



## **Wildfire Crisis Strategy Region 2 Roundtable Summary**

Leadership Panel Session: February 28, 2022  
USDA Forest Service Employees Roundtable: March 1, 2022  
Partners Roundtable: March 7, 2022

### **INTRODUCTION**

The 2020–2021 wildfires highlighted a litany of challenges associated with keeping communities safe and resilient to the impacts of climate change and extreme weather events. This growing wildfire crisis has created the need for a new land management strategy within the USDA Forest Service—one designed to support strategic management and restoration of millions of acres of land in high-risk areas to protect forest health, watershed function, and human infrastructure. The need for increased pace and scale of restoration necessitates approaching challenges holistically and in partnership with employees, multiple agencies, Tribal Nations, state and local governments, communities, industries, organizations, and private landowners.

In January 2022, the Forest Service released its [Confronting the Wildfire Crisis Strategy](#) and associated [Implementation Plan](#) (Plan). Under this Plan, the Forest Service will work with partners and interested publics to strategically focus fuels and forest health treatments at the scale of the problem, using the best available science as the guide.

The USDA Forest Service, with the support of the [National Forest Foundation](#), hosted a series of [ten roundtable discussions](#) in the winter and spring of 2022 in support of the agency's effort to gain input on the Wildfire Crisis Implementation Plan. Planned roundtable conversations with employees and partners are the first of many coordinated engagement opportunities. A separate Tribal Roundtable was convened by the [Intertribal Timber Council](#).

This report is a summary of key themes from the roundtable sessions for Region 2, Rocky Mountain Region of the USDA Forest Service.

Over 100 participants attended the Region 2 roundtable kickoff, and approximately 110 participants attended the subsequent employee and partner sessions.

## **ROUNDTABLE DESIGN AND PURPOSE**

The goals of the roundtables were to

- Share information, goals, and timelines for the 10-Year Strategic Implementation Plan;
- Collect partner and employee input to inform the Plan;
- Provide an opportunity for dialogue among Forest Service leaders and partners to identify key needs and opportunities of the Plan; and
- Gauge ongoing levels of interest and determine ways to leverage that interest and energy.

Each roundtable included three sessions: a two-hour Leadership Panel, during which a group of leaders frame the nature of the wildfire crisis, and two day-long sessions, one with Forest Service employees and one with partners, to offer feedback on the Wildfire Crisis Strategy and Implementation Plan. Please click to view the [agenda](#) and [presentation](#) shared at the Region 2 roundtable.

In addition to the summary of themes provided in this report, the notes captured during roundtable discussions are being shared with (1) appropriate internal agency teams and workgroups and (2) Forest Service leadership at multiple scales. Following the conclusion of all roundtables, the National Forest Foundation will complete a synthesis report that highlights themes from all of the engagements and recommends process-oriented next steps.

## **SUMMARY OF LEADERSHIP PANEL PRESENTATIONS**

A video recording of the Leadership Panel session [is available here](#). The panel comprised the following individuals:

- **Frank Beum**, Regional Forester, Rocky Mountain Region
- **Monica Lear, PhD**, Director, Rocky Mountain Research Station
- **Matt McCombs**, State Forester, Colorado
- **Bill Crapser**, State Forester, Wyoming
- **Greg Josten**, State Forester, South Dakota
- **Cynthia West, PhD**, Director, Northern Research Station and Forest Products Lab

## **Overview of the Wildfire Crisis in Region 2**

Regionally and nationally, we are facing a mounting wildfire crisis. We now speak of fire years rather than fire seasons, and 2020 had the two largest fires in Colorado's history,

burning over 600,000 acres. The Marshall Fire in 2021 demonstrated the degree of destruction that can occur in the wildland urban interface (WUI).

The factors driving this crisis include accumulating fuels, a warming climate, and continued rapid development into the WUI. Historical records show pine forests in the region with 40-60 trees per acre; after decades of fire suppression and fuel buildup, densities of hundreds of trees per acre are now common.

A new paradigm, with new treatments and management techniques, is needed. The current treatment level on National Forest System lands in the Rocky Mountain Region is approximately 190,000 acres per year. To restore fire-resilient systems requires treatment of 3-4 times more acres of forest land, or about 600,000 acres, per year. Such an ambitious plan will need public support, increased funding, and funding that can be used across boundaries.

The 10-year Strategy and Implementation Plan calls for using all available tools to restore resilient, fire-adapted forests. These include thinning of overgrown forests; removal of biomass, including selling byproducts where feasible; and increased use of prescribed fire for restoration and long-term maintenance of fire-adapted systems. Decades of research and experience support these approaches.

Prioritization of high-risk firesheds, which cross ownerships, is necessary to achieve the Strategy's goals. Less than 10% of fire-prone lands in the western United States are responsible for 80% of wildfire exposure. We must work together to achieve the goal of treating 20 million additional acres on National Forest System lands and 30 million acres on Tribal, state, and private lands in 10 years, with ongoing maintenance to protect gains.

Fortunately, there is a rich history of collaboration in Region 2 to build on. Examples include Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Programs and use of the Tribal Forest Protection Act, Good Neighbor Authority, and Shared Stewardship. The [Rocky Mountain Restoration Initiative](#) (RMRI) is already advancing large-landscape cross-boundary management for resilient landscapes, and the Strategy and Plan seek to build on and complement the investments in efforts such as RMRI.

### **Support from the Rocky Mountain Research Station**

The Rocky Mountain Research Station (RMRS) is charged with providing the best available science to forest and land management in the Interior West. The station engages in project development while building social support and integrating different disciplines, data collection, monitoring, and modeling.

The Station has 12 laboratories, including one in Colorado and one in South Dakota, and shares data with Forest Service Regions 1, 2, 3, and 4, which make up almost half the acreage of the National Forest system. Some 400 staff members include 90 research scientists working across seven science programs, the Aldo Leopold Wilderness Research

Institute, and a science applications and communications group.

RMRS works to assess, mitigate, and manage fire risk with their science and programs. Two evolving tools include the definition of “firesheds” and Potential Operational Delineations (PODs), a framework that integrates multiple values into prioritization, including water source protection, cultural and heritage values, recreation, communities, and critical infrastructure.

RMRS scientists are also advancing projects to build social acceptance for prescribed fire and developing tools to engage the public and stakeholders in evaluating and planning to address wildfire risks. These tools include Co-Management of Fire Risk Transmission ([CoMFRT](#)) and Wildfire Research ([WiRe](#)).

RMRS is working to support healthy landscapes by identifying the right places to treat; providing critical information during wildfire events; monitoring post-fire landscapes for long-term changes to water, wildlife, and landforms; and tracking restoration and salvage efforts.

The western United States is expected to see more rapid effects of climate change than some other areas, raising the stakes and increasing the challenges for reaching management goals. The Station is committed to working collaboratively, including with Tribes to integrate Indigenous Traditional Ecological Knowledge (ITEK) into fire planning and to serve public trust lands.

### **Messages from Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota**

There are many common and shared visions for the desired conditions on National Forests and Grasslands. Colorado has a rich history of collaborative and shared management. A reliable body of science supports restoration for resilience and a growing market and industry for forest products and the removal of biomass. The [Memorandum of Understanding between Colorado and the US Department of Agriculture](#) is an example of commitment and common vision.

However, to achieve success, all partners need to “adjust our gaze” to see across boundaries and the critical need for strategic, collaborative action. All land managers feel a strong connection to their landscapes yet will need to think regionally about where and how to apply resources to achieve common goals for over 2.4 million forested lands in Colorado.

Wyoming is pleased to participate in these roundtable sessions and the development of the Wildfire Strategy and Implementation Plan. It is important to acknowledge that this effort is the latest in a string of 30 years of discussions attempting to increase the pace and scale of fuels treatment and to manage for resilience. Notable previous efforts include the following:

- 1990s: New Perspectives in Forestry

- 2000: National Forest Plan
- 2007: Shared Vision for America's Forests
- 2014: Cohesive Fire Strategy
- 2016: All Lands, All Hands Initiative
- 2018: Shared Stewardship Initiative
- 2022: Wildfire Crisis Strategy

The urgency of the wildfire crisis requires decisive action now and for the near future. Social license may be growing due to the severity of recent fire years. However, lessons from some of these previous initiatives have demonstrated unintended consequences. When the goal is simply "more" in terms of treatment, the "wrong" landscapes receive treatment (or sometimes damage) and precious resources are wasted. It is important to not set up systems of "winners and losers," where treatment prioritization is based more on grant-writing capacity than solid science and collaborative goals.

To fulfill the challenge of the Strategy and Plan, all partners should

- Invest the time up front (slowing down if necessary) to agree on goals, expectations, and processes such as reporting guidelines;
- Remember that rising tides lift all ships and that we must share and sacrifice to succeed;
- Focus on workforce development in the Forest Service and with partners;
- Work with non-traditional partners; and
- Create new ways to get work done.

South Dakota is also pleased to participate in the development of the Strategy and Implementation Plan and is invested in their success. The Black Hills are a unique example of the challenges inherent in the WUI. The patchwork landownership patterns are such that most of the Black Hills can be considered the WUI. Interspersed Tribal, federal, state, and private lands mean the fate of all these landscapes are connected.

In this region, over 200,000 acres of ponderosa pine of non-commercial grade need thinning for fuels treatment and restoration. The [South Dakota State Forest Action Plan](#) seeks to apply multiple funding sources across boundaries. It is also important to recognize the importance of strong roles for private industry—big and small—in achieving restoration goals.

### **Reframing Forest and Grassland Management for Fire and Resilience**

Forest and wood products are truly sustainable resources. There are uses for all scales of products and biomass removed through forest treatments. From construction materials to clothing to chemicals, there are opportunities to use all forest materials from the nano (biochar) to the large scale (timber). The challenge is growing and establishing markets and infrastructure.

To restore resilient, fire-adapted forests and grasslands, we need a new perspective on economic markets and forest products. Currently, other than timber, most products will not “pay themselves” off the landscape, and yet treatment is critical. Hazardous waste removal is an established discipline, with techniques for reducing costs of managing waste. These economic models are more fitting for current forest management goals.

New markets are evolving that were not even available a decade ago. For example, carbon sequestration and tradeable credits are a rapidly expanding market. Fuel wood and local uses continue to offer opportunities for small-scale, perhaps mobile, infrastructure and operations. Success will require integrated systems to move materials where they can be processed and used.

### **Next Steps for Wildfire Strategy and Implementation Plan**

The [2021 Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act](#) commits \$5.5 billion to the management of National Forest System lands, with \$3.3 billion dedicated to hazardous fuels reduction. The following is a broad overview of the 10-year Implementation Plan:

- Years 1-2 will focus on launching treatment and restoration projects that are suitable for early implementation. Suitable lands have cleared environmental review, align with priority firesheds, and have the capacity and collaborative support at the ready.
- Years 3-10 of implementation will be influenced by key lessons from these roundtables and from ongoing collaborative planning. The Forest Service is committed to, for example, synchronizing the Strategy and Implementation Plan with state forest action plans.

These roundtables represent a commitment to working together in the right places and at the right scales to restore resilient, fire-adapted forests and grasslands.

## **SUMMARY OF ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSIONS**

### **Themes from Breakout Sessions**

In the employee and partner roundtable sessions, attendees participated in small-group discussions to collect input on the Strategy and Implementation Plans. Breakout session topics aligned with the key areas of work identified in the Strategy and Plan, as follows:

- Cross-boundary partnerships
- Outcome-based prioritization and metrics of progress
- Science supporting wildfire risk reduction
- Markets and industry
- Workforce capacity

Each topic integrated equity and inclusion questions. Each participant was invited to participate in three topics. Major themes from each breakout session are summarized by topic below.

## Cross-Boundary Partnerships

Roundtable participants identified key challenges to cross-boundary partnerships, including inconsistencies and barriers that hinder agency staff from using existing funding and authorities for cross-boundary work; a lack of agency emphasis on relationship-building skills and capacity; a lack of agency resources to define, identify, and reach underserved communities; and matching funds requirements that impede work with partners and underserved communities. Conditions are changing rapidly on the ground, such that Forest Plans and NEPA project documents become quickly outdated, further hindering implementation and partnerships. Despite challenges, participants noted many examples and models of effective partnerships to build on in the region and encouraged the agency to engage and rely on local and regional partners and collaborative efforts.

- Models and tools for effective partnerships include the following:
  - Good Neighbor Authority, particularly for timber and invasive species projects
  - [Joint Chiefs' Landscape Restoration Partnership](#)
  - Shared Stewardship Agreements
  - Pre-season burn roundtable (includes Environmental Protection Agency)
  - [RESTORE Colorado program](#) (working to overcome challenges to matching funds requirements)
  - Bureau of Land Management's use of Categorical Exemptions to expedite restoration and treatment projects
  - [Rocky Mountain Restoration Initiative](#) as an example of shared visioning and prioritization
  - [San Juan Headwaters Forest Health Partnership](#), which connects multiple collaborative efforts to share science
  - The Ute Mountain Ute Tribe's use of Potential Operational Delineations (PODs) as a tool for prioritization
  - Shared positions between the Forest Service and partners or states
  - Partners as "force multipliers" who can often be more nimble in hiring, contracting, and conducting environmental analyses
- Participants offered suggestions to improve collaborative efficacy:
  - It is important to track more than acres treated. More holistic and complete measures of success (resilience, community health, water quality, costs) are needed to guide programs and to "tell the story" of the urgency of this crisis.
  - Effective cross-boundary partnership requires common definitions and understanding of "resilience."
  - Framing restoration and treatment efforts around water and headwater source protection is another way to build common goals and understanding.
  - Use partners to ask good questions and get ahead of potential litigation of NEPA documents.

- Many participants encouraged the agency to build relationships and rely on partners in ways it has not done historically:
  - The agency must get comfortable with money going toward relationships. The Forest Service's widget-based culture discounts relationships.
  - The Forest Service needs a culture change to allow reliance on partners and move away from the idea that the agency is responsible for all initiatives.
  - Long lag times to expand staffing and capacity at federal and state land management agencies make partnerships critical, but recognize that partners and Tribes also have capacity limitations and can become overstretched when asked to participate in multiple efforts.
- Agency process barriers to partnerships include the following:
  - Limitations in existing authorities and funding sources make it difficult to treat across boundaries and engage partners effectively.
  - Grants, agreements, and contracting are often inflexible.
  - Match requirements impede work with partners and underserved communities.
  - Forest Service processes, agreements, and funding adapt poorly to changing conditions on the ground. Climate change and fires mean environmental review and Forest Plans are quickly out of date.
- Challenges for the agency to effectively engage underserved communities include the following:
  - Working with Tribes requires cultural competency, long-term relationships, respect for history, and understanding of Tribal sovereignty and government-to-government standing. The agency may need to approach engagement through a lens of community and economic development.
  - Staff need help and resources to define, identify, and engage underserved communities.
  - Lack of compensation; consider stipends for underserved communities to participate.
  - Partners in South Dakota and Wyoming require different approaches than in Colorado; avoid a cookie-cutter approach.
  - Farming, ranching, and other communities often have trouble attending weekday daytime meetings. To reach them, the agency should consider going out to communities and using carefully constructed focus groups.

### **Outcome-Based Prioritization and Metrics of Progress**

Participants provided input on effective and efficient ways to prioritize and treat the areas that will result in the greatest reduction in wildfire risk. Participants encouraged the agency to engage communities, partners, and underserved communities to identify key values and criteria at a local level and to prioritize treatment areas based on multiple values, including protection of water supply headwaters.

- Participants called for community-based and holistic prioritization based on the needs in a particular landscape. PODs are a useful tool for this.
  - The complexity of values at risk, and tradeoffs between values, underscores the need to engage local communities and stakeholders in prioritization.
  - The agency and partners should ask underserved communities directly what needs and values they would prioritize for treatment and monitoring.
  - Region 2 has a rich tradition of collaboration and local, self-organized stakeholder groups. Prioritization should be built upon this foundation and set of networks.
- Participants expressed views regarding prioritizing specific values:
  - Headwaters are a key area that should be prioritized.
  - There may be tension between watershed and WUI values.
  - Prioritization should consider underserved and vulnerable communities. There is concern that current fireheds do not prioritize these areas and that a focus on asset value will deprioritize them.
  - Areas of high importance to Tribes, for example where they collect traditional food sources, should be considered.
  - Transportation, recreation, and emergency response infrastructure should be considered.
- There is a lack of clarity of how to define, measure, and communicate outcomes under the new strategy.
- Participants considered benefits and pitfalls of prioritizing shovel-ready projects:
  - It may be useful to start with shovel-ready projects while getting others ready for future work. Prioritization is spatial and temporal.
  - A focus on shovel-ready projects can deprioritize underserved communities.
  - Solid science, not readiness, should guide treatment location and sequence.

### **Science Supporting Wildfire Risk Reduction**

Roundtable participants identified information gaps that hinder the ability to consider climate change, water supply, and Indigenous Traditional Ecological Knowledge (ITEK) in planning and projects. Forest Service staff expressed the need for more institutionalized forms of science dissemination, noting that many staff rely on personal relationships with scientists. More direct conversations between staff and research scientists could help to inform development of useful science dissemination approaches. Participants also requested better and more communication tools to convey the urgency and need for forest restoration and treatment to non-scientific audiences.

- While participants feel there is enough science, in general, to support wildfire risk reduction activities, there are gaps and information needs, including:
  - Linking climate change projections and fire behavior models with treatment planning.
  - Synthesis of science, and potentially more science, on how water quality, quantity, and flows relate to management and fire.

- Decision-making frameworks that incorporate multiple values such as risk mitigation, watershed protection, habitat, carbon, and human health.
  - Social science to inform how to engage effectively and build trust and support with communities.
  - Synthesis of social science on human-caused ignitions.
  - Ability to monitor fire risk reduction over time.
  - Landscape-level science, monitoring, and metrics for success that reflect a wide range of values for those landscapes.
- Examples of programs that incorporate ITEK:
  - The [Indigenous People's Burning Network](#) supports Indigenous knowledge for fire and fuels management and landscape stewardship.
  - The Mescalero Apache Tribe uses ITEK to meet their forest management goals.
  - The White Mountain Apache Tribe has incorporated ITEK into their projects.
  - Success can come from funding Tribal priorities even when outside of program goals (e.g., National Fish and Wildlife Foundation Great Plains program).
- There are many challenges to incorporating ITEK, including:
  - A lack of shared understanding of what ITEK means.
  - The need to recognize diversity of Tribes, practices, and views of science.
- Forest managers should consider how carbon management could expand partnerships, markets, and sources of capital.
- PODs were highlighted as an effective and promising approach for information sharing, developing public support, and connecting analysis and planning to implementation.
- Additional models of information sharing include:
  - Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program (CFLRP) monitoring that incorporates community input.
  - The Chaffee County Community Wildfire Protection Plan, which is an example of local prioritization for treatment that also rolls up into broader strategies.
- Communication and information sharing needs include:
  - Clear materials for communicating risk and tradeoffs of treatment approaches, including no treatment.
  - Better and broader communication to convey the urgency of the crisis and build public support for treatment, including prescribed fire and living with smoke. Information should be accessible but not oversimplified.
  - Translating science effectively for decision-makers.
- Connecting practitioners to science:

- Can practitioners identify their needs so partnerships can be formed with RMRS to speak to these gaps? Co-production of knowledge by practitioners and scientists can also be an effective approach.
- Timelines for peer review and publication are long. Scientists should share information in timely ways so practitioners can use it in planning projects.
- Products and tools that synthesize emerging science and lessons are very valuable, such as the Science You Can Use bulletins from the Rocky Mountain Research Station (RMRS).
- Most Forest Service employees rely on personal relationships with fire scientists and ecologists to stay abreast of current information. However, these are limited resources and do not ensure even and broad learning across the organization and partners.

### **Markets and Industry**

Roundtable participants stressed the need for more infrastructure, especially in small-diameter and innovative markets. Improved coordination between supply and processing would enable industry investment in infrastructure and workforce. Participants noted opportunities for the agency to work with communities, tribes, industry, and other partners to build more robust markets and industry and promote economic development.

- Participants stressed the need more infrastructure, especially in small-diameter and innovative markets. Related challenges include:
  - Translating talk about biochar into action on the ground.
  - High costs of hooking up new processing plants to the grid.
  - High costs of transportation over long distances between project locations and processing sites; consider centralized sorting yards.
- Participants stressed the need for improved coordination between supply and processing at a regional scale.
  - To invest in infrastructure and workforce, industry needs long-term projections on supply. The agency should move from a reactive (1- to 2-year) communication timeline to long-term (10-year view) to facilitate investment.
  - Forest Service challenges include staffing capacity and planning issues:
    - Who is tasked with having these conversations with industry?
    - Knowing what supply will be available and where.
  - Using a community and economic development lens, the agency should:
    - Work with communities at all phases of fuel work, from planning to implementation, to understand what communities are willing to take on and how collaboration can spark innovation, markets, and industry.
    - Connect Tribal Nations and underserved communities with economic opportunities associated with this work.
    - Support industry in taking business risks to start new markets.

- Support investment in new equipment (for example, new equipment in Region 6 to expand new markets and opportunities).
- Align wood innovation grants with new facilities.
- Potential new partners include business incubators, agricultural community, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service.
- Additional needs include:
  - A more comprehensive approach to vegetation management that marries timber and fuels more closely.
  - Building public support for landscape-level projects as restoration efforts, not timber sales.
  - Rethinking agency metrics for targets and goals so that programs like Wood for Life can count toward achieving targets.
- Additional opportunities include:
  - Connecting watershed protection goals with opportunities in infrastructure.
  - Enhancing story telling about project success, including how fuels work is helping communities, to build trust and support.

### **Workforce Capacity**

Roundtable participants identified a range of workforce skills and training needed to accelerate treatment and address the wildfire crisis. Recognizing that the Forest Service and many partners are currently overstretched, they also discussed ideas and challenges for workforce recruitment, including among underserved communities.

- Needed training and skills include:
  - Staff who can write grants and contracts and seek innovative funding.
  - Soft skills to outreach and work with communities on planning.
  - Social scientists to advise on developing partnerships and engaging underserved communities.
  - More technical staff (biology, archaeology, etc.) on forest units.
  - Communications and public affairs staff who can explain why the Forest Service is taking particular action, including success stories (i.e., the fire that didn't happen); embrace healthy skepticism about our work.
  - Fuller suite of fuels reduction skills and equipment to work on steep slopes; can industry step in to provide this training?
  - Basic forestry and operation of mechanized equipment; new trainees can increase equipment costs through incorrect operation.
- Training programs:
  - Could high training costs be offset by apprenticeship programs or mentorships? These could shorten the break-in period of new hires.
  - Agency staff struggle to find capacity to train new workers.
  - Partners can support training if they know what trainings are needed.

- The agency should develop an overall training strategy (who should be trained and where).
  - Even with new funding, it will take time to recruit and train new staff.
- Workforce capacity:
  - Everyone in the agency is understaffed and over capacity; need to expedite hiring and figure out how to deploy existing workforce more efficiently.
  - Can staff work across regions on critical components of NEPA planning? Can we streamline NEPA to require less staff time?
  - Partnerships can help extend Forest Service capacity and reach, but recognize that partners also have capacity limits.
  - Overstressing wildland fire suppression workforce is a real concern. Cross-training could be problematic due to different mindsets in natural resource management versus fire suppression work.
  - Supply chain issues are affecting work. Departments need computers, radios, etc. for new programs and employees.
- Workforce recruitment:
  - High housing costs are a key barrier for new workers; can we subsidize?
  - Rigid application requirements and cumbersome systems hinder recruitment. Would-be applicants may not meet basic requirements for applying or struggle with difficult and rigid application systems.
  - Consider different recruiting tools and incentives to reach a younger generation, recognizing the workload has grown exponentially, it is difficult work, and remote areas have poor connectivity.
  - There should be a focus on retaining staff, not just recruiting new staff.
  - Better relationships with colleges could help with the recruiting pipeline.
- Considerations for working with underserved communities:
  - Need a definition of what “underserved” means. Community statistics like median income can be skewed, so it is important to look more deeply.
  - Need to provide robust career development trajectories, not just jobs.
  - Partners, industry, and government need to be persistent and patient in working with underserved communities.
  - Working with underserved communities, including outreach and workforce training, will require new approaches, resources, and skills.

## APPENDIX A

### Wildfire Crisis Strategy Region 2 Roundtable Participating Employee Units and Staff Areas

Approximately 66 employee representatives were invited by the Region to participate in this roundtable. A total of 54 employees attended this virtual event, held over Zoom. The participants represented a broad range of Forest Service units and staff/program areas from across the region.

<b>Forest Service Unit (RO, Station, Forest)</b>	<b>Staff Area or Program</b>
Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland	Forest Supervisor
Arapaho & Roosevelt National Forests and Pawnee National Grassland	Deputy Forest Supervisor
Bighorn National Forest	Forest Supervisor
Black Hills National Forest	Deputy Forest Supervisor
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests	Leadership
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests	Fire Staff Officer
Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest and Thunder Basin National Grassland	Brush Creek/Hayden Ranger District
Medicine Bow-Routt National Forest and Thunder Basin National Grassland	Supervisor's Office
Nebraska National Forests and Grasslands	
Pike-San Isabel National Forests & Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands	Forest and Grassland Supervisor
Pike-San Isabel National Forests & Cimarron and Comanche National Grasslands	Deputy Forest Supervisor
Rio Grande National Forest	Forest Supervisor
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Chief of Staff
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	SFAM
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Cooperative Forestry
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	SPFTR
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	RLMV
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Human Resources
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Engineering
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	State and Private Forestry and Tribal Relations

Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Renewable Resources
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Office of Grants and Agreements
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Timber
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Resource Information
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Recreation, Lands, Minerals, Volunteers
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Strategic Planning
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Engineering
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	External Affairs
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	State & Private Forestry and Tribal Relations
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	External Affairs
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Strategic Planning
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Renewable Resources
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Acting Deputy Regional Forester
Rocky Mountain Regional Office	Shared Stewardship & RMRI
Rocky Mountain Research Station	Forest and Woodlands Sci Program
Rocky Mountain Research Station	Communication
Rocky Mountain Research Station	Water & Watersheds and Senior Advisor for Science
Rocky Mountain Research Station	Human Dimensions Program
Rocky Mountain Research Station	Air Water Aquatic Environments
San Juan National Forest	RMRI/Special Initiatives
San Juan National Forest	Forest Supervisor
Southern Regional Office	National Liaison National Wild Turkey Federation
White River National Forest	National Forest
Wyoming State Liaison (R2/R4)	Liaison

**APPENDIX B**  
**Wildfire Crisis Strategy Region 2 Roundtable**  
**Participating Partner Organizations**

Region 2 invited approximately 112 partner representatives to participate in this Roundtable. A total of 55 partners attended this virtual event. The participants represented a broad range of stakeholders and sectors in this region.

American Forest Foundation	Archuleta County
Arizona Farm Bureau Federation	Aspen Fire Protection District
Aurora Water	Bureau of Land Management
Bureau of Reclamation	CK Blueshift, LLC
Clear Creek County	Club 20
Coalitions & Collaboratives, Inc.	Colorado Department of Agriculture
Colorado Department of Natural Resources	Colorado Division of Fire Prevention and Control
Colorado Firecamp & Chaffee County Fire	Colorado Springs Utilities
Colorado State Forest Service	Denver Water
Gunnison County	Harris Sherman & Associates LLC
Intermountain Forest Association	Jefferson County Government
JW Associates	Ladder Livestock
Mountain Studies Institute	National Association of Forest Service Retirees
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation	National Ski Areas Association
National Wild Turkey Federation	Nebraska Forest Service
Northern Colorado Fireshed Collaborative	Northern Water
Outdoor Afro	South Dakota Department of Agriculture & Natural Resources
The Nature Conservancy	The Wilderness Society
US Environmental Protection Agency	USFS Tribal Relations Program Manager
Walton Family Foundation	White River & Douglas Creek Conservation Districts
Winter Park Resort	