



LEFT HAND
watershed center

Minutes

St Vrain/Button Rock Forestry Health Committee

2:00-4:30 pm, February 13th, 2020

Lyons Regional Library 451 4th Ave, Lyons, CO 80540

Attendees

Rob Addington, The Nature Conservancy
David Batts, EMPSi, Inc., and Lyons Ecology Board and Lyons resident
David Bell, City of Longmont
Chad Buser, US Forest Service
Miles Churchill, City of Longmont, Button Rock Ranger
Sean Cronin, SVLHWCD
Bill Ellis, St. Vrain Creek Coalition & Middle St. Vrain Landowner
Deb Gardner, Boulder County Board of Supervisors (last part of meeting)
Angela Gee, US Forest Service
J.J. Hoffman, Lyons Fire District
Deb Hummel, Left Hand Watershed Center
Ken Huson, City of Longmont
Chad Julian, Boulder Valley/Longmont Conservation Districts
Robert Kerr, Landowner, Allenspark
Paige Lewis, The Nature Conservancy, Longmont resident
Gary Maguire, Allenspark Fire District
Aaron Mayville, USFS, Deputy Supervisor, ARNF
Mark Mendonca, USFS
Chris O'Brien, Left Hand Fire District
Jessie Olson, Left Hand Watershed Center
Paul Orbuch, Paul Orbuch Consulting (to USFS)
Glenn Patterson, Left Hand Watershed Center
Stefan Reinold, Boulder County Parks and Open Space
Yana Sorokin, Left Hand Watershed Center
Nick Stremel, Boulder County Parks and Open Space
Jim Webster, Boulder County Wildfire Partners, Boulder County
Sarah Wegert, Lyons Schools & Pinewood Springs Resident
Jason Whitmore, Left Hand Water District
Monte Williams, Supervisor, Arapahoe-Roosevelt National Forest
Kevin Zimlinghaus, US Forest Service
David Buchanan, Boulder Sheriff's office
Matt Champa, USFS



Welcome & Introductions & Review Meeting Purpose Jessie Olson 2:00 PM

Jessie called the meeting to order at 2:04. She introduced the Left Hand Watershed Center as an organization that works to protect and restore watersheds for people and the environment using a collaborative and science-based approach. The organization recently expanded services to larger St. Vrain basin. Watershed Center board members include USFS, Water Districts, Boulder County, City of Longmont, landowners, towns, trout unlimited, and more. The committee here today is the start of a new collaboration to help define and shape the vision for the future of our forests. She mentioned that we aimed to invite representative stakeholders in the region (both agencies and landowners), to have a productive discussion with smaller group. She also said that we know that additional outreach needs to be done with larger community. She mentioned the survey that we would like all attendees to complete as a means of providing additional feedback to help guide the process. She led a round of introductions, and gave a brief overview of the agenda for the meeting.

Why Here, Why now? USFS/Boulder County/City of Longmont 2:10 PM

Angela Gee, District Ranger, USFS, gave some context for the meeting. We are addressing a few overarching documents:

- (1) MOU between USFS and State of Colorado, signed in October 2019, as part of the USDA Shared Stewardship Investment Strategy for shared stewardship of forest resources in Colorado (<https://www.fs.usda.gov/sites/default/files/MOU-CO-USDA.pdf>). There is some additional development still going on with this, but it provides a good connection with other existing and future efforts and plans. Among the important aspects are shared stewardship, customer focus, and taking advantage of existing efforts such as community wildfire protection plans and county comprehensive plans.
- (2) Joint Chiefs Landscape Restoration Partnership, a collaboration of USFS with NRCS (<https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/newsroom/features/?cid=stelprdb1244394>). This was funded in 2019 for 3 years, and may continue for more. The partnership is meant to improve the health of the forest where public forest and grassland meets private land. Goals are to restore landscapes, reduce wildfire threats to communities and landowners, protect water quality and enhance wildlife habitat.

One of the items in the Joint Chiefs Study is a 4800 acre research natural area in the vicinity of Button Rock. This area may have prescribed burns to help wildlife such as bighorn sheep and elk. There is also a strong level of recreation in this area, which is near Button Rock Reservoir. There is also concern, especially around the Button Rock/Lyons area, both in this study and in the CWPP, for wildfire risk. The terrain here is difficult for firefighting. So it would be good to take measures on the front end to keep fires small.

The whole area that includes the headwaters of North St. Vrain Creek is also important as a source area for public water supply. There are some areas that are zones of concern for influence on water quality.



Jim Webster gave some additional information on community wildfire protection plans (CWPPs) in Boulder County. He is wildfire partners program coordinator for Boulder County. He also served as coordinator for the County CWPP, which is an umbrella document for local CWPPs around the county. Development of the CWPP involved work by several topical teams, such as Modeling and assessment and Forestry. The Modeling group looked at modeling wildfire behavior. Areas with high risk for fire intensity included Allenspark and the Button Rock/Lyons area.

Stefan Reinold, Senior Forester, BCPOS: They help to manage 30,000 acres of land in Boulder County. Some of their work has helped reduce wildfire risk at Heil Valley Ranch. They are always looking for additional work they can do to help the landscape. In collaboration with Longmont, they have noticed that the Button Rock area has not had a fire for a long time. They would like to do some forest restoration treatments to reduce fire risk in the area, including at Hall Ranch. This will be a collaboration with the City of Longmont. Hall Ranch is difficult for work with large equipment, but can be worked with manual labor. They may want to improve some existing roads to accommodate larger equipment. They are hoping to do some joint work with the Forest Service and City of Longmont in the Hall Ranch area.

Ken Huson, Water Resources Manager, City of Longmont, described Longmont's efforts around Button Rock. The City gets 2/3 of its drinking water from Button Rock. In addition, it serves people in unincorporated Boulder County, so it serves about 100,000 people. The area around the reservoir has always been at risk for fire, so in recent decades they have developed forest management plans to guide efforts on fuels management and forest stewardship. It took a few years to get people used to the idea of cutting trees in the source water area. Their demonstration projects convinced people this was a good idea. In addition to water supply, the area is important as a low-density recreational resource similar to a national park. They have treated about 1,000 acres, and have about the same amount yet to treat. Some of the remaining land is very steep and difficult to access. The most critical area for them is near Longmont Reservoir, a small reservoir 2 miles downstream from Button Rock Dam, where the water is actually withdrawn from N. St. Vrain Creek to go into the City of Longmont pipeline. Longmont is excited about this opportunity to collaborate on forest stewardship. They are working on a management plan for the area, so this will fit in with these efforts. The goal of the management plan is to promote a healthy local watershed. Recent City of Longmont community survey of Button Rock visitors (1000 surveyed) indicate that 82% of survey participants support use of prescribed fire as a management tool. They also have a 2017 Forest Stewardship Plan update that provides high-level guidance for planning and implementing fuels reduction and forest stewardship projects. In most years since 2010 they treat 20-60 acres/year. They plan to treat 40 acres in 2020. This work typically includes fuels removal (taken out by hand as firewood) and prescribed burns. They like to collaborate on this work and hope to do so under the Joint Chiefs Initiative and other projects.

State of the Science Rob Addington 2:30 PM

Presentation on the trajectory of our forests in relation to ecology and fire risk (looking at both the upper montane & lower montane). Rob will describe the attributes of a healthy, resilient, forest and discuss how that relates to the current condition of our forests.



Rob, of the Nature Conservancy, gave an overview of science to support collaborative forest management on the Front Range. His background is in forest and fire ecology. In order to work at the right (large) scale to influence fire risk, we need collaborative efforts among many landowners and stakeholders.

General background of Front Range forest and fire ecology: Forest structure and composition is the central aspect of a forest that is affected by many factors such as geology and soils, forest growth and reproduction, management practices, and others. Forest types vary with elevation, and each has its characteristic fire regime affected by factors such as temperature, moisture, and tree species. Lower elevations tend to have ground fires, mid elevations often have canopy fires. Fire frequency decreases with elevation, with less frequent stand-replacing fires in the spruce-fir zone.

Human effects on forests became significant in the 1850s with forest clearing and, after 1900, fire suppression. This has led to increased forest density and greater density of certain species such as Douglas fir that thrive under such conditions. Studies such as the Front Range Historical Forest Reconstruction Network study that he worked on have reconstructed forest characteristics for several of the forest types going back to 1860, in terms of tree ages and growth rates, fire frequency and type, species composition, and tree health (<https://cfri.colostate.edu/projects/front-range-forest-reconstruction-network/>). Findings show a dramatic increase in trees per acre in the montane zone, from 39 to 137 tpa. Tree diameter has decreased, meaning more trees with smaller diameters. Species composition has shifted to more Douglas fir and less ponderosa pine. Similar, but slightly less prominent, shifts have occurred in the upper montane. Lodgepole pine has increased in this zone, along with Douglas fir. A result of these shifts is a change in fire behavior. Since about 1990 there have been numerous significant fires, but we have not yet seen a really large fire in this study area. These fires can threaten numerous important social, cultural, ecological, and economic resources such as clean water, recreation, wildlife, transportation, and housing.

In response to global warming, we expect to see precipitation change from snow to rain, earlier snowmelt, less snowpack, more frequent droughts, more frequent forest disease outbreaks, more frequent fires, changes in species distributions (generally species moving upslope), and increased risk to those resources mentioned above. Rob showed the fire behavior triangle (heat, fuel, oxygen), which stresses the importance of fuels management.

Question: Why haven't we had a fire in the Button Rock area recently? A: We don't know. It might be good to look at whether this specific landscape may somehow inhibit fire. Or perhaps it's just a matter of chance and luck. There have been frequent small fires but they have been extinguished.

Monte Williams comment: A colleague says prescribed burns are not helpful and we should just do mechanical tree cutting for fuels reduction. Rob replied that there is much good science to show that prescribed burns provide additional benefits besides fuels reduction, that are not achieved by



just cutting trees. A prescribed burn protected one flank of the Hayman fire by reducing the fuel load. Monte agreed, and said this has happened in NM and AZ, too.

Sean Cronin asked about financial aspects of fuels reduction. How do mechanical and fire treatment costs vary? A: Prescribed burns cost about \$200/acre; mechanical treatment cost about \$2,000/acre.

Monte: The cost-benefit relation, when extended over a long time, may point to additional cost effectiveness for prescribed burns.

Rob listed several science resources for information:

- Colorado Forest Restoration Institute at CSU (<https://cfri.colostate.edu/>)
- Publications such as GTR-373 (2018) Principles and practice for restoration of ponderosa pine and dry mixed conifer forest on the CO Front Range (https://www.fs.fed.us/rm/pubs_series/rmrs/gtr/rmrs_gtr373.pdf).

This information can help guide restoration efforts, not just to reconstruct past forests, but to create healthy new forests for the future.

Rob also listed a few principles for forest restoration, such as: patterns of forest structure at a fine scale influence overall forest structure and function at a larger, landscape scale. Also, restoration complements natural variation in forest structure based on natural environmental gradients such as elevation, slope, aspect, soils, geology, etc. Within a treatment unit (a small watershed), these natural environmental gradients can be mapped and the information can be used to help guide restoration efforts. Also, natural variation in tree mortality rates and patterns can be used to guide restoration efforts. Fire is an important component of a healthy forest and should be incorporated into restoration plans.

Rob also briefly addressed the approach based on adaptive management to use feedback and monitoring to inform future adjustments in forest management.

These various aspects of science to support forest management were incorporated into a stepwise adaptive management framework to facilitate implementation of principles.

In addition to the Institute and the publication, there are great datasets available such as spatial datasets and model. These include wildfire risk assessments, and a Watershed Investment Tool (<https://peakstopeople.org/watershed-investment-tool/>), which serves as an optimization tool to support decisions on enhancing cost effectiveness of forest treatments.

He also mentioned the Potential Operational Delineations (PODs) approach for development of spatial information to support strategic planning (<https://cfri.colostate.edu/2019/08/27/new-publication-collaboratively-engaging-stakeholders-to-develop-pods/>). Monte Williams spoke in support of the value of this approach for strategic planning on ARNF. Angela Gee mentioned that she has the PODs maps that can be used to help support planning in our area of interest. As this



effort develops, we can decrease the size of the PODs, to help with more specific locally appropriate plans.

Rob also spoke to the importance of social science and collaborative methods to support and enhance community engagement.

Q&A:

Jessie: Regarding collaboration and future action, what happens if we do nothing? A: In light of global warming and other factors affecting the forest, there is urgency attached to these efforts. The no-action alternative carries a large risk of negative outcomes such as large destructive fires that harm both human and ecological resources. The Hayman fire was an example of a large, intensive, high-severity fire that went far beyond the benefits of fires by killing seed-producing trees, sterilizing the soil, and thus inhibiting forest renewal. This carries a risk of converting a forest to a grassland. So the no-action alternative could lead to more, larger, higher-intensity, more severe fires that do greater damage and change the characteristics of the forest.

Sean Cronin: We have smaller treatments and smaller timber harvesting programs here compared to, say, the Pacific Northwest. What is the scope of community interest in forest management projects? A: In general forest treatment projects are well received, but there are examples of local opinions running against certain aspects of the management practices. The more outreach and education we do, the more acceptance there is. When people see the positive outcomes in terms of ecological recovery in burned areas, that helps, too.

Jessie mentioned that in a future meeting we will have an opportunity to take some field trips to see some of these forest types and treatments.

Visioning Session All 3:15 PM

What is our collective vision for the future condition of our forests in this area? What outcomes would we like to achieve? (See notes from various small table discussions that follow these minutes).

Documenting what we learned

Reporting out from the groups:

Jessie (table 1):

- One key element pertaining to the state of the science is to make sure we have some quantified metrics about the specific benefits for specific efforts spent on forest treatments (e.g. quantify the amount of reduction in fire risk that the project would bring to a specific community).
- It would be good to get to the point where we can let some fires burn without having to worry about them. Perhaps this could pertain to 60% of our forests.



- We would like fire to be accepted in the landscape, based on education and community engagement.

Deb (Table 2):

- Aesthetics can be enhanced through attention to burn piles, slash, ground treatment.
- It would be good to reduce social hurdles and anxiety through education for homeowners and opportunities for them to collaborate on forest management.
- It would be good to promote good forest stewardship by landowners.
- We would like to have long-term sustainable forest health, with attention to effects of climate change.
- It would be good to have policies that include recurring management of areas that need periodic treatment, including access required to do this work.
- It would be good to maintain a continuing NEPA process that helps people understand consequences of potential actions or non-actions, and keeps people engaged.

Yana (Table 3):

- Similar. It would be good to have a resilient forest that can recover from disturbance, and recognition among stakeholders that the forest is managed, as it should be.
- We often feel that seeing a dense forest makes us nervous, and would like to see more openings in the stands.

Paul Orbuch (Table 4):

- To this we could add preservation of historical aspects that pertain to history of forest and agricultural use in the area. We would like to maintain healthy forest attributes that are also good for wildlife and flora.
- It would be good to have more education and outreach for the public.
- It would be good to have more specific information about the benefits and risks associated with treatment or lack of treatment on water quality and quantity.
- It would be good to have a forest comprising a mosaic with a mix of fuels loads, stand densities, and other forest characteristics.
- It would be good to collect desired outcomes from the various plans that already exist.

Monte mentioned that there is money available for 3 years in the Joint Chiefs Initiative, through the NRCS and the USFS. NRCS can target work on private land and USFS covers public land. There is potential for additional funding in the future. The Joint Chiefs Initiative has a vision for where it's heading, and good buy-in from collaborators and stakeholders, so much of the up-front work has been done. So good proposals stand a fair chance of funding under this initiative. It's not just about acres treated, it's also about strategies for creating a landscape that meets long-term objectives. They asked for 3-4 million; have been getting around \$1-2M per year combined through both NRCS and USFS.



Is this the Button Rock/St. Vrain Forest Health Committee? Does it include Allenspark? It might be good to use a more geographically inclusive name, such as St. Vrain Creek Forest Health Committee, or North St. Vrain Creek. There is flexibility in the name, but we should choose something soon so we can have a good one and stick with it.

Next Steps & Action Items Jessie Olson 4:20 PM

Jessie asked for additional thoughts on how to enhance community engagement:

- Chad mentioned the new District Conservationists is hoping to emphasize engagement with private landowners
- We should target the water customers for additional education—it's not about protecting their homes, but their water.
- Sarah suggested taking advantage of existing community meetings as opportunities for education and outreach.
- David Batts recommended being careful with timing and frequency of meetings—sometimes people get burned out on them. We should also take advantage of existing representative community committees that already exist.
- Sean Cronin: the Ag community would be interested in information on how forest management might affect quantity of water available for irrigation. SVLHWCD can help with some of this outreach.

Potential Dates for Next Meeting (March 19th, 20th, or April 3rd, 8th, 9th). April dates appeared to work well for everyone.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35.

Breakout groups Notes

Notes from Table 1 discussion:

1. Name(s)

Jessie Olson, Glenn Patterson (Watershed Center), Mark Mendonca (USFS), Chad Julian (Conservation District), Bill Ellis (Raymond/Riverside), Gary McGuire (Allenspark Fire District), David Buchanan (Boulder County sheriff's office)

2. Review your understanding of the state of the science. What surprised you and did not surprise you about Rob's presentation.

Most of those at our table were generally familiar with the concepts covered in the opening presentations. Gary McGuire asked why we are doing this. Are we protecting Longmont's



water? Jessie responded that that's one of the questions we're addressing. What are the values and goals that we want to work for? Gary asked if we can we let nature take its course to restore itself? A (Chad J.): Right now, if we leave things as they are, for the lower montane in the front range from Ft. Collins to Colorado Springs, we are on track to see a conversion from forest to grassland over 50 years, plus billion-dollar fire damages. Big fires result in 10s of thousands of dollars in damages per acre, plus forest conversion. A big fire in Allenspark could destroy 40% of the houses. A big fire in a source area could result in skyrocketing water rates. Forest management could help with these values plus wildlife habitat and other ecological values.

3. What outcomes would you like to achieve in the future for our forests?

- David (background in land management and now working for Sheriff): It would be great to see, on 60% of our landscape, the ability to take a more laissez-faire approach to certain types of fires in certain types of forest stands. In other words, do the work up front to make fire less of a threat to the landscape in many areas.
- Mark Mendonca, USFS, agrees with this approach. Do the work up front to make it possible to let some fires burn when they occur.
- Chad: if you do only mechanical treatment, you'll miss some important aspects of forest restoration. Incorporating fire into forest treatment brings multiple benefits. This is supported by dozens of scientific studies. This type of integrated forest management helps restore ecological integrity and also protects property values.
- Bill Ellis: It seems that certain areas, such as near dense cabin development, should be treated with mechanical thinning, while others, such as more open forests away from homes, are more suitable for burning. Mark agrees, and noted that this can be incorporated into the PODs approach.
- Gary McGuire: It would be good to have quantitative metrics to show the benefits of certain amounts of money spent on treating certain numbers of acres and the amount of risk reduced for community. This could help enhance community buy-in, and perhaps help with appropriate property insurance.
- Do we need more weather monitoring and weather forecasting capabilities, when we let fires burn? Mark: we use the best info available, but some parameters are outside our capabilities to predict. Gary: We don't have the understanding of specific fire behavior to do this consistently.
- Chad: We've made a lot of progress since 1978 on monitoring, data, and models, so we are already doing it better.

4. What current conditions (attributes) of the forests are favorable and unfavorable?

{Didn't discuss}

5. What future conditions (attributes) of the forests are desired?

Bill Ellis: he likes the mechanical fuels reduction work that has been done and would like to see more. This helps protect homes and the watershed. Eventually more carefully managed fire



would probably be accepted, too. Some people, however, seem to want to live in the middle of a dense forest.

Notes from Table 2 discussion:

1. Name(s)

Angela Gee (USFS), Miles Churchill (City of Longmont, Button Rock Ranger), Jim Webster (BOCO Wildfire Partners), Kevin Zimlinghaus (USFS), Jason Whitmore (LHWD), Robert Kerr (Allenspark Landowner), Deb Hummel (Watershed Center)

2. Review your understanding of the state of the science. What surprised you and did not surprise you about Rob's presentation.

- Robert K. did not know what the GTR-373 and was looking for a copy.

3. What outcomes would you like to achieve in the future for our forests?

- Aesthetic: manage slash piles
- Reducing Fire Risk: Reduction of ground fuels (slash piles)
- Management/Policy: Instill and adapt implementation policy that prioritizes both landscape scale and repetition of treatment at sites with established access.
- Protect Landscape/ Drinking Water Post-Fire: Establish and adhere to BMPs for post-fire conditions that will not impair water quality/needs downstream.
- Resilient Forests in the Future: look at past conditions to restore problem areas with emphasis on the future- what trees may exist here in the future? What management techniques will help with future forest composition? Allow for fluctuation in tree species distribution across landscape

4. What current conditions (attributes) of the forests are favorable and unfavorable?

- Favorable: gaps from recent mechanical treatments.
- Unfavorable: Clumps of trees, dense understory
 - Lack of collaboration with mixed ownership. Especially finding access
 - Population growth in forested areas
 - Lack of natural revegetation

5. What future conditions (attributes) of the forests are desired?

- Favorable: Diverse landscape, age class, size class, mosaic structure
 - Maintenance of gaps
 - Presence of wildlife and adequate habitat

Notes from Table 3 discussion:

1. Name(s)

Sarah Wegert (Pinewood Springs); Stephan Reinold (BOCO); Chad Buser (USFS); Aaron Mayville (USFS); Ken Huson (City of Longmont); Rob Addington (TNC); Yana Sorokin (Watershed Center)

2. Review your understanding of the state of the science. What surprised you and did not surprise you about Rob's presentation.

- (Stephan) A mix of endemic beetle activity and fire can accomplish desired conditions



- (Ken) Wanted feedback from the group – Does it make sense to use mechanical treatments to create meadows. Stephan, Rob, and Aaron agreed it makes sense.
- 3. What outcomes would you like to achieve in the future for our forests?**
- Resilient forests that can handle fire
 - Don't want to see loss of entire forest
 - Want to see it done with a strong social license
 - Want public to accept forest treatments as “good work” – e.g. when they see a fire happening, then think of it as a good thing
 - Should be achieved at the watershed scale – e.g. appx. 60,000 acres
- 4. What current conditions (attributes) of the forests are favorable and unfavorable?**
- Unfavorable: Dense trees, increasing density, monoculture, uniform forest conditions, lack of breaks
 - Favorable: Well thought out management of the landscape (e.g. access control, patrol, stream restoration, OHV use).
- 5. What future conditions (attributes) of the forests are desired?**
- Diverse landscape, age class, size class, mosaic structure
 - Whatever it takes to not lose it all and to help the forest bounce back
 - More diversity, more wildlife habitat, and more options in the face of climate change
 - Ability to recreate in trees

Notes from Table 4 discussion:

1. **Name(s)** – Paul Orbuch (USFS), David Batts (Lyons), Sean Cronin (St Vrain & Left Hand Water Conservancy District), David Bell (City of Longmont), Monte Williams (USFS), Matt Champa (USFS), Nick Stremel (Boulder County)
2. **Review your understanding of the state of the science. What surprised you and did not surprise you about Rob's presentation.**
 - Interesting that northern Boulder County has not burned in a long time. Shadow of Longs Peak an influence?
 - Unlike that ponderosa regenerates if we do not act and forest burns.
 - Good to know we can track past fire history as detailed by tree rings in the area. That information and recent nearby burns can be used to build case studies for the public.
3. **What outcomes would you like to achieve in the future for our forests?** [Example outcomes may include, protecting drinking water supply (water quantity and quality), reducing fire risk, providing wildlife habitat, providing aesthetic and recreational benefits, creating resilient forests



that withstand climate change, collaboration on management across the landscape, and more. See back for more examples.

- All of the above for sure.
- That outcomes in land management plans already in existence nestle in and are consistent with future new plans. And that we can highlight and demonstrate these outcomes to the public.
- That Boulder County forested lands can receive wildfire on the worst possible day and that we do not experience deleterious effects as a result.
- Be able to use managed fire on these landscapes some day.
- Diversity of flora and fauna.
- Conservation of Boulder County cultural resources such as settlement history and agricultural history on forested lands.
- That the forest post treatment provides increased water supply yield.

4. What current conditions (attributes) of the forests are favorable and unfavorable?

- Unfavorable: Dense trees and climate change impacts in a dynamic system
- Favorable: A dynamic system

5. What future conditions (attributes) of the forests are desired?

- Diversity good
- Need to have a goal/plan for downed materials and surface fuels. Most likely desire a mosaic across the landscape for soil health and diversity. But likely to increase chance of spot fires in places.

Extra Item on Public Outreach Ideas

- Buttonrock project will need a public outreach strategy sooner than later and certainly in advance of NEPA initiation. Recruit local activist to assist and use experts to do outreach.
- Needs to appeal to and target 100k water users in City of Longmont among others.
- Consider Santa Fe, New Mexico Fireshed effort as a model
- Consider BoCo public bus tours similar to GMO tours done through Agriculture Department. Charge folks \$5 to participate as done for GMO tours.