

4

Community Outreach and Collaboration

4.1 Strategic Planning

Several strategic planning meetings were held throughout the course of the Plan’s development. The initial “kickoff” meeting, held 9/25/07 in Idaho Springs, brought together CWPP “core team” members, prominent stakeholders, and USFS fire managers to discuss the scope of the project, desired outcomes, and agency participation (Figure 8). The group delineated and defined the county’s WUI zones that would be targeted for assessment.



Figure 8. CWPP Strategic Planning Meeting

A second meeting was held at the CCC building in Georgetown on December 4, 2007. Again, core team, prominent stakeholders, CSFS and USFS were in attendance. Project progress was discussed, goals and objectives were reviewed, USFS policies concerning mitigation private land that borders public land, NEPA, and seasonal vs. full-time residence were reviewed.

A third planning meeting was held on January 22, 2008 to plan the second set of community meetings.

4.2 Community Outreach

The success of any CWPP is dependent upon community involvement for both strategic input and long-term ownership and implementation. A plan that accurately reflects the community's interests, concerns, and priorities will have greater legitimacy and long-term success.

The outreach strategy this CWPP employed was a multi-tiered approach to engage interested parties, raise public awareness, and generate public input for mitigation recommendations and action plan through:

- CCC landowner questionnaire;
- Community-based meetings; and
- County web site posts.

Goal

The goal of the community involvement activities for the Clear Creek County CWPP was two-fold, 1) to inform the community of the project, and 2) to stress the value of their input during the information-gathering phase and during the comment phase of the draft Plan. Since this is a community-based plan, it was essential to obtain as much information as possible about the perceptions, concerns, and issues of residents and landowners in the WUI areas, as well as other watershed stakeholders. The primary means of collecting community input was through a distributed questionnaire and through a series of public meetings.

4.2.1 Questionnaire Strategy

The purpose of the landowner survey was to gain information about how landowners in the county perceive the potential risk of wildfire and their attitudes towards risk reduction and preparedness strategies. The survey results may be used to focus public outreach activities aimed at wildfire risk reduction and loss prevention. Additional benefits of the survey include educating and informing the public, incorporating public values into decision-making, improving the quality of decisions, and building trust in this planning process.

- Tri-fold project flyer and questionnaire – 4,000 bulk mailed to homeowners and property owners in the wildland/urban interface areas of the Clear Creek Fire Authority (mailed 10/19/07)
 - Brief project overview and community involvement overview
 - Meeting announcements
 - Project contact information
 - Questionnaire
 - Listing ways to submit questionnaire and/or get more information
- Newspaper insert – 2,000 copies of same flyer/questionnaire inserted in 10/24/07 *Clear Creek Courant*
- Mailed to HOAs/POAs (25)
- Ad in 10/24/07 and 10/31/07 *Clear Creek Courant*
- Calendar listings in 10/24/07 and 10/31/07 *Clear Creek Courant*
- *Other Voices* article in 10/24/07 *Clear Creek Courant*
- Emails to HOAs and other stakeholders (approx. 300)

4. Community Outreach and Collaboration

- Meeting notices posted in local shops, businesses, restaurants, etc. in Silver Plume, Georgetown, Empire, Dumont, Idaho Springs (approx. 50)
- Project page on CCC website
- Questionnaire drop-box at Safeway (Oct.19-Nov. 30)

Results from over 225 responses are tabulated and summarized in Appendix XX.

4.2.2 Community Meetings

Two sets of public meetings were organized, four meetings total. The first set was held early on in the project to obtain preliminary community/stakeholder input (via presentations, questions/answers, interactive mapping, and questionnaires); the second set held after the release of the draft Plan in order to collect final comments. For each set of meetings, one meeting was scheduled for the east end of the county and one at the west end, both following the same format and agenda. The meetings were held at locations and times considered convenient for the working public, and pizza and beverages were provided. Overall, the meetings were successful with positive information exchange and impressive attendance—approximately 50 participants at each meeting (Figure 9).

A series of community meetings are incorporated into the county’s CWPP development process. Locations were chosen to accommodate residents living in both the east and west regions of the county. Two sets of meetings were held. The first addressed the initial wave of public interest generated by the survey questionnaire. The meetings provided a forum through which to involve residents in discussing the CWPP process, the effectiveness of fuel reduction, available resources, public perception of values, hazards and risks, and other questions or concerns they had related to emergency services and fire agency response. The second set of meetings was designed to accommodate discussion of the draft report that was posted for public review.



Figure 9. Clear Creek County residents and landowners review project base maps

Note: Community Meetings #3 & #4 pending.
See Appendix F for Community Meeting details.

4.3 Stakeholder Collaboration

Integral in the planning and development process of the CCC CWPP has been the active involvement of a core stakeholder group (Table 5). This group has worked closely with the core team and has provided strategic and tactical guidance and support relating to all facets of the development process. This is the intention of the CWPP process that this group be extended over time to include other land management agencies.

Table 5. Core Stakeholder Team

Team Member	Organization	Contact
Rick Albers	CCC SO	303-679-2380
John Chapman	Southern Rockies Conservation Alliance	
Donna Kline	CCC OEM	3003-679-2364
Chris Crouse	Clear Creek Watershed Foundation	303-567-2699
Einar Jenson	Evergreen FPD	
Ed Rapp	Clear Creek Watershed Foundation	
Matt Taylor	CCC GIS	
Lisa Vogel	CCC Lands	
Tim Vogel	CCC Site Development	

Due to the county’s unique location at the apex of the state’s central access through the Continental Divide, the values-at-risk component of this CWPP takes on a greater sense of urgency and importance than what other fire-prone areas contend with. These values include economic impacts to commerce and other resources that would be negatively impacted in the event of interruption due to a large scale wildfire. Downstream watershed impacts to major municipal water supplies, disruption of major electrical high transmission supply lines, and major commerce impacts on a national scale if transportation flow is interrupted on I-70, all have to be considered in a comprehensive county assessment (Table 6).

Table 6. Municipal, Commercial, and Downstream Stakeholders

Organization/Agency	Primary Contact	Contact
Standley Lake Cities	Shelley Stanley	303-679-2377
City of Golden	Anne Beierle	303-384-8153
City of Arvada	Jim McCarthy	720-898-7765
City of Northglen	Shelley Stanley	303-679-2377
City of Westminster	Mary Sabiezius	303-430-2400 x2137
Lookout Mountain Sanitation		
CDOT	Saeed Sohbi	
XCEL Energy	Steve Smith	
Climax - Henderson Mine	Bryce Romig	(303) 569-3221 x 1204

4. Community Outreach and Collaboration

Organization/Agency	Primary Contact	Contact
Loveland Ski Area	Ken Abrahamson	
Denver Water Board		
Front Range Watershed Working Group	Mary Sabiezius	303-430-2400 x2137

The county is also home to 266 square miles of National Forest that is managed by the USFS. These lands have always been a valued resource to the county with local timber enabling the early and rapid development of the region’s mines and towns. Today these forested lands attract throngs of recreational enthusiasts who help drive the county’s tourist industry. However, just within the last few years, this critical resource has come under serious threat of annihilation from the mountain pine beetle. Closer collaboration with USFS foresters, planners, and fire managers is necessary to better coordinate treatment strategies and facilitate an accurate and informative flow of information to residents and the general public (Table 7).

Table 7. Local USFS Consultive Contacts

Team Member	USFS Department	Contact
Mark Martin	Planner, Boulder Ranger District	mlmartin@fs.fed.us
Dave Niemi		dniemi@fs.fed.us
Dave Buchanan	Fire Manager	dbuchanan@fs.fed.us
Dan Lavato		dalovato@fs.fed.us

