


Part 1 - Governance Models



Governance Model 1 - 3 Districts that collaborate together

0 Votes

Pros:

- Bottom up & flexible
- Crosswalk with the Front Range Roundtable
- Will bring funding to parties
- Local emphasis (more adaptable)

Cons:

- Potential duplication of efforts
- 3 meetings for those involved in all three regions
- What about areas outside of PNFF?
- Don't reinvent USPP
- Local level still writing grants as opposed to other models where a steering committee and coordinator manages grants.
 - Who's going to apply for the grant?
- USPP operated for 7 years before coordinator was brought on
- Would not want to create inequity right off the bat by having less coordinated groups compete for funding

Gov. #2 → ~~Structure~~ NOCO Mirror

Pros

- Simplify funding for partners → "doers on the ground"
- The NOCO structure really thought through structure, and committee spends time so on the ground don't have to
- NOCO has discrete funding
- ~~NOCO~~ NOCO already exists, could work easier w/ similar models

Gov Model 2 "Noco Mirror"

Votes: |

Cons

- Not all partners work across whole Pike
- Both ~~parts~~ → there are still folks not at the table
• Forest wants to engage business, more interconnected
- NOCO started as building relationships - no money involved and developed over time, only got coordinator last 1/2 year.
 - Took time to develop & developed organically.
 - Broad, not place based
- NOCO is not rapidly moving b/c so big & broad
- We don't have time to develop slowly

NOCO Mirror


1 Vote

Pros:

- Simplify funding for partners "doers on the ground"
- The NoCo structure really thought through structure and committee spends time so on the ground doesn't have to
- NOCO has discrete funding
- NOCO already exists, could work easier with similar models

Cons:

- Not all partners work across all areas
- There are still folks not at the table
- NOCO started as building relationships, no money involved and developed over time. Only got a coordinator last year.
 - Took time to develop and developed organically
 - Broad, not place based
- NOCO is not rapidly moving because it is so big and broad
- We don't have time to develop slowly



3rd Governance Model - Combine both models

20 Votes

3 RD level subgroups with coordinator support, and 1 steering committee housed under a fiscal agent.

Pros

- Focus on unique areas but hybrid could help with areas with low band width

Part 2 - What priorities should this group focus on?

Landscape Treatment Prioritization

- Risk assessment, values (incorporating previously ID'd values)
- Build / prioritize actions already taking place (look at cross-boundary)
- 900 response date - brief report
- Multi-value assessments - determining overlapping values - how to collectively address each unique priority plan
- Maintaining each organizations identify
- Each org has their own priority Map, ID where on the map we have overlap.

Fire Adapted Communities

- Education and outreach occurs on the local level

- You can't disengage wildland
- Fire departments playing a role within the partnership
 - Communities will have more trust with that connection
 - Communicate to local fire chiefs, where ppl are taking action
- Communication structure
 - Bottom and top can communicate
- Crossover of many partners strengthen message to public
- Social license, established plans should be used and expanded
- Could priority be given to firewise communities for doing mitigation?
- Issue - No funding for communities that can't pay for mitigation up front, and many areas don't have HOAs
- Listening / compromising with homeowner wants vs management needs
- Making firewise revamped / grow or adapt it
- Lead by example

Response and Evacuation

- Evac handled by sheriffs. State in charge of response
- Collaborate would help with communication and education
- But bigger role should be pre and post fire
- PODS?
 - Expanding beyond federal land
 - Control lines on the landscape
 - Collaborate to help shape PODs?
- Improving Evac with mitigation
- Create and distributing maps problematic for evac, but could evac responsibility falls on local

Other priorities

- Recreation
 - Users interface with it
 - Conservation and protection
 - Education
- Post Fire risk to assets, values at risk education
- Does having "fire shed in name limit us in eyes of public funding
 - Rec people not sure they should be involved?
 - SOCO Healthy Forest Initiative (possible name)
- Communities that have a collaborative are much more resilient AFTER a fire
 - Focus on post fire and recovery after disaster
- Ag is important in Park county and best handled at local group level
- Insurance industry not participating, ways to get them involved?
- Prioritize Rx fire, expanding its use, build on what Pike is doing
- Advocate to regional and state legislature, change laws for Rx fire.

LANDSCAPE

TREATMENT PRIORITIZATION

* Risk assessment, values (incorporating previously ID'd values)

* build / prioritize actions already taking place (look at cross-boundary)

* 900 response date - brief report

→ * multi-value assessments - determining overlapping values - how to collectively address each unique priority plan

* maintaining each organizations identity

- each org has their own priority Map, ^{ID} where we have overlap

FIRE ADAPTED COMMUNITIES

* ed/outreach occurs on the local levels

* you can't disengage wildland

* fire departments playing a role within partnership

→ Communities will have more trust connection w/ community

- Communicate to local Fire Chiefs, where ppl are taking action

* Communication structure bottom & top can communicate

- Crossover of many partners strengthen message to public

- Social license, established plans should be used & expanded

- ~~the~~ ~~the~~ Could priority given to firewise / communities doing mitigation?
↳ can't formalize b/c of equity.

- No funding for communities that can't pay for mitigation up front
Issues: many areas don't have HOAs or formalized

- Listening / compromising w/ homeowner wants vs management needs

* making firewise ~~not a~~ ~~more of~~ revamped

↳ hasn't grown/changed/adapted

* lead by example

Response and Evacuation

- evac handled by Sheriffs. State in charge of response
~~and~~

~~and~~

Collaborative work help w/ communication & education.

But bigger role should be pre & post fire

- PODS?
→ expanding beyond Fed. land
→ control lines on the landscape
→ collaborate help shape PODs?

- improving evac w/ mitigation

- Creating & distributing maps problematic for evac, but evac.
responsibility falls on local

OTHER PRIORITIES

- Recreation.

- users interface w/ it. → Conservation & Protection
- Education

Post fire risk to assets, values at risk education

→ does having "fireshed" in our name limit us in eyes of public, funding
↳ rec not sure they should be involved? - SOCO Healthy Forest Initiative?

→ communities that have a collaborative are much more resilient **AFTER**
* focus on Post fire & recovery before disaster
- ~~search~~

- Ag. is important in Park County → best handled at local group level

Insurance

- Industry not participating → how do we get them here?

- ↳ mortgage industry starting point? Any contacts in groups?
- ↳ California insurance industry more engaged. EDDRA → CO Regulators
- annual meeting @ Broadmore. Speak @ bar meeting @ USA

* Prioritize Rx Fire, expanding its use, build what Pike is doing

Advocate to regional & State Legislature, Change laws, for Rx Fire, @ space 3
(we do have wildfire commission & Forest Commission)