


Study of Forest Management Preferences and Values for the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative



Jessica M. Clement, Ph.D.
Antony S. Cheng, Ph.D.
Kathie Mattor, M.S.

Colorado Forest Restoration Institute
Department of Forest, Rangeland and Watershed Stewardship
Fort Collins, CO 80523
July 14, 2010



Table of Contents

| | |
|------------------------|---------|
| Executive Summary | Page 3 |
| Introduction | Page 4 |
| Methodology | Page 5 |
| Explanation of Results | Page 5 |
| Results I | Page 6 |
| Conclusion | Page 14 |
| Appendix A: Notes | Page 15 |

Jessica Clement, Ph.D.
Antony Cheng, Ph.D.
Colorado Forest Restoration Institute
Department of Forest, Rangeland and Watershed Stewardship
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, CO 80523

July 14, 2010

Survey Results of Public Values toward Forests near Woodland Park, CO

Executive Summary

Ecological, social and economic monitoring are part of the efforts conducted under the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative. To address the social monitoring component of this, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute designed a survey and compiled and analyzed the results which the Coalition for the Upper South Platte printed and mailed. The survey was sent in late 2009 to residents in and around Woodland Park to explore residents' values and beliefs regarding local forest management issues. Questions centered on residents' familiarity with the WPHFI, forest treatments types, reasons for forest treatments, issues regarding woody biomass use and demographic characteristics of respondents.

The majority of respondents were not familiar with the WPHFI, or had been involved with its activities, although they had been residing in the area during the Hayman Fire of 2002. Generally respondents were favorable about increasing the amount and type of work conducted on the forest, and favored all reasons mentioned in the survey for doing such work including fire prevention to protect property, and improving wildlife habitat. The majority also favored using a diversity of vegetation treatment methods to reduce fuels such as patch cutting, forest thinning, prescribed fires and reducing the amount of development around forests. Most of the twelve forest values in the survey were favored by the majority of respondents, and the four top twelve were aesthetic, biological diversity, life sustaining and future values. The majority of respondents support local woody biomass utilization such as providing heat and energy to public buildings. In terms of demographic characteristics, about half of the respondents had moved to the area within the last 10 years, the majority was between 31 and 45 years, 42 % were women, 67% had 4 years or more of college education, and 47% earned more than \$ 75,000.

The results indicate that the USFS and the WPHFI's attempts to address fuels and forest health issues are supported by residents but the public has a great need for further information regarding e.g. vegetation management methods, biomass utilization considerations and other forest management issues. Woodland Park has a relatively high percentage of educated residents who appear generally favorably disposed to e.g. biomass utilization but they would benefit from more information in order to contribute to these discourses. The general picture that this short survey presents is that the general public doesn't view the world through a

narrow lens such as "hazardous fuel reduction" -- residents see the forest in broader terms and have more nuanced values about living in the midst of the forest than protection of their property from wildfire only. Surveys such as these, used to complement collaborative learning, and other meaningful public communication processes, can help to bridge the gap in communications, allowing stakeholders, including natural resource agencies, to more clearly learn how their constituents really connect to their forest landscape.

Introduction

The Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative (WPHFI) was established to expedite and enhance implementation of forest health, fuels mitigation and biomass projects in the area surrounding Woodland Park with emphasis placed on areas as identified in Teller County's Community Wildfire Protection Plan. The WPHFI is a multi-stakeholder effort with a Memorandum of Understanding between Colorado State, Federal, county, city and other partners who have agreed to the following objectives:

- 1.) Build a strong network of agencies to more effectively achieve the WPHFI goal and address other community-related needs including preparation for future fires.
- 2.) Create a footprint of treated or protected areas on at least 20% of the approximately 41,000-acre project area by December 2010.
- 3.) Engage local citizens in actively participating in the implementation of their CWPPs and empower them to maintain a level of involvement in natural resource management into the future, as WPHFI provides a model of community-based collaborative wildfire mitigation implementation.
- 4.) Pursue at least three endpoint-market options for biomass for heat, energy, disturbed-lands reclamation, or wood products, as a step for increasing future treatment acres throughout the Front Range by lowering the cost of disposal.
- 5.) Create an active outreach program that publicizes the project's successes and lessons learned so that other communities can benefit from our experiences.
- 6.) Monitor the project so as to increase our understanding of the costs and benefits of our work.

Under this Memorandum of Understanding, Colorado Forest Restoration Institute has provided support in a number of ways for ecological, social and economic monitoring. In order to provide social monitoring support and explore community capacity regarding WPHFI's goals and objectives, a survey was sent to residents in November 2009. This short report provides the results of that survey. The three objectives of the survey were to:

- Explore residents' familiarity with the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative.
- Understand residents' beliefs about and preferences for forest management and biomass utilization.
- Learn about Woodland Park residents.

Methodology

The Colorado Forest Restoration Institute (CFRI) designed a social science survey instrument to meet WPHFI needs which were to evaluate what values residents have in relation to surrounding forests, and their beliefs and preferences regarding forest management techniques and forest product utilization. The survey was designed on the basis of other surveys that had been used to explore similar questions in relation to forest planning efforts on the Pike and San Isabel National Forests, Bridger-Teton National Forest and Shoshone National Forest by Drs. Cheng and Clement (Clement and Cheng, in review, 2010). The Coalition for the Upper South Platte (CUSP) printed and mailed the surveys and CFRI entered and analyzed the data and compiled the data for distribution. A one-time survey was sent to residents in and around Woodland Park in late November 2009. The six-page survey consisted of an explanatory letter, a short introduction, and five sections addressing respondents':

1. Knowledge of the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative
2. Beliefs regarding forest management
3. Values regarding the forests around the town of Woodland Park
4. Respondents' views on biomass utilization
5. Demographic information.

The survey was sent to all the mail boxes in the Woodland Park zip code 80866 that provides mail to the outlying properties of Woodland Park, approximately 4000 households. The response rate was 14%, with 563 usable surveys received. This allows the results to be interpreted with a confidence interval of +/- 3.83%.

Explanation of Results

Every methodology has its limitations. In order to allow the data of this research to be helpful, it is important to note these limitations explicitly. In this case the survey methodology is grounded in social psychological theory and forms a tool for discovering general trends in a sample of people. If the sample is large enough, the data can be extrapolated to the population from which the sample of people is derived, in this case at a confidence level of 95% or greater. The most important limitations of a survey are that it is a snapshot in time, that it captures general trends and is not a helpful tool to discover small, unusual but perhaps important factors, nor does a survey provide an explanation for the reasons why respondents answered the way they did. Other social psychological methods are available to capture these layers of information. Another limitation is that due to logistical and financial constraints, it was only possible to do a one-time mailing. Other sampling methodologies that require more funding can provide a higher response rate. A one-time mailing such as this may mean that the self-selection process that motivates respondents to take the trouble to fill in and return any survey may be more pronounced in this case. We therefore recommend that the results are used to extrapolate to the cohort of Woodland Park residents who are interested in forest issues.

Results I

Margin of error is max. 3.83% if result is around 50 %. The margin of error decreases as response rates get closer to 100 or 0 %

Survey Questions and Responses

Responses are provided in percentages (%) unless indicated otherwise.

Section 1: Your knowledge of the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative

Q-1 Had you heard about the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative before receiving this questionnaire?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 40 |
| 2. No | 60 |

a. If yes, how did you hear about this effort?

| | % |
|------------------------------------|----|
| Had not heard of it before | 60 |
| Friend or family member | 9 |
| U.S. Forest Service | 5 |
| Colorado State Forest Service | 4 |
| Chamber of Commerce | 0 |
| Newspaper/ Newsletter: (See notes) | 17 |
| Radio | 0 |
| Television | 0 |
| Other: (See notes) | 5 |

Q-2 Have you ever attended any meetings related to the Teller County community wildfire protection plan or meetings for your subdivision?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 15 |
| 2. No | 85 |

Q-3 Have you been involved in any volunteer efforts associated with local fire mitigation or forest restoration?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 20 |
| 2. No | 80 |

a. If yes, have you volunteered with any forest restoration efforts in areas impacted by the Hayman Fire?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 9 |
| 2. No | 91 |

Q-4 Have you contacted your local State or US Forest Service, County, or Town representatives about forest related issues in the past twelve months?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 26 |
| 2. No | 74 |

Q-5 Were you here during the Hayman Fire in 2002?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 68 |
| 2. No | 32 |

b. If yes, were you directly impacted by the Hayman Fire?

| | % |
|--------|----|
| 1. Yes | 31 |
| 2. No | 69 |

Section 2: Your view on how the local forest should be managed

Q-1 There has been an increase in efforts to reduce the risk of forest fires near communities over the past decade through forest thinning and prescribed fire in forest areas near communities (the wildland-urban interface). Please indicate your opinion of the amount and type of work being done on private and public land?

| Amount of work: | Far too low | Too low | About right | Too high | Far too high | Don't Know |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-------------------|
| Forest thinning on Private Land | 14 | 34 | 14 | 1 | 1 | 36 |
| Forest thinning on Public Land | 10 | 31 | 33 | 3 | 1 | 22 |
| Prescribed fire on Private Land | 8 | 19 | 13 | 2 | 2 | 56 |
| Prescribed fire on Public Land | 5 | 21 | 30 | 3 | 3 | 38 |

Q-2 Vegetation treatments currently occur for the following management purposes on the Pike and San Isabel National Forests. Please indicate your level of favor or opposition to vegetation management on the Pike and San Isabel National Forest for *each* of the following reasons:

| Reasons for Vegetation Management: | Strongly Favor | Favor | Neutral | Oppose | Strongly Oppose | Don't Know |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| Forest products. | 28 | 34 | 19 | 7 | 3 | 9 |
| Fire prevention to protect life and property. | 53 | 38 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| To salvage dead or dying trees. | 48 | 37 | 6 | 3 | 1 | 5 |
| To create or improve wildlife habitat. | 52 | 37 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 4 |
| Do not support timber harvesting for any reason. | 4 | 7 | 19 | 20 | 43 | 7 |

Q-3 Forest managers use different vegetation treatment methods to reduce fuels and achieve other management objectives. Would you favor or oppose the following actions?

| Actions | Strongly Favor | Favor | Neutral | Oppose | Strongly Oppose | No Opinion |
|------------------------------------|----------------|-------|---------|--------|-----------------|------------|
| Clear cutting (more than 5 acres) | 4 | 10 | 13 | 34 | 35 | 4 |
| Patch cutting (1-5 acres) | 10 | 33 | 20 | 19 | 14 | 4 |
| Forest thinning | 41 | 50 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 1 |
| Prescribed fires | 17 | 48 | 19 | 9 | 4 | 3 |
| Reduce development in/near forests | 26 | 30 | 23 | 13 | 6 | 2 |
| No Action | 1 | 1 | 9 | 25 | 58 | 6 |

Q-4 Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your values for the forest in and around the town of Woodland Park.

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|--|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| Aesthetic value - I value these Forests because I enjoy the scenery, sights, sounds, smells, etc. | 89 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Biological diversity value - I value these Forests because they provide habitat for a variety of fish, wildlife, plant life, etc. | 80 | 18 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cultural value - I value these Forests because they are a place for me to continue and pass down the wisdom and knowledge, traditions, and way of life of my ancestors. | 40 | 30 | 25 | 4 | 1 |

| | Strongly Agree | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree |
|---|----------------|-------|---------|----------|-------------------|
| Economic value - I value these Forests because they provide economic opportunities (timber, fisheries, minerals, and/or tourism opportunities). | 31 | 40 | 17 | 11 | 1 |
| Future value - I value these Forests because they allow future generations to know and experience the forests as they are now. | 69 | 26 | 4 | 1 | 0 |
| Historic value - I value these Forests because they have places and things of natural and human history that matter to me, others, or the nation. | 53 | 33 | 12 | 2 | 0 |
| Intrinsic value - I value these Forests in and of themselves, whether people are present or not. | 65 | 25 | 7 | 2 | 1 |
| Learning value - I value these Forests because we can learn about the environment through education, scientific observation, or experimentation. | 50 | 37 | 12 | 1 | 0 |
| Life Sustaining value - I value these Forests because they help produce, preserve, clean, and renew air, soil, and water. | 77 | 19 | 3 | 1 | 0 |
| Recreation value - I value these Forests because they provide a place for my favorite outdoor recreation activities. | 64 | 27 | 7 | 1 | 1 |
| Spiritual value - I value these Forests because they are a sacred, religious, or spiritually special place to me or because I feel reverence and respect for nature there. | 44 | 22 | 23 | 6 | 5 |
| Therapeutic value - I value these Forests because they make me feel better, physically and/or mentally. | 60 | 30 | 8 | 1 | 1 |

SECTION 3: Your views toward local woody biomass utilization

Q-1 Do you currently use wood for any of the following?

| Wood Uses | Yes | No |
|--|-----|----|
| Heating (Wood stove/fireplace) | 57 | 43 |
| Heating (Pellet stove) | 5 | 95 |
| Energy | 3 | 97 |
| Landscaping (timbers, posts, fencing, mulch) | 59 | 41 |
| Other purposes (Respondents were asked for other current uses of wood—See notes.) | 11 | 89 |

Q-2 To what extent do you support or oppose local woody biomass utilization?

| | % |
|---------------------------|----|
| Strongly Support | 39 |
| Support | 35 |
| Neither Oppose or Support | 21 |
| Oppose | 4 |
| Strongly Oppose | 1 |

Q-3 Indicate your level of support or opposition to the following uses of woody biomass.

| Actions | Strongly Favor | Favor | Neutral | Oppose | Strongly Oppose |
|--|-----------------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|------------------------|
| Use biomass to heat of local public buildings | 27 | 42 | 18 | 9 | 4 |
| Use biomass to provide energy to local public buildings | 27 | 41 | 20 | 8 | 4 |
| Use biomass to supplement the nearby coal-fired power plant. | 28 | 35 | 23 | 8 | 6 |
| Other uses of biomass (Respondents were asked for other uses of woody biomass—See notes.) | 48 | 20 | 25 | 3 | 4 |

SECTION 4: In this section, we would like to learn about you and your community.

Q-1 In what community do you live or what community is closest to your home?

| | | |
|----------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
| Aspen Hills | Hawk Ridge | Riverwood |
| Columbine Estate | Holiday Hills | Rosewood Hills |
| Country Ridge | Kiowa St | Stone Ridge Village |
| Crestwood | Lake George | Summer Haven |
| Crestwood Park | Majestic Park | Sunnywood |
| Crystola | Manitou Springs | Tamarac |
| Crystola Canyon | Mills Ranch Road | Teller County |
| Crystola Pines | Morning Sun Valley | The Reserve at Tamarac |
| Divide | Northern Rampart Ridge rd | Tranquil Acres |
| Evergreen Heights | Northwood | Valley View |
| Florissant | Paradise Estates | West Creek |
| Flying Cloud Estates | Paradise Valley | Westwood Lakes |
| Forest Edge | Quinlan Gulch | Woodland Park |
| Forest Edge Park | Rampart Ranches | Woodland Valley |
| Foxworth | Ranch Estates | Woodland West |
| Grandview Estates | Ridgewood | |

Q-2 How long have you lived in or near this community? ____YEARS

| | % |
|------------|----|
| 0-10 | 49 |
| 11-25 | 37 |
| 26-50 | 12 |
| 50 or more | 2 |

Q-3 How long have you lived in Colorado? ____YEARS

| | % |
|------------|----|
| 0-10 | 28 |
| 11-25 | 35 |
| 26-50 | 29 |
| 50 or more | 8 |

Q-4 Is the residence where you received this survey your primary residence? Yes 98 %

Q-5 What is your age? _____YEARS

| | Total |
|-------------|-------|
| | % |
| 18 – 30 | 20 |
| 31 – 45 | 61 |
| 46 – 65 | 15 |
| 66 or older | 4 |

Q-6 Are you? (Please circle one response): Male 58 % Female 42 %

Q-7 What is the highest level of education you have completed? (Please check one response).

| | % |
|-------------------------------|----|
| Less than high school diploma | 0 |
| High school diploma or GED | 15 |
| Technical/vocational | 18 |
| 4-year college degree | 26 |

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| Some graduate work | 13 |
| One or more graduate | 28 |

Q-8 What is your approximate annual household income before taxes? (Please circle one response).

| | % |
|----------------------|----|
| Less than \$ 10,000 | 1 |
| \$ 10,000 – 24,999 | 7 |
| \$ 25,000 – 49,999 | 22 |
| \$ 50,000 – 74,999 | 23 |
| \$ 75,000 – 99,999 | 16 |
| 100,000 – 124,999 | 16 |
| \$ 125,000 – 149,999 | 5 |
| \$ 150,000 or more | 10 |

Q-9 Are you retired? Yes 37%

Conclusion

There appear to be two points that emerge most clearly and Question 1 and 2 in Section 1 illustrates this well:

1. Generally, the respondents favor the work that is being done to clear fuels and address forest health issues in surrounding forests. There appears to be some leeway to perhaps even increase the amount of work being done on public lands depending on what work is done and whether it is private or public land. Certainly there is a large degree of agreement among respondents about which reasons for conducting treatments are more favored.

2. A relatively large amount of respondents display hesitancy in answering the question by checking the "don't know" option. In other questions, the "neutral" option is checked relatively often.

Other results indicate that respondents value the forests for reasons that go beyond the here-and-now, and even beyond human needs, as displayed with the high agreement related to future and biodiversity values, and the need to conduct treatments for wildlife habitat. On the one hand residents are clear that they wish to see the wildfire risk reduced as much as possible but on the other hand residents are also clear that factors such as wildlife, aesthetics and the

future are important as well. How these desires translate into desired conditions and appropriate management actions becomes a more nuanced and complicated question, to which collaborative learning is the best tool with which to explore this. Surveys are scientific tools with which to explore social psychological questions but they also can raise awareness regarding a process on the issue at hand. In this case, around 4000 households received a mailing containing this survey, more than 563 respondents took the time to fill in and return the survey which therefore may create a window of opportunity in this community to extend outreach and communication efforts.

There is a general support for utilization of biomass for community heating and energy purposes, and it appears from the comments to be related to a disfavor of "waste" and less to economic benefit. The comments indicate that biomass utilization is favored on the condition that there is "respect for the land", and that it does not increase costs.

In sum, when presented with these subjects in a survey, there appears to be interest in them but also many questions. Local residents appear in favor of forest management and biomass utilization efforts. There also appear to be favorable opportunities for the WPHFI and the USFS to increase engagement with residents on these issues and provide more in-depth information regarding the trade-offs related to on the ground forest management, and the use of products of those activities.

APPENDIX A

NOTES

SECTION 1: Your knowledge of the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative

General Comments:

- Heard from a friend that CUSP did a lousy job at Quaker Ridge and tells friends to view the area before contacting CUSP
- I strongly oppose the use of ATVs for recreational noise. I feel it violates the wildlife habitat.
- Our biggest problem is Pine and Ips Beetle!
- Return envelope did not have a stamp - very upset. Given the impression of an extremely disorganized group. This does not raise my confidence in you having anything to do with the management of our forest
- Would be happy to volunteer to clean up dead wood in nearby forest!

Section 1: Q-1 Had you heard about the Woodland Park Healthy Forest Initiative before receiving this questionnaire?

- I have seen the devastation caused by forest fires and beetle-kill. I applaud the efforts to mitigate both and find beneficial uses for the forest products, both firewood and biomass, as well as other uses
- I walk my dog in forest (HY67) three times a week - I like what they have done
- Is this being funded by the \$25 million gifted to the forest service after Hayman? Who is this coalition?
- Make subdivisions pay for own forest improvement projects; illegible other comments.
- Very aware of USFS efforts to thin forest and replant

Section 1: Q-1 a. What newspaper/newsletter did you hear about WPHFI?

Courier
Courier View (3)
Gazette (2)
Mountain Jackpot
Pikes Peak Courier View
Teller County Extra
Ute Pass Courier (2)

Section 1: Q-1 a. How else did you hear about WPHFI?

| | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| County Commissioner (5) | Personal Experience |
| CUSP (3) | Previous mailing |
| CWPP | Ranch Estes |
| Fire Department (2) | Slash site |
| Friday Farmers Market | Teller County Extension |
| HBA meeting | Teller County Government (3) |
| HOA(4) | Woodland Park P and R Department (3) |
| NRCS | USFS |
| Observation | |

Section 1: Q-2 Have you ever attended any meetings related to the Teller County community wildfire protection plan or meetings for your subdivision?

- Not sure if same thing but attended meeting for wildfire info put on by USFS
- Know of none
- No but would like to
- Wildfire meetings at Ute Pass Cultural Center
- Yes, but my subdivision is only 6 residences
- Yes, when resident of Ridgewood in 1970s

Section 1: Q-3 Have you been involved in any volunteer efforts associated with local fire mitigation or forest restoration?

- I did fire mitigation on my own property during the Hayman Fire
- Eagle scouts
- I've cut down beetle-killed trees on my property
- On my property only
- We removed 93 infected or dead ponderosa pines on our two acres
- Not since 70s, early 80s

Section 1: Q-4 Have you contacted your local State or US Forest Service, County, or Town representatives about forest related issues in the past twelve months?

- About the degradation of US forests due to shooting ranges. Also do they pay for the trees they raze down?
- Grazing lease
- About trails
- Initiated forest management plan in 2003
- Yes, but no reply
- Beetles

Section 1: Q-5 Were you here during the Hayman Fire in 2002?

- Surrounded by dense smoke but 0 damage to our property
- No damage but evacuated for 2 nights.
- We were on standby to evacuate and we boarded approximately 40+ horses in our pens.
- (hayman impact) Except insurance doubled
- No but lived in Colorado Springs. Can see Hayman Fire damage from our back deck
- No, but my insurance went up!
- Evacuated
- Smoke, right on the edge of the mandatory evacuation area
- Sorta
- Provided lodging for friend's family who had to evacuate. Involved in aerial firefighting
- But everyone was affected and still are.
- Family in WP, we live in Springs
- Fear, trouble breathing, housed friends who lost house, put belongings in storage, prepared for evacuation.
- Got ready to evacuate
- I moved away for four years
- I was a member of search and rescue at the time. The Sheriff refused to use free, trained volunteer manpower at the time!
- In another country
- In Colorado Springs
- Lived in Englewood
- Moved all my family heirlooms and important papers and photos to my daughter's house in CO Springs. DIRTY AIR!
- Moved house items to storage out of town, on alert for evacuation, moved my horse twice.
- No, other than preparing to evacuate
- One week in evacuation zone, no burn on my property
- Only heightened awareness
- Only in the sense that we helped others and were packed/ready to evacuate
- Packed, but not displaced.
- Standby evac (3)
- We evacuated from our home for a week, but we were lucky to have been missed from damage
- We moved some valuables out of the house
- Were only five mi. from fire
- Yes, but no fire at our subdivision

Section 1: Q-5b. If yes, were you directly impacted by the Hayman Fire?

- Vacation
- ? Not inside the burn

SECTION 2: Your values for the local forest and your view on how it should be managed

Section 2: Q-1 Please indicate your opinion of the amount and type of work being done on private and public land? (See results section for amount and type of work)

- (thinning on private land) "from what I have seen"
- Prescribed fire on public lands - Hayman fire
- I've heard that areas are chosen to be thinned through the political influence of residents
- (private thinning) we do ours!
- Cannot comment - Totally uninformed on the subject
- (About right) - Given resources currently available. More would be better.
- (Prescribed fire) - Generally a stupid, expensive plan
- Don't get around much, I wouldn't guess on any questions
- Not enough info to respond.
- Prescribed fire (private and public land) - Both are examples of poor forest management
- Prescribed fire done on wrong days
- Prescribed fire is too dangerous
- Should not use public money for private land work
- Thinning on public lands - Good work so far, but need to cover more area
- Prescribed fire is horrible for our asthma though
- Not knowledgeable to give opinion

Section 2: Q-2 Please indicate your level of favor or opposition to vegetation management on the Pike and San Isabel National Forest for *each* of the following reasons. (See results section for specific reasons)

- What does vegetation treatment mean? Last question worded very poorly
- last part: I disagree with this statement, but do not know whether to circle strongly favor or oppose
- "poorly worded! I support reasonable harvesting for healthy forest preservation"
- Cannot comment - Totally uninformed on the subject
- (last question) - This question cannot be answered with a score, does not make first four
- (last question) - What? It appears you are asking a backwards question
- (last question) Strongly support - Don't know which to circle
- Confusing statement - I do support harvesting
- Forest products - As long as portion of revenue comes back
- Forest Products?

- I do support timber harvesting
- I support some harvesting
- I'm not clear on what is meant by Vegetation Treatment. My guess is tree cutting.
- Leave dead trees
- Timber should be harvested like any other crop
- Too many deer in our area. Need to relocate deer.
- too much damage to soil and aesthetics from harvesting, woodpeckers and some mammals use dead trees to nest
- What are forest products? Leave dead trees for wildlife
- What do you mean by "vegetation management?" only support timber harvesting on a limited basis for building purposes
- What do you mean by vegetation treatments?
- (last question) - When regulated can be both inexpensive and effective
- (last question) Poor question, wording. I support forest harvesting.
- Not knowledgeable to give opinion

Section 2: Q-3 Forest managers use different vegetation treatment methods to reduce fuels and achieve other management objectives. Would you favor or oppose the following actions? (See results section for specific actions)

- Forest Service could have stopped Hayman early on
- Development near forests not your concern
- Must differentiate between Pine and spruce/fir forests as well as north facing aspects. Must preserve mixed densities
- Need to define "vegetation treatment"!
- I do support timber harvesting, I don't know how to answer
- Don't know; Merry Christmas trees
- Cannot comment – Totally uninformed on the subject.
- Prescribed fires - so many times are not controlled as planned
- favor prescribed fire if done responsibly
- (favor) prescribed fires that are under control!
- Clearcutting - spruce, yes/ pine, no
- There is tremendous beetle-kill in Alaska. It is so vast they can't do anything and they simply say we let nature do what it is doing because we can't stop her.
- Not sure how clear cut and patch cut are different
- Not knowledgeable to give opinion

Section 2: Q-4 Please indicate how much you agree or disagree with the following statements regarding your values for the forest in and around the town of Woodland Park. (See results section for value statements).

- (cultural): my culture doesn't teach these customs but I support those that do
- Spiritual - Not my Theology
- Spiritual - Huh!!
- Cultural - unsure to answer if my ancestors are from Ireland via Iowa
- (recreation value): Against so much encroachment w/ATV's etc.
- Intrinsic and Therapeutic very important.
- Ranked #1-Future, #2-Biological diversity, #3-Spiritual.
- Cultural - Gobbledygook!!
- Economic - especially for Teller Co.
- Historic - These are man-made (CCC) forests
- Recreation - No motorized vehicles
- Recreational -Very important, ++agree
- Not knowledgeable to give opinion
- Spiritual: "Forests are not God"; therapeutic: !!!

SECTION 3: Your views toward local woody biomass utilization

Section 3: Q-1 Do you currently use wood for any of the following? (See results section for uses).

- Dead trees only!!
- I do not burn wood as it pollutes the air
- Plan on installing a pellet stove next year
- I use only dead wood from own property
- You should explain what woody biomass is
- Define woody biomass utilization
- Have fireplace, rarely use it. Have a few railroad ties for landscape
- only use lumber already cut for thinning by permit only

Section 3: Q -1 Current other uses wood (Numbers in parentheses represent the number of times wood use mentioned)

| | |
|--------------------|-------------------------|
| Art (3) | Interior home trimmings |
| Backyard fires | Log home (2) |
| BBQ/ Fire pit (4) | Lumber |
| Bluestain paneling | Mental health |
| Building (4) | Mulch (2) |
| Campfires (3) | Outdoor fireplace |
| Chimineas | Peace and tranquility |

| | |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|
| Christmas trees (2) | Planting |
| Compost (3) | Pulp |
| Construction | Redwood deck |
| Crafts (2) | Remodeling |
| Custom Wood Homes | Sawdust horse bedding |
| Erosion Control (2) | Skateboard ramps |
| Furniture (3) | Small building projects |
| Home decorating | Timbers for decks and building |
| Home maintenance | windbreak |
| House | Wood stove |
| House deck | Woodworking |

Section3: Q-2 To what extent do you support or oppose local woody biomass utilization?

- Dead trees only!!
- No blanket approval, Don't use Hayman fire to close roads just because you can
- Define woody biomass?
- I don't know what biomass utilization means.
- What is biomass utilization? Piss poor question.
- This question is too simplistic. All these questions and answers depend on the degree of pollution generated from burning the wood
- Depends on condition for preservation
- I would not support biomass if it increases taxes or our utility bill
- Depends on how much and how well it is done
- Define woody biomass utilization
- Don't know enough about it
- What is biomass? Don't know what it is (7)
- Neither oppose or support at this time

Section 3: Q-3 Please indicate your level of support or opposition to the following uses of woody biomass. (See results section for specific uses).

- (supplement power plant) "need more info"
- I don't know the environmental impacts, so I am not sure. But I don't think forest products (as I assume woody biomass could be called) should be wasted
- Generating electricity is an inefficient process. Using wood rather than our higher quality fuels would only make the process less efficient. Heating homes and buildings locally would be the most efficient use of biomass and will decrease or keep the demand for electricity lower. This conserves our higher quality fuels such as nat. gas and coal.
- What nearby power plant?; This survey was sent to my business, I live in the Lake George area.

- What is biomass?
- Be careful... industry has a way of dominating use! Sustainable biomass is excellent as long as harvesting safeguards are in place.
- Don't know what biomass means! If you cut it down, make use of it
- I support the above as long as there is respect for the land. Don't molest it.
- (heat local buildings) - like our house, (electricity for public buildings and to supplement power plant
- Ok if only use timber cut for mitigation and forest health
- I would support use of ONLY dead - I do not support the killing of LIVING
- Make available wood pellets from Hayman fire for home use
- Define woody biomass utilization
- Biomass?
- Can we?
- Don't have enough understanding
- I don't know enough about it
- Impact on atmosphere? Cost vs benefit?
- Only support if the process makes sense economically - no subsidies for inefficient uses
- What about solar energy? We have plenty of sunshine that doesn't impact our forests!

Section 3: Q-3 Other uses of woody biomass (Numbers in parentheses represent the number of times wood use mentioned)

| | |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Biochar production | Fuel |
| Biofuel | Furniture |
| Biomass? (4) | Heating homes (7) |
| Building soils in burns | Home (3) |
| Building supplies | Landscaping (3) |
| Burn beetle kill | Lumber |
| Cellulosic ethanol | Mulch (8) |
| Charitable donation (9) | Pellets (5) |
| Christmas tree | Personal use (8) |
| Compost | Public use |
| Construction | Public mulch access |
| Cordwood | Residential use |
| Direct methanol | Structures for fish habitat |
| Dwellings | Thinning for private use |
| Engineered wood products | Wildlife habitat |
| Erosion control (2) | Wood burning stoves |
| Firewood (4) | Wood products |

SECTION 4: In this section, we would like to learn about you and your community.

General Comments

- You should have defined terms
- How do these questions have to do with how I feel about or use the forest!!!
- I have a very strong interest in your work!!! Would like to be added to mailing list
- Is there no way to speed the reseeding and re-growth of burned areas?

Section 4: Q-2 How long have you lived in or near this community?

- Third generation native

Section 4: Q-4 Is the residence where you received this survey your primary residence?

- Business address

Section 4: Q-8 What is your approximate annual household income before taxes?

- With spouse
- NYB
- Prefer not the answer