

Forest Health Advisory Council
July 26, 2017
Buena Vista, CO
Meeting Summary – Draft

Attendance

Carolyn Aspelin
 Norm Birtcher
 Cindy Farney
 Neilie Goodwin
 John Hall
 Scott Jones

Aaron Kimple
 Lyle Laverty
 Doug Lempke
 Mike Lester
 Mark Morgan
 Mike Preston

Chuck Rhoades
 Jenna Sloan
 Travis Smith
 Tom Spezze
 Ben Tisdell

Facilitation: Heather Bergman, and Katie Waller

Action Items

| | |
|----------------|---|
| All | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Send the name and email of any interest parties who would like to receive FHAC meeting summaries and agendas to Heather. • Send all draft recommendation language to Heather by August 11. • Submit all edits to draft recommendation letter to Heather by August 18. |
| Heather | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Create an email list for interested parties to receive FHAC meeting summaries and agendas. • Send out final Preliminary Agreements document when all substantive edits have been received. • Include time in the next meeting agenda to talk about additional funding sources. • Send out a scheduling poll for the next meeting date in November or December. • Finalize the letter to the WRRRC so it is a full memo from the FHAC and prepare it to be sent to the Legislature, as well. Carolyn Aspelin will deliver it to the WRRRC. |
| Carolyn | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deliver final WRRRC letter to WRRRC through appropriate channels. • Deliver final FHAC recommendations to the Legislature through appropriate channels. |
| Neilie | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider if there is a better way to talk about the statewide power grid as it relates to economic resiliency in the Preliminary Agreements document and send to Katie and Heather. |
| Lyle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with Mike Lester and Doug Lempke to combine language about forest management tools and the role of prescribed fire and send to Katie and Heather. |
| Ben | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite bullets six and eight in the Preliminary Agreements document and send to Katie and Heather. • Write language regarding development in the WUI for the Barriers and Opportunities document. |
| Travis | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reorder the document when all substantive edits have been made. |
| Mark | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite the opportunities for limited financial resources and send to Katie and Heather. |
| Aaron | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Write language about the sharing of resources between agencies as an opportunity for wildfire in the Barriers and Opportunities document. |

| | |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| Ben and Mark | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work together to draft language regarding the barriers and opportunities related to outreach and education, taking into account the success of past and present CTIA efforts and send to Katie and Heather. |
| Ben and Norm | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite bullet eight regarding outreach and education. |
| Mike L., Lyle, and Doug | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewrite the third, fourth, and ninth bullets regarding prescribed fire in the preliminary agreements document. |
| Mike L., Mark, Chuck, and Lyle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendation language regarding governmental immunity. |
| Mike L and Lyle | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendation language regarding the elimination of fire borrowing. |
| Aaron and Jason | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendation language regarding landscape-scale planning. |
| Carol and Ben | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft recommendation regarding the renewal of the Wildfire Matters Committee. |
| Tom, Doug, and Mike L. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft language about expediting burn permits and work with John Swartout to identify feasible next steps and report back at the next meeting. |
| Lyle, Norm, and Ben | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with the USFS to draft a recommendation regarding the timber industry in Colorado. |
| Aaron and Tom | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify which entities are building the list of collaborative efforts and report back regarding progress and if they need any help. |
| Tom and Mike P. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draft a recommendation in support of federal funding sources for forest health and State-level matching funds to be sent to the State Legislature and the Colorado Delegation. |

Updates

Council members shared updates about related work they have been doing outside of the Forest Health Advisory Council (FHAC); below are the highlights of these conversations.

- A subcommittee of the Emergency Fire Fund (EFF) is looking to identify possible structural changes of the EFF. The structure has not changed in 50 years, and it is currently not meeting the needs based on the number of acres burned. They are looking at similar models in other states, particularly in Utah, which is shifting to a model that encourages front-end mitigation and State payment for fire costs afterwards. Ben Tisdell will keep the FHAC updated on progress when meetings resume after fire season.
- In speaking with Senator Roberts about her biomass bill, she indicated she is interested in staying updated on the work of the FHAC. Others have indicated this same interest. All members should send the names of people who would like to stay up-to-date on FHAC meetings by receiving meeting agendas and summaries to Heather Bergman so she can create an email list.

Preliminary Agreements

FHAC members have been working to create a list of preliminary agreements that will be used to guide future efforts. The most recent draft was edited by a task group, and members offered edits to it. Below are the highlights of these discussions.

1. *Colorado's forests are largely not healthy due to drought, disease, and lack of active management. Precious human values such as water and wildlife resources, recreation opportunities, and forested communities around the state are in jeopardy due to high-severity fire, insect infestations, and other transitional disturbances.*

- This bullet needs to include the idea that over-suppressing fire is what made the forests unhealthy in the first place.
 - The cause of the current state of the forest is more complicated than just over-suppressing fire; this bullet should also capture the fact that human values have changed and that has resulted in a change in management needs. Human relationships with both fire and Colorado's landscape have changed significantly in recent years.
 - It is inaccurate to talk about the state of Colorado's forests without talking about the role of fire suppression.
2. *Colorado's forests are at high risk of immediate and catastrophic fire. Loss of human life and community structures and infrastructure are the top concerns, and for good reason; however, rural, suburban, and urban communities and residents will see significant adverse impacts to the following values should there be a high-severity fire in the State:*
- | | |
|--|---|
| ○ Watershed health | ○ Irrigated agriculture |
| ○ Water quality (municipal, industrial, and environmental) | ○ Wildlife habitat |
| ○ Recreation opportunities and economy | ○ Statewide power grid reliability |
| ○ Stream level stability (post-fire flooding) | ○ Homeowner's insurance premiums |
| ○ Timber production and markets | ○ State and federal financial resources |
| | ○ Quality of life and Colorado values |
- The list of bullets should include wording about economic health and resiliency.
 - The reference to statewide power grid reliability could be combined with another statement that references economic resiliency; however, adding this could result in too much detail.
3. *While high-severity, catastrophic wildfires endanger human values, fire is a valuable and necessary part of Colorado's ecosystem. Managed, natural ignitions and prescribed fire can be powerful and effective management tools when managed appropriately.*
- This language talks about fire in a concerning manner. Natural ignitions are very risky and should often be put out because of the significant fuel loading on the forest under current conditions.
 - Timber should be viewed as an asset, not a liability.
 - It is a reality that land managers are going to have to let some natural ignitions burn due to access issues. This would be best under ideal condition, but that may not always be the reality.
 - Current conditions do not lend themselves to letting natural ignitions burn; there would be too great an impact to watershed health.
 - There should be a list of bullets that include all the different tools that can be used to manage a forest to health.
 - The only way to decrease suppression costs is to decrease fuel loading on the forest.
 - It is important to mention that all Colorado's forests will see fire.
4. *Prescribed fire is an important tool that all land managers must be able to use, and its use needs to be expanded. When used under the proper conditions, the risks associated with prescribed fire are outweighed by the ecological, social, and financial benefits.*

- Prescribed fire should not be used when timber harvest is feasible. Access issues may drive the use of a particular management tool in this case.
 - The wording should be changed to emphasize that prescribed fire is an important tool under certain conditions, particularly after mechanical treatment.
 - The current challenge with prescribed fire is that it is rarely used as a management tool due to restrictive permitting systems.
 - This needs to overtly say that mechanical treatments and removing economically-feasible biomass from the forest is a tool that creates forest conditions that are resilient to fire, either prescribed or natural.
5. *Recreational opportunities are an important aspect in forest health. Colorado's forests accommodate multiple use and bring in roughly \$28 billion annually. As these forests transition to a healthy ecosystem, there may be some tension between recreation and forest management; however, these two critical values can and should be complementary and not in competition with one another.*
- This should make a clearer connection between recreation and forest health.
 - The first sentence should read, "Recreational opportunities are dependent of forest health."
6. *Current funding for forest health action, is not adequate to treat Colorado's forests at a pace and scale that will effectively reduce the risk of wildfire. More money is needed from the local, State, and federal levels for active and proactive management. While the current levels of funding are not sufficient, opportunities exist to leverage these available sources and create shared solutions through collaborative efforts, partnerships, and private industry at all levels of government. Additionally, current resources can be allocated in a more effective and efficient way.*
- This first sentence should be rewritten to talk about the effects of wildfire.
 - The first sentence should say "to reduce the negative impacts of wildfire."
7. *The USFS owns and manages roughly ____ forested acres within Colorado. The USFS processes and procedures for developing and implementing treatments (any activity that achieves a management goal) makes their ability to address forest health issues difficult and expensive. Collaboration and institutional support are paramount to help USFS staff be as effective as possible.*
- In the current political climate, it is not likely that forest health will get any significant new funding. It would be best for the FHAC to look into things such as self-funded taxes and other similar mechanisms.
 - USFS owns and manages 10,179,000 forested acres in Colorado.
8. *More effort is needed to educate the public and elected officials about forest health. This should include the importance of forest treatments of all kinds, as well as the role for fire in the ecosystem.*
- It is important that public education encompasses teaching people about modern forestry and land management techniques so logging is not just associated with clear cuts.
 - It would be useful to list the types of treatments so that people understand their purposes.
 - This agreement should discuss the need to shift public perception as it relates to forest management, as well as forest health and fire.

- People need to know that while clear cuts are a forestry technique that is acceptable under certain circumstances, it is not the only technique.
 - People often do not think about forest health until conditions are unacceptable. This has to change for any public outreach to be sustainable.
 - The public must understand how all the parts fit into the system of managing a healthy forest; there has to be a focus on the entire management process.
 - The US Forest Service (USFS) talks about education and engagement, not just education. This could be a good time to use that wording.
9. *The lack of a robust and consistent timber industry in Colorado makes treatments to achieve forest health operationally and financially difficult. Stimulating a sustainable timber industry and market requires long-term harvest and production guarantees aimed at decreasing operational costs over time. This would require a change to timber programs within the necessary agencies.*
- This section should talk about the different types of treatments and tools that can be used to manage for forest health.
 - There are many different types of treatments that can meet the goals of forest health.
10. *Planning, implementation, assessment, and maintenance of all types of forest treatments benefit from data and research. While Colorado has a great resource in the Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI) at Colorado State University (CSU) and the Rocky Mountain Research Station (RMRS) through the US Forest Service, CFRI and RMRS lack the capacity to meet all of our research needs. Additional support and capacity for research is critical.*
- No changes proposed.
11. *Burned Area Emergency Response (BAER) assessments should look at hydrologic impacts beyond National Forest boundaries to pour points that will be impacted by post-fire flooding.*
- This is a new addition from the sub-team developed to discuss the draft preliminary agreements document.
 - This should remain in the document and should be carried over into the barriers and concerns.

General Comments

- The document should be reorganized so that the problems are towards the top, followed by solutions.
- This document seems very fire focused, but that is because that is a necessary tool that is currently not available to all land managers.
- Since the problem is so complex and there are so many nuances, it is important that the Council speak simply and with one voice. Defining every aspect of this problem is not feasible in this document.

Next Steps

The Council agreed to the following next steps:

- Aaron Kimple will suggest edits to the first bullet.
- The second bullet will be rewritten to mention economic health and resiliency.
- Neilie Goodwin will consider if there is a better way to talk about the statewide power grid as it relates to economic resiliency.
- Mike Lester, Lyle Laverty, and Doug Lempke will rewrite the third and fourth bullets regarding prescribed fire.

- Doug Lempke will write an overarching statement about forestry management tools.
- Ben Tisdell will send in new language for the sixth bullet regarding funding and leveraging resources through collaboration.
- Ben Tisdell and Norm Birtcher will rewrite the eighth bullet regarding for education and public engagement.
- Travis Smith will revise the order of the document when it is completed.
- After all members have submitted the rewrites of their assigned sections, the document is final and will be sent out to all members for public dissemination.
- This document will be used to inform a presentation for the Water Resources Review Committee at Colorado Water Congress.

Barriers and Opportunities

The FHAC sub-team also suggested edits to the Barriers and Opportunities document. The Council discussed this document and suggested edits. Below is the summary of this conversation.

Problem Statement

- This is the same statement that is listed on the preliminary agreements document.
- Any changes made to the other document must be captured here.

Challenges, Barriers, and Opportunities

- This section is accurate.
- There are no needed changes for this section.

Wildfire

- Bullet 11 from the preliminary agreements document that refers to BAER should be included as both a barrier and opportunity under wildfire.
- Any reference to BAER should include the window of time to be assessing the impacts of wildfire.
- Using the word “shift” when talking about suppression and active management is not fully accurate. It should be rewritten to say “increase.”
- Shifting funding is accurate, as it is not increasing funding necessarily, but moving it to the front end (treatment) rather than spending it on the back end (suppression).

Limited Financial Resources

- The opportunities that are currently listed do not actually do anything to generate meaningful changes in financial resources. They are ineffective.
- Opportunity language should be added about using legislation, local building codes, or other funding sources to make meaningful change.
- There are new funding sources that could be viable options, such as self-selecting taxes for people who live in the wildland-urban interface (WUI) or by asking developers to treat their land prior to development. Fees, taxes, or permits can all serve as a way to fund treatment in either an ongoing or one-time tax.

Outreach and Education

- This section is lacking details and should talk about the idea of branding forest management so that it is more publicly accepted.
- This should be rewritten to capture the same ideas as discussed for the Preliminary Agreements document.

- Any edits to this section should consider what methods have and have not worked for the Colorado Timber Industry Association (CTIA).
- CTIA has done a lot of work to suggest and implement some best management practices (BMPs) for contractors; that effort should be reflected in this section.

Timber Industry

- There is a typo under the opportunities that says, “incentive” rather than “incentivize.”
- The information in this section is accurate and does not need to change.

General Comments

- The wildland-urban interface is not included in this document and should be listed as its own topic. This is needed to capture the issues with changing human values, structural values, local land use codes, and other efforts that are already underway.
- If someone chooses to build in a high fire-risk area, there must be discussion about at what point the burden of protection should not fall onto general taxpayers.
- A section should be added that discusses water quality, as maintaining and improving water quality is one of the most important functions of the forest.

Next Steps

- Tom Spezze will write barrier and opportunity language about BAER.
- Tom Spezze will write language for a new section regarding water quality in a way that is consistent with the Colorado Water Plan to ensure that the nexus is clear.
- Ben Tisdell will write language regarding development in the WUI.
- Ben Tisdell and Mark Morgan will work together edit the Outreach and Education language.
- Mark Morgan will write more detailed language about the opportunities relating to limited financial resources.
- Aaron Kimple will write language about sharing resources between agencies as an opportunity for wildfire.
- This document will be used to inform a presentation for the Water Resources Review Committee at Colorado Water Congress.

Water Resources Review Committee at Colorado Water Congress

The Council has been considering what, if anything, it should present to the interim Water Resources Review Committee (WRRC) when it meets at Colorado Water Congress in August. Below are the highlights of this discussion.

- At the last meeting, some members indicated that the preliminary agreements and the barriers and opportunities documents should be presented to show everyone that the FHAC is meeting regularly and doing work.
- Presenting to the WRRC could be a good opportunity to see the initial reaction to messaging before going out to the entire Legislature.
- The preliminary agreements document should definitely be finalized for the WRRC meeting.
- These two documents will be effective in working with the Legislature, as it shows them that FHAC members are experts and can be resources when trying to create or pass a forest health-related bill.
- Presenting to the WRRC would be a great opportunity, particularly as the Wildfire Matters Committee has not yet created their schedule for the upcoming legislative session.
- The WRRC has a one-and-a-half hour listening session at Colorado Water Congress, during which FHAC would present its information.

DRAFT

“Low-Hanging Fruit” Recommendations

At the previous meeting, members identified a several topics for which they thought they could develop recommendations now with relative ease. These were distinguished from topics that would require more group discussion prior to getting to a recommendation. For four topics (reestablishing governmental immunity for prescribed fire, eliminating fire borrowing, supporting landscape-scale planning, and renewing the Wildfire Matters Committee), certain members agreed to draft some language for a FHAC recommendation. For the remaining issues, members discussed appropriate action items. Below are the highlights of this conversation.

Reestablish Governmental Immunity for Prescribed Fire

- This item would benefit from more time, as there is a lot of work that needs to be done behind the scenes since it is more politically charged than others. There are concerns about this at the State level.
- The State Forester has meetings set up to start discussing the issue with key leaders in the state, but there is still a significant amount of work that needs to be done.
- FHAC members are willing to help the Colorado State Forest Service (CSFS) in any way possible to move this conversation along.
- The FHAC could make this a recommendation in a way that does not force the CSFS into an uncomfortable position. A FHAC recommendation could even serve as a political tool that protects the CSFS from advocating for this change.
- This recommendation should be crafted carefully so that it helps alleviate political pressure on the CSFS and also does not set the FHAC up for failure.

Endorse Elements of Colorado’s Water Plan

- Mike Preston wrote a draft of a letter from the FHAC to the WRRRC that endorses the Colorado Water Plan. This letter identifies how the Colorado Water Plan (CWP) relates to the work of the FHAC, how the FHAC can help move CWP goals along, how funding from the Water Plan can also help impact watersheds and forest health, how the FHAC can assist in creating and meeting critical goals and actions through the development of meaningful metrics, and the role of the 9 basin roundtables and other existing infrastructure in implementing the Water Plan in a way that is in line with forest health goals.
- The Legislature has indicated that they want to fund issues that deal with water and forest health in tandem through Senate Bill 259. However, the allocation of the \$1 million set-aside for forest health and aquatic species is unclear.
- While \$1 million is not enough to treat all the forested acres, it is a good start. It creates a clear landing place for future funds and gives coalition efforts an opportunity to move their efforts forward. The Legislature should be complemented on this effort.
- Forest health work likely fits under fire prevention and mitigation projects, which is one category that is listed among others to benefit from the \$1 million pot.
- It might be a good idea to list all of the collaborative efforts that are underway in the state, as this is something for which the Water Plan calls. However, it seems that there are already existing efforts to catalogue them all.
- It would be wise to not tell the WRRRC that they should revise all of their guidelines for funding, as they have not been tested yet. Instead, it could be beneficial to encourage or promote the use of language that encompasses forest restoration activities in the future.
- The guidelines will likely be massaged throughout implementation, as staff is able to see how they work in real time. Recommendations should only be suggested after the guidelines have actually been implemented.

- The intent of this letter is perfect, as it suggests clear areas for partnership without listing demands, particularly for funding.
- This letter sets the stage for creating a clear link between water quality and forest health in planning efforts. These two efforts usually take place in different circles, and it would be useful to bridge this gap.
- The Colorado Water Conservation Board is currently accepting statements of intent from those who plan to apply for funding next year. These will likely be used to inform the Legislature about additional funding needs in the future.

Expand the Use of Prescribed Fire

- The current smoke permit application process is too onerous and prevents effective slash management. Burn permits are often quite restrictive in terms of feasible burn windows.
- The current process is more of a prohibition than permission. Currently, any smoke is considered a failure, which is not realistic. There needs to be a sliding scale of acceptability to overcome these unrealistic standards.
- Many different agencies are involved with the process of permitting the use of prescribed fire.
- Capacity is also an issue that relates to prescribed fire.
- It would be wise to not ask for additional funds, but rather to support interagency groups that work with the proper partners to resolve some of the issues.
- It is hard to separate the use of prescribed fire from the use of mechanical treatments.
- This recommendation should be a simple statement saying that the FHAC endorses the use of all land management tools, including prescribed fire when appropriate.
- This should reference the best available science, even though there are knowledge gaps.
- The recently-published CSFS forest health document explains the importance of active management and prescribed fire in a useable way.
- The message should be that prescribed fire is a cost-effective management tool that compliments other treatment options.
- This issue is more of an overarching one. Specific actions items to achieve it include reinstating governmental immunity for prescribed fire. The best course of action is to include this with the recommendation for governmental immunity, so the importance of prescribed fire as a management tool is clear.
- Much of the language for this recommendation already exists in the CSFS report.
- Reinstating governmental immunity does not mean that CSFS is going to be able to burn immediately, but it does take a step in the right direction.
- The most time-sensitive role for CSFS to fill in regard to prescribed fire is State assistance for pile burning on private lands.

Expedite Burn Permits

- The FHAC should encourage the Colorado Department of Public Health and the Environment (CDPHE) to address how much smoke can be in the air at one point in time.
- Private landowners often do not know how to go about getting burn permits.
- Perhaps burn permits should be removed from CDPHE entirely. However, there is likely a good reason for why they are managed there in the first place.
- The Legislature should decide where the responsibility of burn permits should live. It would be better for them to ask for FHAC member advice behind the scenes, rather than have it look like FHAC members are trying to tell them how to do their job.

- Perhaps the best course of action would be to recommend that the applicable agencies participate in a discussion about how to streamline the permitting process for all types of agencies and people.
- The Governor would likely have to be the convener of an inter-agency dialogue to streamline this process. The recommendation from the FHAC would be asking him to make it a priority.
- It is important that the agencies would be directed to talk about streamlining the process, as well as revising the conditions under which burning may take place.
- The best way for the FHAC to reach the Governor would be write him a letter.
- Before any action is taken, the leaders of each of the impacted agencies should be alerted to the recommendation.
- It would be useful to talk to some people who work with the Governor in order to make sure they would be on board with receiving such a recommendation. FHAC member John Swartout could be a useful connection to ensure that it does not appear that FHAC members are attempting an end run.
- The best messaging would be to state that it would be wise for the affected agencies to come together in order to streamline processes to expand the use of prescribed fire, rather than telling the Governor to convene certain people and make them streamline certain things.

Identify Champions/Build Relationships with the Wildfire Matters Committee

- FHAC members could sit down with the representatives to whom they have a connection to walk them through the necessary documents, explain the work of the FHAC, and gather their thoughts.
- It would be best to first give the entire Committee a full update on the work of the FHAC before personally reaching out to certain members.

Support Resolution Regarding the Importance of USFS Providing Consistent Timber Supply

- There are 24 mills that operate on USFS lands, and their annual capacity is 189-meter board feet per year (MBFY). In fiscal year 2016 (FY16), the USFS sold 123 MBFY of aspen and conifer. Including biomass processing, this is about half of what the current capacity is within the state. The USFS only sold about 64 percent of what they could in 2016, impacting only .15 percent of the suitable timber base in the state. This data supports asking the USFS to increase output from Colorado's national forests and to more efficiently use the exiting budget to do so.
- Another hurdle relating to timber harvest and capacity is that the logging and trucking infrastructure is lacking, but that is a separate issue.
- Any recommendation from the FHAC should be discussed relating to forest management, rather than only laying out the economic benefits to those in the timber industry.
- While more timber can be harvested off the national forests, it should be stated that there has been a 28 percent increase in timber harvest on USFS lands in the past six years. It would be more helpful to tell the USFS exactly what they need to change in order to increase timber production and feed mills.
- The most important aspect of working with the USFS to harvest timber is consistency, and Region 2 is better than most at staying engaged with contractors.
- It is likely that the agency-level timber targets will continue to increase. This is a challenge for the USFS as it is an expense item in the budget, and the budget is not increased even when timber targets are increased.
- It is important that the economic viability of timber harvesting at the correct scale is considered.

- Timber has an economic stimulation component as well, as for every one timber sale that goes on the market, 35 jobs are created.
- The FHAC should press the Regional Forester of the USFS to increase timber targets.
- There is a struggle in some areas of Colorado that contractors do not want to remove the product that needs to be removed to support ecological goals.
- A recommendation could be for the USFS to redirect resources with the goal of closing the gap between industry capacity and timber targets.
- The Good Neighbor Agreement with the CSFS could be a good opportunity to increase timber production, especially since the USFS is currently under a hiring freeze. However, the CSFS cannot augment timber sales, just dampen the impact of inadequate staff capacity.
- There are other options for the USFS to build capacity through partnerships.
- In general, there is a positive relationship between the timber industry and the USFS.
- Some areas that need mechanical treatment are challenging to treat and outside of the suitable timber base.
- Working within the WUI is not an economically-feasible solution for consistent work for the timber industry, as it is costly. Perhaps people in the WUI should be contributing financially.
- The timber industry does not solve the issue of forest health, but it is a tool that can be used in conjunction with others to shift forest conditions toward health.
- Increasing capacity for timber within the USFS should not be done without increasing capacity for forest health.
- Colorado's environment allows for expedient regeneration, and it is rarely an issue that a treated stand would not regenerate at the required rates. Clear-cutting can be a technique used in certain parts of a treatment area, but it is not relied upon as a stand-alone technique as it has been in the past.
- Any recommendation coming out of the FHAC needs to have a clear objective that addresses and differentiates between cutting trees and feeding mills.

Establish a Statewide Fire Marshal

- It seems that Mike Morgan from the Colorado Department of Fire Prevention and Control (CDFPC) serves as a de facto State fire marshal.
- There is no need for the FHAC to make a recommendation regarding this item at this time.

Endorse CFLRP-Style Approach to Forest Management/Make Forest Stewardship Subsidy Decisions Based on Need

- These items should be tied together, since they both address capacity.
- It is hard to get low-value timber incorporated into stewardship agreements. It is important that this status quo changes, as the need to remove low-value timber is high.
- The FHAC should look into recommending the creation for forest health stewardship districts, as it could be a way to have subsidies pay for the harvesting of low-value timber.
- Individual landowners could pay a tax since they are the most immediate beneficiaries of treatments as it pertains to wildfire, but that may not be accurate since all people in Colorado benefit from healthy forests.
- It is unclear from the broad statement about which aspects of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) the FHAC would be supporting.
- Endorsing the collaborative aspect of the CFLRP would be wise, as that would likely bring in additional funding to collaborative groups in Colorado who are doing forestry treatments.
- The Flagstaff model could be useful, as it shows an example of citizens choosing to tax themselves in order to fund landscape restoration work. Summit County also recently funded a mill levy that is used to fund WUI forest management work.

- Subsidies may be an unrealistic solution, as all agencies and organizations have tight budgets right now.
- There are many agencies that are choosing to spend any influx of money on collaborative efforts, similar to the CFLRP.
- Money may be tight, but that does mean there are no available funds; they may just be in different places.
- Oftentimes it seems that the issue with funding is in getting enough match. That could be a possible solution for the FHAC to look into recommending.
- Colorado organizations need to maintain their national competitiveness by participating in collaboratives, as that is the type of organization that is currently benefitting from funding.
- The FHAC should support the renewals of the CFLRP, the Farm Bill, and the Joint Chiefs funding sources to continue to support forest health in Colorado. The best way to go about supporting these funding sources would be to work with the Colorado delegation in Washington.
- Along with collaborative efforts, a significant portion of money is being allocated toward ecosystem services.
- Setting up water funds may be a good way to funnel more money toward forest health issues in Colorado.
- While asking for money from the federal budget can fill some gaps, there needs to be a strategy for how forest health and land management activities are funded sustainably and removed from politics as much as possible.
- The FHAC could submit a letter to the WRRC listing the coalitions and collaborative organizations that exist and could benefit from funding.
- Before taking any concrete steps, it would be best to have a list of the existing collaborative organizations. Having this information would make any ensuing FHAC recommendations more powerful.
- CSFS is often available to help match federal funds, but would be wise to identify as many sources as possible.

Next Steps

- Mike Lester, Mark Morgan, Chuck Rhoades, and Lyle Laverty will draft a few paragraphs regarding governmental immunity.
- Mike Lester and Lyle will draft a few paragraphs regarding the elimination of fire borrowing.
- Aaron Kimple and Jason Lawhon will draft a few paragraphs regarding landscape-scale planning.
- Carol Ekarius and Ben Tisdell will draft a few paragraphs regarding the Wildfire Matters Committee.
- Carolyn Aspelin will finalize the letter to the WRRC and make it a full memo from the entire FHAC. It will also be sent to the full Legislature.
- Tom Spezze, Doug Lempke, and Mike Lester will draft language about expediting burn permits and work with John Swartout to identify feasible next steps. They will report back at the next meeting.
- Present FHAC efforts to-date to the Wildfire Matters Committee when the first round of recommendations is complete. FHAC will reach out to those representatives they know personally after this update.
- Lyle Laverty, Norm Birtcher, and Ben Tisdell will work with the USFS to draft a recommendation regarding timber industry in Colorado.

- The FHAC will support the Colorado Water Conservation Board (CWCB) effort to identify a list of collaborative efforts around the State.
- Aaron Kimple and Tom Spezze will identify which entities are building the list of collaborative efforts and report back regarding progress and if they need any help.
- Tom Spezze and Mike Preston will draft a recommendation in support of federal funding sources for forest health and State-level matching funds and send it to the State Legislature and the Colorado Delegation.
- Heather Bergman will add a discussion about additional funding sources to the next meeting agenda.
- Anyone who is drafting recommendation language should send it to Heather Bergman by August 11 for dissemination to the entire group.
- All edits to draft recommendations and language should be sent to Heather Bergman by August 18.

Water Resources Review Committee Listening Session Presentation

The discussing the above points, the FHAC agreed to the following:

- Travis Smith, Mike Preston, and someone from CSFS will present the letter to the WRRRC.
- Presenters will send the presentation date, time, and location to Heather Bergman, who will send it out to the FHAC. Any member is welcome and encouraged to attend.
- Heather Bergman will finalize the letter and send it to the presenters. Carolyn Aspelin will deliver it to the WRRRC.
- Ben Tisdell will present the final letter at the Rural Economic Resiliency meeting with the Governor the next day.

Meeting Schedules

Due to the upcoming legislative session, the FHAC will not meet again until November or December on the Front Range. Heather Bergman will send a scheduling poll out to FHAC members with possible suggestions.