

## Minutes From 9/19/2006 CWPP meeting at NRFPD Station II

### Present:

Kent Foster	USFS
John Twitchell	CSFS
Chuck Vale	RCOEM
Bob Reilley	NRFPD + Captains Cove Subdivision
Jeff Finoff	Hahns Peak
Marge Eardley	Hahns Peak
Jim Hicks	Hahns Peak
Bill Speaker	Red Creek
Karen Kosakowski	Ranches at Steamboat Lake

### Agenda: Introductions

Process- CWPP 8 step process and the Routt County Plan

Outcome- Timing and Scope

To do's- Clean up GIS maps, meeting schedules, Money (who pays, does what?)

After introductions were made Bill Speaker asked if we need additional political representation i.e. Routt County Government, Commissioners. Chuck Vale commented that he represents Routt County as the Emergency Manager for the County. County Commissioners do not want it perceived that they are directing CWPP's, CWPP's should be community driven.

Kent Foster began an overview of the CWPP eight step process and its relation to the Routt County Fire Plan. Kent F. and Chuck V. discussed the Routt County Fire Plan. Bill S. wanted to make sure that the CWPP worked with the County Fire Plan.

Bill S. asked if we had identified appropriate stakeholders. Additional stakeholders might include ranches, businesses, homeowners, environmental groups, religious groups, State Parks.

John Twitchell discussed the CWPP plan developed in Gould, CO. John T. noted that the Gould plan is short on prioritization and that the NR plan might include more treatment priorities. John T. also discussed the inclusion of Deb Alpe for plan writing and meeting facilitation and that the CSFS might have funding to pay for such as position.

Discussion followed regarding communities and values at risk as well as identifying these risks. Bob Reilley suggested the CWPP might want to break communities/subdivisions into larger geographic areas such as Clark South (to include 129, 56,54,52), Seedhouse Corridor (to include 64), Clark North (to include 129, 62), and North of the NRFPD (areas north of Columbine). Additional discussion followed identifying the commonalities vs. differences in these geographic areas. Recreation opportunities were also included.

Karen Kosakowski recognized that the majority of the stakeholders present at the meeting were from the Clark North Area and she felt this area was well represented and at the very least, the CWPP could move forward with this area represented.

Marge Eardley and John T. suggested that the number of meetings for CWPP development be limited. John T. reiterated that we could encourage Deb Alpe to help facilitate the process to keep progress moving forward.

Discussion of Kent F. maps followed. The USFS, CSFS, and Routt County would develop GIS maps identifying urban interface, beetles, and areas at risk, with the community's input. Additional mapping could include weather and fire expectations.

The identification of the Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) and the ability of the CWPP to define the distance from subdivisions were discussed. No set distance currently identified.

Ideas surrounding regulation vs. education for property owners was brought up. Education was recognized as preferred. It was suggested that the CWPP might be a good tool to assist this function. Subdivision covenants vs. codes were included. CSFS pamphlets and Fire Chief listed as good education sources. John T. noted that the Gould CWPP tried to identify many of these issues.

Kent F. suggested looking at Step 5 (community risk assessment) for next meeting.

The "next steps" were identified to include:

- getting an 'invitation' list together to gather additional stakeholders (Bob, Chuck, John, Kent)
- briefly review this meeting and process approach at the next meeting for the anticipated new attendees
- identify the extent of the WUI for this plan through maps
- evaluate risks and values (everyone)
- identify risks and values on maps (everyone)
- develop evacuation plans (Bob, Chuck)
- try to get a news story for next meeting (Chuck, Bob, John)
- ad in 'Happenings" (Bob, John)
- set date for next meeting. November 16, 2006 at Station II 7pm. (Thursday)

← - - - - Formatted: Bullets and Numbering

Preliminary agendas for the next meetings:

3<sup>rd</sup> meeting identify the risks and treatments

4<sup>th</sup> meeting prioritizations of treatments

Meetings should be finished by March 2007 so that the plan can be written and in place for the 2007 fire season

Bill S. asked Kent F. and John T. about Forestry Management to include mix of trees and age class and diversity and what the next forest might look like in an effort that history would not repeat itself.

Meeting Adjourned.