtable	<a href="mailto:lisa.dale@du.edu">lisa.dale@du.edu</a>	
Tony	Simons	Larimer County Emergency Services	<a href="mailto:simonsap@co.larimer.co.us">simonsap@co.larimer.co.us</a>	
Jessica	Clement	Lake County/ CSU	<a href="mailto:jclement@warnercnr.colostate.edu">jclement@warnercnr.colostate.edu</a>	
Jim	Weld	FSC and LSA	<a href="mailto:fsc@fone.net">fsc@fone.net</a>	
Chuck	Dennis	CSFS/ Denver Water	<a href="mailto:cdennis@lamar.colostate.edu">cdennis@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	303-465-9043
Mike	Babler	TNC	<a href="mailto:mbabler@tnc.org">mbabler@tnc.org</a>	
Keith	Worley	Forestree Denver LLC	<a href="mailto:forestreedev@aol.com">forestreedev@aol.com</a>	
Chris	White	Anchor Point	<a href="mailto:chris@anchorpointgroup.com">chris@anchorpointgroup.com</a>	303-550-4505

Dave	Root	CSFS	<a href="mailto:daveroot@lamar.colostate.edu">daveroot@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	719-687-2951
Rich	Hansen	CO Division of EM	<a href="mailto:rich.hansen@state.co.us">rich.hansen@state.co.us</a>	720-852-6618
Larry	Long	CSFS	<a href="mailto:lalong@lamar.colostate.edu">lalong@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	719-687-2921

**JFSP Team**

Judy	Serby	CSFS	<a href="mailto:jserby@lamar.colostate.edu">jserby@lamar.colostate.edu</a>	970-491-7559
Dan	Williams	USFS/ RMRS	<a href="mailto:drwilliams@fs.fed.us">drwilliams@fs.fed.us</a>	
Tony	Cheng	CSU/WCNR	<a href="mailto:chengt@warnercnr.colostate.edu">chengt@warnercnr.colostate.edu</a>	
Emily	Saeli	Legacy Land Trust	<a href="mailto:emsaeli@yahoo.com">emsaeli@yahoo.com</a>	
Kathie	Mattor	CSU/WCNR	<a href="mailto:Kathie@mattorconsulting.com">Kathie@mattorconsulting.com</a>	970-491-1900
Sam	Burns	Fort Lewis College	<a href="mailto:burns_s@fortlewis.edu">burns_s@fortlewis.edu</a>	
Alex	Bujak	USFS/ RMRS	<a href="mailto:abujak@fs.fed.us">abujak@fs.fed.us</a>	