

Appendix F

Stakeholder Interview Summary

Background

Lane County initiated a Community Wildfire Protection Planning (CWPP) process in fall 2004. The County hired Oregon Natural Hazards Workgroup to assist in the development of a plan aimed to address the complex issues surrounding Wildland/Urban Interface Fire. Lane County understands that the success of a CWPP is tied to the ability to effectively involve a broad range of local, state and federal stakeholders in the planning process. The inputs from a diverse group insure that the final plan reflects the highest priorities of the community, while highlighting the fact the implementation will need to be accomplished through a collaborative partnership.

In early January, ONHW conducted telephone interviews with 18 stakeholders identified by the steering committee for the Lane County CWPP. The purpose of the stakeholder interviews was to document key issues, concerns, and current activities related to the CWPP requirements of:

1. Collaboration: A CWPP must be collaboratively developed by local and state government representatives, in consultation with federal agencies and other interested parties.
2. Prioritization Fuel Reduction: A CWPP must identify and prioritize areas for hazardous fuels reduction treatments and recommend the types and methods of treatment that will protect one or more at-risk communities and essential infrastructure.
3. Treatment of Structural Ignitability: A CWPP must recommend measures that homeowners and communities can take to reduce the ignitability of structures throughout the area addressed by the plan.

Stakeholder interviews accomplish this by gather various perspectives from the local, state and federal partners by:

- Identifying critical issues and concerns,
- Documenting of current activities, and
- Exploring opportunities for collaboration.

Appendix F includes a summary of key issues identified by stakeholders and a transcript of the telephone interviews. Lane County will use the information from the interviews to assess the risk factors of local preparedness and capabilities and to analyze common themes

surrounding fuel reduction and structural ignitability within the wildland/urban interface.

Methodology

Stakeholders came from a pool that included both public and private interests, and all have either expertise in fire issues or the authority to help with implementation of the plan.

ONHW sent each stakeholder a preliminary email explaining the plan and its purpose. The email also contained a copy of the interview questions for the stakeholder to look over prior to the actual interview, a brief statement explaining why they had been selected as a stakeholder in the process, and a list of available times to be interviewed. Interview questions were grouped into four main areas:

- Current Activities
- Key Issues Related to Hazardous Fuel Reduction
- Key Issues Related to Structural Ignition
- Collaboration and Participation

Some questions were modified slightly or not asked at all depending on their relevance to the stakeholder. Each interview lasted approximately 30 minutes. Interviews were transcribed by hand during the interview, and then typed into a computer template afterward. Following completion of the interviews, all of the answers were documented then analyzed for common themes.

ONHW completed the interviews in February and March 2005.

Participants

ONHW interviewed the following stakeholders:

- Nancy Ashlock – Assistant Fire Management Office, BLM Eugene
- Carl West – Fire Management Officer, USFS - Siuslaw National Forest
- Rick Rogers – District Forester, ODF Western Lane County
- Lena Tucker – District Forester, ODF Eastern Lane County
- Donna Disch – Oregon State Fire Marshal
- Mark Reese – Lane County Sheriff's Office
- Dale Wendt – Lane County Public Works/Land Management
- Don Nickell – Lane County Public Works/Land Management
- Chief Dale Ledyard – McKenzie Fire and Rescue
- Chief John Buchanan – Siuslaw Valley Fire and Rescue
- Chief Marty Nelson – Lane County District #1 (Veneta)

- Kevin Urban – Community Services Director, City of Oakridge
- Karl Morgenstern – Coordinator, Drinking Water Source Protection, EWEB
- Mike McDowell – Team Leader, Weyerhaeuser
- Steve Akehurst – Chief Forester, Rosboro Lumber Co.
- John Buss – Chief Forester, Davidson Industries
- John Day – Union Pacific Railroad, Oakridge Office
- Roxie Cuellar – Director of Government Affairs, Homebuilders Association of Lane County

Summary of Themes

Stakeholders mentioned several themes repeatedly through all categories of questions: 1) funding obstacles; 2) follow-up and maintenance of policies and programs; and 3) education of landowners. The remainder of this section summarizes other themes of the interviews within the four areas of interview questions.

Risk Perception and Current Activities

The following is a brief summary of the stakeholder's perception of wildland/urban interface (WUI) fire risk, current policies and programs, and funding for programs related to WUI fire.

Perception of fire risk

- There is a perceived threat from fire in the wildland-urban interface area by all of the stakeholders
- The WUI conditions exist and in fact the threat is increasing and protection capabilities are difficult without strategic planning
- The main fire threat is from the build-up of hazardous fuels when debris accumulates on the forest floor after thinning or other treatments
- There is a need for outreach in areas that are unprotected by a Rural Fire Protection District

Current policies and programs

- Lane County zoning codes (e.g. Chapter 15 and Chapter 16 sections 10 & 11) were mentioned as mitigation element
- Fire Defense Board and Fire Prevention Co-ops activities
- Current emphasis is on response plans
- Oregon Department of Forestry's plans and programs focused on prevention and response
- Oregon Forest Land Urban Interface Protection Act of 1997 (better known as Senate Bill 360) was also mentioned

Funding

- Nearly 50% of the stakeholders have received some form of grant funding for various activities related to WUI fire issues
- Government agencies and Rural Fire Protection Districts currently apply for grants and matching funds for mitigation projects, fire planning, outreach, equipment needs, and GIS mapping
- Private sector stakeholders raised questions on eligibility

Key Issues Related to Hazardous Fuels Reduction

Stakeholders provided their issues and concerns related to identifying and prioritizing fuel reduction treatments. They were also asked about concerns they had regarding the types of methods used for fuel reduction treatments and about resources to help the County move forward with fuel reduction projects.

Identifying and prioritizing fuel reduction treatments

- Risk assessment can and should be used to identify and prioritize hazardous fuels projects
- Urban and under-protected areas should be a priority
- Fuels need to be treated on a landscape scale vs. a site-specific scale (e.g. defensible space projects and landscape scale projects should be done in conjunction with one another)
- Public and private projects need to be more coordinated and can facilitate sharing of labor, tools, and knowledge

Types and methods for fuel reduction treatments

- Most methods have been proven to work well, but the effectiveness of a particular method is dependent upon the nature of the hazard and the topography of the area
- Prescribed burning presents unique challenges in Lane County specifically around smoke management (e.g. diminished air quality and complaints from residents) and safety fuels can hold heat and flare up long after the fire crews have left. However, some stakeholder believe prescribed burning is good for forest health on a larger landscape scale
- Stakeholders were split on their concerns over the use of chemical treatments. Some see chemical treatments as affordable means of fuel reduction, while others had concerns about their environmental impacts.
- Brush cutting is effective, but is costly and requires dedicated maintenance
- Stakeholders indicated that debris removal is an important component of fuel reduction but that it is costly

Key Issues Related to Structural Ignition

Stakeholders provided insight regarding which regulatory and non-regulatory policies and programs might be effective in motivating property owners to reduce their risk to wildfire. A follow-up question was then asked regarding the obstacles that may hinder implementation of these policies and programs.

Non-regulatory policies and programs

- Homeowner and landowner awareness plays an important role in reducing structural ignitability, but current levels of education and awareness are lacking
- Free or easy debris removal programs are lacking and would be a great resource to enable the public to reduce their risk by removing hazardous fuels from their properties
- Firewise Workshops and Firewise Communities USA programs at the local level (e.g. fire district, town, or neighborhood levels)

Regulatory policies and programs

- Defensible space incentives or fire protection requirements from the insurance industry should be explored
- County building ordinances that regulate building and roofing materials are needed, and need to be followed up on and maintained over the long-term

Obstacles

- Funding for both non-regulatory and regulatory policies and programs is lacking
- Human resources for long-term follow-up and maintenance of policies and programs could be a problem
- Education of landowners and the public of their responsibilities in following regulations

Collaboration and Participation

Stakeholders answered questions related to their current level of participation in reducing the wildland/urban interface fire risk to Lane County. Other questions asked about current and future collaboration opportunities among stakeholders or other agencies. All stakeholders interviewed stated that their organizations are willing to collaborate on more site-specific local community fire plans that follow the countywide plan.

- There is currently limited collaboration among several agencies regarding wildland-urban interface or disaster protection issues
 - US Forest Service and BLM Interagency office collaborates with the Oregon Department of Forestry on wildfire response
 - Lane County Fire Defense Board

- Lane County Fire Prevention Co-op
- Lane County Interagency Emergency Response Team
- EWEB Hazardous Materials GIS Tool (collaborated with 27 agencies)
- Opportunities for collaboration will be increased through the process of this plan
- There will need to be a designated leader to drive the process and keep up the interest in the issues in order to ensure long-term collaboration and participation
- Careful consideration must be given on how to establish effective collaborative process to accomplish risk reduction.

Results by Question

1. Do stakeholders perceive a threat from wildland-urban interface fire in Lane County?

They perceive a threat and through the Lane Co. Code have tried to mitigate it

Chapter 16 sections 10 & 11

Impacted and Non-impacted Forestland zoning restrictions

Firebreaks

Road maintenance

Yes, builders definitely are aware of dangers of forested areas whenever they build a house there, but it is not a big issue for us.

Yes

Surrounded by Willamette National Forest

Depending on conditions the a fire could pose a great risk to the city and its residents

Homes located the WUI

Depending on where the fire is there could be 10-15% of homes located in this area

To some level – most Siuslaw fires are human caused rather than lightning caused. Siuslaw has a fairly low risk of wildfire.

Yes. WUI conditions exist and are increasing. Protection of values will be difficult without a strategic plan in place. Natural occurrence of fires has caused a buildup of fuels that are dangerous.

Yes, Concern for Lane County

Potential for wildfire due to the six years of drought

Roads and keeping roads open

Parks

Waste Management not as much as other departments under public works

FLEET if back up equipment is needed- specifically in a response situation

The Parks Department had some experience in wildfires- the 126 fire in 2000 or 2001- some parks were used by fire fighters.

Public Works role is confined to Lane County Land Management (LCLMD)

Yes,

Drinking water source protection

Electric sources

Substations

Hydroelectric

4 stations on the McKenzie

There is also McKenzie Crew housing

Yes

Yes, big concern. Our land ownership is mixed with 15 miles around Mapleton, as well as areas with homes intermingled and private in-holdings. So, high fire risk is always a big concern

Yes.

Volatile fuel buildups: The threat comes from volatile fuel buildups in the valley, brush, dense pockets of trees near homes. They all can ignite quickly given the right weather conditions.

Under protected areas: Rural areas and under protected areas that don't have local fire departments are at risk because it's hard for home owners to understand what needs to be done to protect their homes.

Yes, Weyerhaeuser does perceive a threat.

The threat comes from a combination of backyard burning that goes out of control,

car fires on Weyerhaeuser roads,

trespassers with fireworks of firearms on Weyerhaeuser property, and

arson fires on Weyerhaeuser land by people who are trying to burn down equipment and property.

Other sources of threats are illegal dumps and meth labs that are located within a short distance from Weyerhaeuser land.

In 2001 and 2002 person/s driving up Weyerhaeuser roads and property attempted to start fires by throwing matches and fireworks. Most of the individuals who try to start fires on Weyerhaeuser land are caught.

Yes- SGT supervises deputies that patrol public land (interface?) and look for hazardous fuel loading. Work with Eugene/Springfield local fire departments and ODF to ID and mitigate fuels hazards. EX- Westridge fire between Westfir and Oakridge couple of years ago, 2 fires in one season.

Yes, has perception of asbestos forest, but with fuels and development has potential
subdivision covenant -> required shake roof, decreasing now (~50%), new are metal and are replacing shakes

Yes, no counties in Oregon are at low risk; with the population of Lane County the overall risk is probably low to high, but not as threatening as other areas.

Yes, Rosboro's ownership is intermingled with residential property and other developed property, and when that land isn't being taken care of, it threatens Rosboro's property.

Yes, due to conditions in Dist. Heavily forested area, inadequate infrastructure (ingress/egress), limited ability to work on private lands Dist. Encompasses Fox Hollow, Lorane Hwy, Gimple Hill, Noti, Veneta

2. Has stakeholder received grants or are they thinking of applying for grants related to wildfire in the WUI?

Yes in 2003 received Chapter 9 Federal funding to support fire safety breaks and fire safety on private lands.
For inspections, and,
Long range implementation

Not at the present moment.

Have not applied for any grants. We do fuels reduction projects through funding from Title II money from the Secure Rural Schools Act. In the last few years, have done around 500 acres of treatments with around \$100,000.

Have not applied for any grants specifically. We receive money from National Fire Plan for treatments (normal channels of funding). Working with ODF and their grants to help implement projects.

They receive Title 3 Funding- goes to LCLMD into the GIS mapping and risk assessment
Working on a Homeland Security Grant working with emergency management overlays for GIS
Terrorism
Critical Infrastructure
Hazardous Materials
Hospitals
Evacuation Routes
Care facilities (Day Cares and Elderly Centers)

Yes
Working with ODF
Working on GIS base assessment tool for wildfires
This tool is being developed for fire departments, ODF and other agencies that deal with fire mitigation, reduction and response
The GIS Tool
Yearly basis
Assessment of Conditions
Fuel Loads
Priority Areas
Resources inventories of equipment
Access routes to prioritized areas
Critical Resources to be protected if there is a fire
ESA Habitat
Bases on all of the above the GIS tool will predict the fire's behavior.

Received one grant for \$18,000 that was education based. Have not been successful with grants for fuels reduction – seem to be a higher priority in the southern and eastern parts of the state.

Yes,
National Fire Plan: ODF has received a grant from the National Fire Plan to help with projects creating defensible space around homes in the Coburg Hills and Marcola areas.

CWPP: ODF has received for two others Oakridge Westfir areas, a CWPP grant to assist them in writing a CWPP

ODF will be applying for two more grants for the Upper Mackenzie area and Bohemia Mining Community (down by the Umpqua communities). These communities are wanting to put together a CWPP and the grant money will help them with that process.

Weyerhaeuser has never applied for any grants, not sure if there are any.

Easter Lane Forest Protective Association funded by ODF. It's an association of landowners east of I-5 and the association is 100 years old. ODF gets funding from USFS to fund people who work on reducing risk of wildfire. Association members pay a membership fee based on some aspect of their land
Associations like this one are found all over the state.

No, no future plans.
7 total staff (including Sgt) are supported by stable funding from title 2 and 3 funds; LC reallocated Title 3 to LCSO for Forest Patrol Program.

Yes, ODF grants (NAME?) on response equip (slide in tank for truck) 90% match, and personal protective gear 50% match
East Lane ODF NFP/WUI public education

Currently in pursuit of one from the Nat'l Fire Plan (NFP) about ways to address structural ignitibility.
Other sources might be Insurance foundations.
NFP grant based on the CWPP risk analysis protocol from Jim Wolf.

Not aware of any grants available to private businesses; most go to other governmental departments/agencies

Not in relation to WUI
FEMA Fire grants for equipment
Homeland Security- CERT basic 1st aid response training.

3. Does stakeholder have any current plans, policies, or programs related to wildland-urban interface fire?

Referred me to Kent Howe- his supervisor

No. I'm not aware of any publications/research at the national HBA, but I don't see everything they produce, either.

Emergency Response Plan
Inter-government agreements with the City of West Fir, the USFS and other small communities (he did not go into detail about this.)

Forest Fire Management Plan. Provide response capabilities. Work with ODF on cooperative agreement to fight fire (both sides go out together). Siuslaw is not receiving NFP funds – money going mostly to eastern Oregon. Planning vegetation management projects for thinning in the WUI for timber harvesting on federal lands.

Federal Wildland Fire Policy – agency driven; protection based.
Integrated Fuels Management Strategy – identified high risk areas in the WUI.

Don't know the details- referred me to Bill Sage and Keir Miller

Yes, on hydroelectric generation stations located in USFS land there are Disaster readiness, response, risk reduction plans in place.

Required by the USFS

Also have fire response tool cache

Storage of tools

Fire equipment

Fire truck

EWEB also has a fire response plan, (i.e. when to hand off to other agencies)

The entire ODF plan is related – focused on prevention and reaction/response.

Fire seasons are usually short out here around the Coast, though this year may be more of a problem. During these times when the burning index is low, we do more patrolling, signing, gating, and a higher level of watch around areas near residential homes.

General wildfire programs – Readiness – we have people and equipment available and keep good access routes, and increase awareness level when risk is high.

Mitigation/ risk reduction - Silviculture and fuel reduction go hand in hand. Reduce slash after logging. Areas next to interface – we do more burning when smoke isn't an issue.

Senate Bill 360: Overall, Senate Bill 360 is the overarching guidance (Oregon Forest Land Urban Interface Protection Act of 1997). Senate Bill 360 allows for communities or counties to map their risk in the WUI and establish risk classification. This is legislative police but there is no funding to enforce it; agencies rely on grants through national fire plan to enforce the legislation. One problem is that not everyone is doing it. But the bill sets a standard for creating defensible space. Homeowners could be liable for extra costs if a wild fire happens and they've not complied.

- Everything else (all other programs/policies) is local
- ODF provides information at community events
- GIS: they have GIS to help with mapping. They're refining their GIS to be able to look more specifically at individual homes and identify risk.

- Fire Defense Board: ODF participates with Fire Defense Board, which consists of all the fire chiefs in the county

- Fire Prevention Co-op: Also a part of the Fire Prevention Co-op, which includes other partners such as the US Forest Service and the BLM

- Participates in Keep Oregon Green

Lena thinks that lately there has been more of a push to focus on WUI areas and fires in the WUI

Most timber companies put together a fire plan, includes fire safety information that is used for training employees and contractors. Weyerhaeuser's fire plan lists resources, key operator contact information, and an inventory of all of their company's equipment. Weyerhaeuser's document is roughly 100 pages long, and they provide a copy of the fire plan to neighboring landowners. Weyerhaeuser gets fire plans from the other landowners in return. Fire plans are updated yearly.

Weyerhaeuser operates a Hunter Hotline that lets hunters know whether Weyerhaeuser's timber lands are open for hunting due to fire danger.

Weyerhaeuser has tight restrictions on public access to their timber lands: they don't let public into timberlands during the work week, and they close the gates on weekends if there is fire danger. Most of the fires they've had have been started by trespassers so access restriction is one of their key policies.

Weyerhaeuser also buys ads in the newspaper when fire risk is high to let public know why tree farms are closed and to prevent trespassers from breaking onto the tree farms.

Weyerhaeuser responds to any fires on active operations. Any fires that happen on inactive operations are responded to by the Eastern Lane Forest Protective Association.

Weyerhaeuser tries, when possible, to improve water sources that could assist firefighters.

They also update road conditions, when possible, to make access easier for firefighters.

No. If called on an illegal burn-by FD and LRAPA, LCSO can respond and use as outreach opportunity.

USFS, BLM, ODF, LC Fire Defense Board

Umpqua, Siuslaw, Willamette, ODNRA, all BLM lands in County (partnerships)

Disaster readiness – ex. education programs

E Lane with Homeowner Assoc, and ODF, focused on mitigation

Response – ex. improved emergency access

SOP's in place for fire

Risk reduction – ex. defensible space, education programs

E Lane ODF efforts at identifying defensible space, water access, especially on Camp Creek Ridge
Partnerships related to reducing wildfire risk in the WUI).
EL ODF main contact, 2 neighbor RFD's communicate

Disaster readiness – ex. education programs
Technical advice, Identify existing statewide programs, promote Fire Def Boards to generate a county level ID of unprotected areas, focus on building capacity to defend existing areas, then outreach to unprotected to get to join.

Response – ex. improved emergency access

Key is unprotected areas, unsure of solution about how to address

Risk reduction – ex. defensible space, education programs

NFP grant on the survivability of structures
Work with LCDC on streamlining the process from land design to county code to fire code with common goal.

Partnerships related to reducing wildfire risk in the WUI).

Work with Federal Mgrs, County Emergency Mgrs,
Biggest partner is ODF,
Try to pool applicants so not applying against one another @ county level.

Rosboro has an annual Fire Plan that details their internal fire actions and responsibilities. Their plan is shared with most forest department districts and state agencies.

Rosboro has a relationship with the Oregon Department of Forestry, and through ODF Rosboro is connected with rural fire departments.

Fire Associations: collection of landowners in each district that provide input and contractual relationships with ODF for fire protection (Contract with ODF for fire protection on the private land); 14 associations across the state

Disaster readiness – ex. education programs

CERT

Response – ex. improved emergency access

Crew trained in Wildland Fire Fighting and gear at certain times of year

Risk reduction – ex. defensible space, education programs

Education with Homeowners association, Granges

Partnerships related to reducing wildfire risk in the WUI).

W Lane ODF

Fuels Reduction Display- Station 185 @ Macbeth and Fox Hollow (1-1.5 ac)

4. What issues or concerns should county consider in identifying and prioritizing fuel reduction projects on public lands?

Yes

He talked about how staff go to workshops to learn more about mitigation techniques and how to properly address risk with hazards (not just fire, but all hazards- including natural and man made)
He mentioned that State Code has been updated so that firebreaks are now required around all structures not just dwelling units. Including Propane tanks

Especially look into urban areas and how fuel reduction will affect these areas.

Again he did not go into much detail, even after probing questions.

There should be a higher level of treatments on private lands. Clear cutting equals higher slash loads which increase dangerous fuels.

Fuels need to be treated on a landscape scale vs. a site-specific scale. Defensible space projects and landscape scale treatments need to be done in conjunction with one another; also need to be done collaboratively. Currently, we have agencies all working on projects independently of one another. Also consider fire behavior – fuels reduction projects usually affected during extreme conditions.

Large Timber Land Owners, they need to be in this process
Rural Communities- especially those who are not incorporated. Their input is critical because there tends to be 30-50 homes in the WUI area. USFS and BLM blow down data needs to be considered in the GIS data. Where there could be large amounts of hazardous fuels on the ground because of a wind storm

Four main ideas/ concerns

Know where the fire risk is.

Is it an isolated site or larger pattern on the landscape?

How will this risk be treated EWEB would like to be informed of the treatment, because this is the sole water source.

Large treatment, small treatment

What type of treatment

To make sure that the treatments in high risk areas are done correctly

How long are the response times to the high risk areas?

Is there access to these areas?

Where is the equipment to treat a fire in these areas?

Post fire hazards (EWEB has talked to USFS about this issue)

Generally there is post fire treatments that must take place i.e. reclamation

Concern in some high priority areas where there is no vegetation this could cause mudslides, landslides, and other natural hazards that could impact people, homes, drinking water and other important infrastructure)

This is an area that should be addressed in the risk assessment and the base map.

Number of houses at risk. Types of fuels and history of fire in the area. Risk assessment factors and classifications.

In our area gorse is a fire concern – burns hot and burns when fire index is higher. Gorse follows right-of-way, roads to homes, coastal area in the first mile in from the ocean. Bandon burned down due to large amounts of gorse. Scotch broom is also a problem. These are both noxious weeds and covered in the noxious weed program but this program may not be too effective.

Davidson actively reduces gorse on our land. But can't do anything on neighbors' lands. Thinning not a good treatment for gorse because spreads seeds, chemical treatment better. Education on this issue is important – may be able to pair fire danger and noxious weeds issues.

We should prioritize projects by risk and by potential benefits. There are areas where fuel loading high but may not be much economic benefit to treatments.

Priority areas are right of ways, highways, more risk as people move towards our lands. Dunes City and Florence are growing towards us. Having neighbors creates more risk.

Arsonists are big worry, hard to protect against. So, not high on priority list.

High fire danger – how to educate and increase awareness.

Keep action items simple and manageable: In choosing risk assessment guidelines that Lane County's CWPP will be working with, keep it simple. Right now it's based on GIS, methods from a Salem Forester. Keep the level that we're working on manageable, not too small. This way we can document changes over time and see what's been recommended and what's actually been done to reduce a community's risk of wildfire.

- Under-protected areas should be a focus.

- Tell people maintenance will be needed: It's important to allow for reminders to people that things need to be updated, that they'll have to continually work on maintaining defensible space around their homes.

- GIS: GIS is good, it allows for fire departments to easily see residents and access points within the communities.

The county already does some control, but could do more to control road side vegetation, including more mowing and use of herbicides.

The county should be more vigorous in holding landowners adjacent to public roads more responsible when they don't control their vegetation.

More law enforcement resources could be used to patrol areas where there are back roads and vulnerable areas with high amounts of vegetation fuels.

A lot of money can be put into fuel reduction, but if you can't control the people intentionally or unintentionally setting fires, then it doesn't matter

Educating landowners about what the damages of wildfires are, and how they can be held responsible if they are negligent about a fire, should be increased. Letting people know that they can be held responsible for a fire if they are found to be negligent, and then following through on prosecution should be increased.

No, support ODF, USFS, BLM in how they interpret the plan.

Resistance to regulations

County permit process now mandates 30-40' primary and secondary fuel breaks

Access to areas

How to act without clear and present danger impetus

Assess Risk, if risk started on fire what would be consequence, S face S slopes, grasses

Use of Risk analysis is Key.

ONC (OR and CA Counties) using Title III monies, in accordance with Public Law 106, reauthorized 106.

One Contiguous plan, not hop and skipping around ownership

ID existing resources (SOLV, Boy scouts)

The bigger problems lie on smaller private lands that aren't responsible to the Oregon Forest Practices Act. Largest forest project management is usually managed under that regulatory umbrella (under the Forests Practices Act), but non-forest operations have no regulatory oversight, some of the biggest issues that Rosboro sees are related to those unregulated smaller properties.

Is a never ending project, funding to sustain it.

How to get people to do it themselves on routine basis?

If they don't need to know that they are accepting the risk and that the FD might not be able to help them in a fire.

ID-> How assess risk to ID projects? Nature of plants, and proximity to house? How to prioritize, and prioritizing for the resident is a problem.

Prioritization-> How to communicate to folks, and not trespass on values.

4.1 What about recommending and implementing projects on private lands?

Referred me to the Parks department

Talking to landowners, providing a choice. This will help them realize the risk on their property.

Public lands- they are doing a lot as is. (He was talking about the USFS and their effects for fuels reduction)

The majority of the valley lands in the Siuslaw district are private – higher up lands are public. Should have more treatments on private land within the WUI. The Forest Practices Act (OR ??) governs private lands.

Homeowners disinterested in defensible space projects because of their love for the rural area/forest space (probably reason for living there).

Education of homeowners would help – demonstrate that they can get the same look with lower risk (different materials, plants, etc.)

**He addressed lands in the parks and lands surrounding parks
Problem with parks is that they are under funded- therefore fuel treatments are not in the budget.

Some remote sites have used thinning, however this is not for wildfire reduction this is for economic reasons. Timber is harvested off these site every five years or so.

Referred me to parks- he did not feel qualified to give me answers or specifics on this topic.

1. Issues are clear and defined
2. OPTIONS! Don't lock a landowner into an either/or situation
3. Education on why they should do this and why they should have treatments on their land
4. Funding assistance and/or grants

Homeowners are unmotivated because fires are few and far between.

Timber land owners seem to be concerned with fire so will be more willing to implement projects.

Implementing – smoke issue on burning is important in the public eye. The State smoke management program is good. The private forester needs to be able to burn to reduce fuels, the public needs to understand these issues.

We work closely with ODF and with the RFPDs.

Give homeowners tools, motivation, and education: Once we have determined highest risk sites we should start with those, but we have to engage homeowners and give them tools, motivation, and education about why/how they should create defensible space around their homes. Help them help themselves. We don't want it to look like it's the government coming in and telling them what to do.

Tips for maintenance: Give them tips to keep their homes updated and maintained to keep fuels down.

Help homeowners work together: We should work on creating more of a strategic plan that isn't isolating specific homes, but linking several landowners to help people protect themselves together.

Highest risk, not highest monetary loss: It's important to look at who is most at risk, not just most expensive areas at risk.

Weyerhaeuser has done some pruning to reduce the ladder affect along roads they felt were more vulnerable to traffic and human interference. They have also done pre-commercial thinning and vegetation control on vulnerable roads.

Once you get 50 yards away from public roads, the risk from roadside fires disappears, so fuel reduction projects should be limited to 50 yards along side roads.

Private Timber is in tune with fuels reduction through the limitation of access, good at shutting down land when at risk.

Checkerboard ownership pattern in County creates problem

Need to educate folks on limits of Dept's response

Focus on self help (owners)

If feds or public land managers don't join in when abutting land owners house, can cause land owner to drag feet and not participate.

Need to not shy away from chemical weed control, he said he knows there's a stigma attached to using chemicals. But from their perspective, chemical weed control is the most cost effective way to reduce the fire threat. Keeping the stuff from growing in the first place is important to reducing the threat of wildfire.

Mechanical clearing is an option, and so is prescribed fires (though burning is not always an option around cities). But chemical should be encouraged as an option, not for heavy fuels, but noxious weeds.

Property rights and economic issues

No right to go on property and do stuff w/out permission

Design of Homes is a problem

Culture change- don't stack wood under deck, people don't like the look, and it won't happen here

Need to find balance between the reason they moved there and being safe

Logistics and Econ

Rid of debris?

Open burn season (mid-Oct - mid-June, assess with FD Chief), or truck it out

4.2 What are your concerns related to the types of methods used to reduce vegetation fuels?

The County only has the power to offer suggestions to landowners. The county cannot restrict how vegetative reduction is carried out.

The Coastal Overlay Zone (Sand Dunes) there are already restriction with removing vegetation, so if this area is zoned F1 or F2 there is a fine that that must be maintained. However, the county can only offer suggestions on how to maintain vegetation in this area.

The county only does chemical treatments along right-of-ways.

He does not have any concerns, he said that all actions to reduce fire risk is a good action

The majority of methods have been proven to work well. One problem may be that prescribed burning produces a lot of smoke and the public may not have a lot of patience with that (because of diminished air quality). Especially in Siuslaw, where a lot of prescribed burning is meant to blow west towards the ocean; smoke affects Florence, which is a huge retirement community with a large elderly population. A way to help may be to find a way to utilize the fuels (biomass uses) – to use it instead of burning. However, this is economically difficult.

Smoke management is a big issue (unclean airshed). Debris cleanup another issue – where can people put their debris? It would help to do mechanical treatment prior to prescribed burning – without it, would be very hard to keep fire under control during prescribed burning.

Did not have specifics

However, for our information there is a moratorium on the use of herbicides on right-of-ways. Generally the board has issues with

chemical treatments or chemical control; they might be in favor of thinning or other forms of treatments that don't use chemicals for vegetation controls.

Concerns include balancing the needs of the community (i.e. tree huggers, and other portions of the community)

Concerns- Political Issues

1. Look at the watershed (holistic) approach, not from a single isolated site.
2. Look at impacts that can affect the entire watershed
 - a. large removal of trees will affect drinking water
 - b. Roads cause problems for drinking water and EWEB, high traffic larger impacts, more possible runoff, etc.
 - c. Chemical treatments are not a favorite of EWEB, again high impacts to the drinking water.

It is hard to cut brush back every year (and redundant because it grows so fast and comes back every year). Easier to change the land usage – keep trees growing to reduce brush (have to keep in mind that landscape is far different than that of central and southern Oregon, which is less brushy so requires different treatments). Burning to reduce fuels doesn't work in this area – especially under-burning around houses because the fuels can hold heat in the ground for months and flare up again.

Pile burning and grapple pile burning - big tool for us for reducing hazardous fuels.

Chemical treatment– we use for some tree release. (?)

Thinning – not too much because our trees are more mature stands.

Use all methods for vegetative fuels reduction. All tools can be used to help accomplish the project. Depending on what the project is it could be simple methods.

Prescribed burning is good for forest health on a larger landscape.

Managing debris from fuel reduction projects: One thing to consider is the debris that will be left after certain methods, like burning. We'd have to figure out how to manage the left over debris because then they become hazards if they remain on the ground and are not dealt with. Incentive programs to deal with debris could be created, like biomass utilization, free land fill day at the dump. These programs could help convert the debris into mulch, like "chipping" debris and using it for mulch.

Chemical thinning is Weyerhaeuser's method of choice; it's the most affordable and the safest.

Mechanical brushing or hand brushing is more costly and more dangerous to the people doing it.

Prescribed burning can be very dangerous because it can become an uncontrolled burn. It's the thinning option you have the least control over.

None. Private timber very concerned with weeds as a fuel source, so use chemicals to knock down, can be very volatile. BLM/USFS more subject to public scrutiny, results in checkerboard ownership conflict. Private Timber Consortium meetings-> monthly, Village Inn, wed am. Contact Jeanie Hunt @ weyerhauser SPGFLD for times.

Mechanical thinning

Lots of appropriate tools, cut chip brush,

EX- 5 ac piece near building

Prescribed burning

Good tool

Chemicals

use as pretreat, not by self, part of whole, others work better

Mechanical thinning or

Safety, practice. Instructional film on clearing and fuels reduction

Prescribed burning

Coordinate with Air quality and NRes folk

Riparian area behavior

Sustainable

Goats

Chemicals

Usually used in suppression, consequence of suppression is dead vegetation

DEQ responsible for public info and local contact over what is sprayed, crucial

Concern was not about including anything, but that we shouldn't exclude things because of stigmas that might be attached to them, we should have all options open for consideration.

Mechanical->

can take down to handsaw level, labor intensive

Burn->

Successful method, risky in populated areas, low pop density is positive
Need resources to accommodate risk of pres fire expansion.

5. Are you aware of any current resources or opportunities that may be available to help the County move forward with fuel reduction projects?

no

Forest Management Grant through the USFS. He said that they have received grants from them, but it was not on wildfire mitigation.

Use of Lane County Correction work crews. An opportunity may be better coordination between agencies or private landowners to complete treatments together or at the same time. (Use of tools, labor, etc.)

Just current National Fire Plan grants.

Not aware of any

Most funding that they receive goes to roads, which are restricted for road maintenance and development by state statutes.

Most of the funding that is received is regulated by the state

Waste Management has used some money for site specific clean ups, this only includes old cars, refrigerators, items of this nature. Not specific to vegetation reduction or maintenance and is only on a site specific basis.

Yes

ODF grants for the McKenzie

USFS will have resources to reduce fuel loads once the CWPP is in place

Source Protection Program through EWEB

Assistance to improve drinking water on the McKenzie

For landowners upstream to help them reduce impacts on the McKenzie i.e. if a chemical treatment is proposed, EWEB can help find/fund other treatments that will not have a larger effect on drinking water.

Funding the GIS tool that can help in wildfire preparation and mitigation

Grant money – spent wisely (i.e. not cutting blackberries back)

Two different grants:

National Fire Plan has grants for community assistance funding through all federal agencies. Any organization, county government, local government can get help with planning, prevention education, or actual fuels reduction projects. This grant application process happens yearly.

ODF has access to Western State Fire Managers Grant Fund for fuels reduction or prevention education projects.

Title Two and Three Money: Other options are Title Two and Title Three money that counties get directly which can then be used for those types of projects (prevention education and fuels reduction).

If bio-mass ever gets underway in the state, projects could get developed through that.

The Fire Plan that they do, and that other companies do, could be a good resource.

No

___ --> Public contact in WUI, reactive not proactive.

NFire Plan

ODF fuels reduction grants

SOLV, Boy Scouts

ODF with CWPP

Use pilot projects and follow up from them

EX- Keno Fire District, contact is John, work with USFW

There are regulations on the books that deal with noxious weed control that aren't regularly enforced, the plants that are listed under Department of Agriculture's noxious weed list (ragweed, etc.). There's more enforcement opportunity there that isn't being utilized.

No.

Important to get County to understand this is Not a One Time Event.

ID method of self action, how can they do it themselves

Grant \$ for fuels red on paper looks good, have to do it over and over.

Standalone structures for firewood? Larchitect (landscape architect??)

example house in each dist to address aesthetics?

6.1 What types of non-regulatory programs might be effective in motivating property owners to take action to reduce their risk to wildfire?

Awareness: they provide handouts at the Lane County Fair, in the

Southern Hills area of Eugene and at the County Court House.

Actions must include awareness and giving them information that will empower them to protect themselves.

We can make builders aware of need to use fire retardant materials and sprinklers and they can make buyers aware. So providing information would be helpful.

Education and outreach- said the USFS does a good job of this, the road signs that tell the fire risk.

Media- more information on promoting fire risk

Incentives for people who are watchful for keeping an eye out for people who are starting fires or if there are areas of high risk. A Community Wildfire Watch Program

Help landowners financially – cash payments to help with the cost of treatments.

Public recognition might be a good thing – showcase a family/home/private land treatment as being great and maybe have a newspaper article or on the news.

Insurance breaks on homeowners insurance for having defensible space around the home.

Education – the Firewise workshop is a great example. Sample areas (pilot projects) to demonstrate actions and effects. Dollar incentives per acre of cleared land. Free locations for debris removal for the public.

OUTREACH- promotional materials, education, funding for private cost share

Another Advantage is the GIS system that is being developed includes all tax lot information

mailing addressed

This will allow for easy up-to-date information for direct mailings for landowners in the risk areas or to a target audience

Education – home shows, door to door talking to homeowners

- FireFree Programs: Most successful programs that Lena has seen include the “FireFree Program”, which originated in Bend. It’s a very simple program, mainly a media blitz this time of year (late winter), which publicizes (through radio, TV, newspapers, etc.) ten simple steps that people can take to clean up around their homes and make their homes more defensible. Bend has gone further and created ways to deal with the debris that are created: The landfill opens up free dump days for people to be able to dispose of their debris. This has been successful because it’s something that people can do it in a weekend, so really easy for people participate in.

- “Living With Fire” is another program through ODF that gives simple steps people can take to make their homes defensible. This program is used mostly for more established homes. ODF has a whole newspaper type brochure that they put in newspapers. It’s also affective because it’s simple.
- “Firewise Communities” is another program that’s great for new development. It targets insurance companies, builders, planners, etc.
- Creating action items for the west side: Most of the existing programs seem to have been developed more for “east side” of the state conditions, so starting to work toward further defining fuels that can be found on the west side would be another place to focus efforts.
- OSU has a fire resistant plant guide, for people who want to plan plants that are more resistant to fire than others.

Not really thinking of any, Westridge Fire multiple evacuations

~3-4 yrs ago Lane County “No Fire in My Backyard” magnets (i.e. Firewise Community label)
 NY City program (Don’t let Fire be Your Fault)
 Emphasis on prevention, bring individual into the decision

Insurance ratings
 Educate about combust/non-combust materials
 EX- Deschutes FIRE FREE, not official driven, focus is on citizens

AESTHETICS-> work time is a lot and the result is perceived as being UGLY

Debris-> make disposal methods easy, now have to do it, truck it, and pay somebody to make \$\$ off of it. Centralize (Rexius) v. Decentralize (site) mulching? Need to address profit motive, and interrupt cycle

6.1.1 What are the obstacles in implementing these types of programs?

No enough manpower to reach all of the people that need it

People are busy and have other priorities. But there is the interest, just need to nag and make it a priority. Just need someone to make it happen.

FUNDING—there is never enough to achieve the programs.

Getting insurance companies on board.
Get the County involved – recognition (monitoring?)
Make it standardized across all counties in Oregon. (Less confusing for landowners who own property in multiple counties or for those that move. Also would make it easier for insurance companies to come on board)

Funding. Also, different agencies have different resource values.
**Both areas would be helped by more collaboration – partnerships among agencies are a big asset in getting more grants.

If the programs are not voluntary or voluntary and/or not on the person's land it might be hard to implement.

Reaching homeowners – the ones that come to you and want to help aren't the problem – it's the non-participatory homeowners that are difficult to reach.

- Getting the information into people's hands.
- Keeping it simple for people to understand.
- Recommended actions have to be doable, things that people can do it in a weekend, so that they can just get it done.
- Assisting the elderly and disabled: For elderly, disabled, people that can't do it themselves, the county needs to find ways to help these people take care of fuels reduction and defensible space projects. This could be done through county programs, inmate crews, contracting with private companies, etc., but these people can't be ignored or overlooked.
- Long-term engagement of homeowner participation: The Plan needs to capture people's attention, get them engaged and motivated, get them to follow through with action steps.

Reluctance to participate
Perception of RFD as resource to respond and protect

Retro fit challenges (\$\$\$), Source of incentives
Lack of knowledge and education
Maybe try multimedia and outreach, need basic tool kit for areas to use UNPROTECTED AREAS

\$\$\$, Time, aesthetic perceptions

6.2 What types of regulatory policies might be most effective in reducing potential losses from wildfire?

Lane County Code- Chapter 16

New policy (new 2004 revision to Chapter 15 in Lane County Coed) that gives power to the fire departments to ensure fire safety along public (not county maintained) roads. This allows the fire departments tell the landowner how to make the roads safer incase of a fire emergency.

Widening the roads

Removing tree branches

Making sure that access is available if it is needed.

Collaboration between title companies, the fire department, and the county on telling new landowners and educating them on the restrictions and policies that pertain to the fire break.

In areas where fire danger exists you can regulate the use of fire-retardant building materials, particularly roofing materials. This regulation is not a concern for us, or builders, or roofers. Builders often Ok with using fire-resistant roofing but homeowners want a specific roof type and there is nothing the builder can do. A regulation would help the builder to do the right thing.

Most are in place - More participation with the private landowners and the County on reducing wildfire risk.

County building ordinances to govern roofing materials, etc. County ordinances for new construction could also mandate water sources access and road access/width. (also make new ordinances mandatory for homeowners before they sell)

Housing code ordinances – roofing materials, etc. (suggested we look at the Deschutes County Plan). Insurance policies related to fire risk reduction.

Buffer Zones for new construction sites

Perimeter for all new construction to have an area free of undergrowth

Insurance companies could write in fire protection requirements for homeowners insurance. Building permits or codes to reduce risk. ODF public use regulations.

Senate bill 360.

Fire insurance incentives for homeowners: Insurance companies could start doing homeowner's insurance ratings based on fire safe dwellings, if your home isn't defensible, you might not get fire insurance. Other states already have programs with insurance companies to do this.

New Construction might be easy to change code. Change to building code for existing structures might be hard,

Require occupied structures in the district to join, make part of Lane Code?
Encourage others who aren't in the district to join within a certain time period if code change made
LC done good work reducing fuels below houses and creating def space

Insurance, ISO Ratings
Goal 4 and Goal 7 OR, streamline land use regulations, building codes, and fire codes

F-2 zoning is issued and checked at time of development permit, not a continuous compliance situation.

6.2.1 What are the obstacles in implementing these types of programs?

The fire districts-
Some have and will implement some will not.
Political aspects of asking landowners to maintain the roads
Funding
Collaboration between title companies, fire departments and the county
Getting it to happen- bringing all these parties together to ensure that it happens
There is perception that homebuilders don't like more regulation but this is not the case with fire retardant building materials.

Cost can be an issue, but not the case with Class A fire retardant building materials. Often can be cheaper.

Sprinklers can be a cost issue. But it is more of an issue of homeowner being afraid of sprinklers...that they might go off as a result of a burning steak and ruin carpets, art, sofa, etc. According to fire marshal, sprinklers are more sophisticated today and don't go off accidentally very often because sensitive to heat not smoke. Sprinklers also more affordable today. So, if fire marshal educates builders, then builders can educate home buyers.

I asked who is resistant to regulating use of fire retardant roofing materials in the WUI, the public? I don't think anybody cares. We should just regulate it. I don't think the Commissioners have gotten around to it, but I don't think they are resistant either. I wrote Nancy Matheson (Nathanson?) about the issue once, but never heard back. I'll have to talk to some people, but I would guess you could get our endorsement on this issue.

If a mandate is put in place that makes people do something, there need to be funding there to help them. The funding can come in different

forms- manpower to help them with treatments, or money to fund these projects.

Educating landowners on their responsibilities.
Implementing county ordinances, especially for already built homes/structures.

Funding. Someone to follow up and make sure policies are being met and followed. Resistance from homeowners.

Political Problems

Does not know if codes could be changed

The process of getting codes changed- the entire process of public meetings, hearings, etc.

This would only apply to cities outside incorporated areas
all incorporated cities have their own codes and process for adopting new codes

Possible concern- South Eugene, however this area is inside the UGB and this would have to be taken up with the city of Eugene

Developer, Constituents who have power to stop or request exemptions from the regulations

Gave the example of the house that fell into the McKenzie River, after the owners got an exemption.

Getting insurance companies on board. Building codes need to be rechecked and maintained over time. Public perception of rules (public use regulations) – clear definitions to the public of what “off-road”, etc. means.

Funding for implement senate bill 360 is a continuous problem.

Getting everyone on board and understanding what the law requires.

Convincing insurance companies to get on board could be an obstacle.

States already partnering with insurance companies (usually the larger ones like State Farm) are Colorado, Arizona, and maybe New Mexico.

Who will be enforcement to ensure compliance? Where will the money come from to support them?

Political fear of added costs

i.e. sprinkler system in WUI houses

Feb 2005 pg 7 Fire Fighter Magazine,

Disconnect between on ground folk and policy

People are ready to take action, often don't want to plan

Thus is important to collaborate to use resources well
Maximize resources
Remove duplication which leads to turf battles.

Time of regulation coverage, continuous compliance and persuasion
technique

7. What do you see as your organization's primary role in this community plan and in reducing the wildfire risk to communities in Lane County?

They don't want the lead role- they want to help because of constraints on funding and personnel

After the plan is implemented when more funding is available to promote more awareness Lane Co. feels this is where they could fit in.
Promotion on TV, radio and other media
More promotion at the Lane County Fair (He made it sound like people were really receptive to the literature that was given out at the fair)
When funding is available they could start taking proactive measures for fire mitigation, because of funding this is not possible at the present time.

We have a role if it fits into what we're doing and you nag at me to be part of the agenda and convince me to participate. Our role could be endorsing a regulation for roofing materials in the WUI. Another role is educating home builders.

Identification of risk and hazard areas.

Improving the brush cutting and chipping program. Oakridge has a year round program that is free to residents and chips their brush and other year debris. This has been a successful program that is getting more and more popular.

Benefits to this program

People know that they can get rid of their waste

At the same time because people no longer have to burn their yard waste they are reducing the chances of fire.

Long-term the City is applying for grants to get a leaf vacuum, this way they can start to make mulch to provide back to the city's residents.

To be a partner. Already have cooperative agreement with ODF. Since feds don't have jurisdiction on private lands, be supportive of private land efforts and try to combine them with public land treatments/programs at the same time.

Forest conditions info (NEPA). Map skills; resources
knowledge/specialists; federal publications; resources for treatments.

Compliance Programs Nuisance

Referred me to Jane Burgess- Compliance Officer Nuisance 682.3724

Assistance with debris clean up- (Waste Management- again the site specific assistance)

Keep roads open- for response and recovery

Parks- evacuating camp areas

LCLMD

Referred me to Bill Sage and Keir Miller

Kent Howe- Planning Program Manager- 682.3734

Most Community Development Planning, Outreach and Ordinances are dealt with through them.

They want to help develop the plan, they want to be involved

Their focus is on the McKenzie, because this is where their resources are. (Drinking water, hydroelectric plants, substations)

Want to ensure that this is done right and all avenues are considered in developing and implementing this plan

They have already collaborated with 27 other agencies on the Hazardous Materials GIS tool (a GIS tool that helps in chemical spills) thought that these agencies, with the bridges that have already been built would be a great source of collaboration and to keep the collaboration going.

Keep on with ODF's existing plan. Work on education and prevention.

For commercial timber owner it's about getting your crop to rotation, but fuel reduction should really be encouraged. And the industry really isn't going that way. Lot of fuels are being left on ground because of the cost of burning and the restriction to when you can burn. You can treat chemically, but fuels still left on ground creating a risk, which is also risk to your neighbors and community. Many companies just concerned about crop rotation, but if leave risk, then affects more people down the road.

ODF is best suited to facilitate development of the plan, because they have the ability to bring in federal partners to help work on plan, they have wildland fire expertise, and have an understanding of fire behavior in wildland setting. ODF can also offer help on the technical side. However, they'd be best as facilitators because they already work with all the other fire agencies.

ODF also has access to grant funding through other programs, and they can get money for fuels reduction projects once the plans for fuels reduction projects are developed.

Weyerhaeuser's primary role is to continue to exercise tight control over their operators in fire prevention. They monitor their products from harvesting to delivery and they take responsibility for the fires that they are responsible for.

The better they can control access and keep people out of their lands, the more effectively Weyerhaeuser can prevent fires.

Partners and supportive of mitigation efforts
Represent the response arm LCSO
Help with rural landowners

All RFD's responsible for education about risk and mitigation; public education
Coordinate with County group, LC Fire Prevention Co-op

Technical assistance
Iterative Feedback can help us evaluate and wants to hear how we are doing. Important to hear successes to highlight
She can inform from the state level.

Rosboro's largest role is to maintain their own property, they can start there. If they have conditions on their land that present risks to the community, then they need to be internally aware of that and their role. Rosboro can also work through associations for increasing the education component to educate rural landowners about wildfires.
East, South Cascade district, all districts have wildfire education programs that Rosboro supports.

Willing to be a strong partner in County project, part of solution
Provide information, site visits, be proactive
Make them not want to see us 😊, educational outreach about risk

8. How this plan strengthen your involvement in wildfire risk reduction and support it in the long-term?

Media
Providing awareness materials for people and to educate them on how to protect themselves.
Handouts
Providing information from insurance companies about reductions in fire insurance if measures are taken to protect their house.

Nag us. Be a squeaky wheel.

He wants to see an outline or the plan before saying how Oakridge will fit into the plan

Once the plan has prioritized fuel reduction projects/zones, USFS will know what needs to be done and go in that direction. They can get ahead of the game by knowing what needs to be done.

Once plan is in place and risk prioritization is established, it will be easier to plan projects and get funding for projects. Will be clear which areas need to be focused on.

They want to have a voice at the table

The already distribute 5 million in road funds to cities in Lane County; however this is mainly for roads projects.

They are already involved with inter-agency collaborative efforts

-Inter-Agency emergency response team, they determine where and what the risk are in Lane County. This is for all disasters and Haz Mat emergencies

These efforts are already in place, easier to bring people into the process

CWPP provides GIS information to EWEB. This information can help develop the GIS on a year-to-year basis if all the agencies and stakeholders are actively involved. Knowledge of where the risk areas are to address them annually
GIS will be long-term support

It will put more emphasis on ODF's existing programs.

It depends on what types of programs and where projects start.

Important issues to us are fuel reduction projects around right of ways and roads – fires tend to start near roads – keep right of ways brushed up – power lines and railroad right-of-ways often have high fuel loads.

ODF is interested in creating partnerships with neighboring agencies in different levels of government.

Through the partnerships, communities can partner with them and understand what the problems and risks are.

Giving people understanding and education will reduce the risk of wildfire and reduce the size of fire because fuels on the landscape will have actually been changed. From this, we will reduce the potential for large-scale, hazardous wildfires.

No one is more committed to fire prevention than Weyerhaeuser; Didn't seem to think that any improvements needed to/could be made to Weyerhaeuser's fire prevention policies and programs (not what he said, but my inference from his comments).

Build in a year by year evaluation to ensure that Forest Patrol team exists with funding,

County wide plan in place so don't have to re-invent the wheel
Coordinate and support interaction
like Eugene FD in south hills re "Not in my backyard"

Review plans and provide input
Clear communication of expectations: do we want her input or not?
Can assist with oversight at the local level

Best thing would be that any plan that comes out would have an array of incentives for landowners to keep up their property and protect it from wildfires. Any plan needs to work with the strategies already in place and enhance those.

Mentioned that often you'll see big mega-programs/plans that come out, and all this work and money has been spent on them and then no results are seen. So any plan that we produce should work toward getting the information out and getting the plan actually implemented on the ground level.

Mentioned incentives, and when I asked further he suggested property tax incentives. Canada has a tax structure that if a person's property was in better condition you received a tax break for it.

LC- a better/more responsive partner, consistent rural housing zoning F-2 and Rural Residential is two different things and can be totally contiguous in landscape.

9. What opportunities and obstacles do you see for increased collaboration with other agencies and stakeholders?

Opportunities

Once the collaborative process is setup this will allow for more public to be reached and informed.

Constraints

Funding for developing the plans and getting it off the shelf

Developers are part of the HBA. However, not a lot of developments in rural areas because of land use laws, particularly not in forested areas. Only individual's homes being built in rural areas, we can work with individual homebuilder and buyers. I perceive the fire marshal as being more concerned with access.

Homeowners- opportunities this will help them protect themselves. This is where collaboration and education will really help landowners. Fire insurance reductions- collaboration between insurance agencies and homeowners could save both parties money.
Obstacles- if homeowners did not participate and FUNDING

One obstacle is that usually the more people that are involved, the harder it is to get stuff done (too much time spent talking, figuring things out). **If the CWPP can develop standards (remove the preliminaries) it may make it easier for effective collaboration among agencies and landowners.

It also may make it easier to collaborate if there is some review board made up of people from all aspects (steering committee?) to prioritize projects in a collaborative way because different agencies have different priorities (would make it non-competitive).

This process (writing the plan) is an opportunity for collaboration among agencies and stakeholders. It brings everyone together and shows opportunities for future collaboration.

Obstacles

Funding is an obstacle for all agencies

Opportunities

Already have collaborative effort set up

Rural CERT program- (Community Emergency Response Training Program) - for more details contact Linda Cook

Opportunities

If this plan is done right- collaboration, careful risk assessment, and all action items are attainable and landowners are given options.

Once collaboration occurs and everyone is on the same page, then communication is already set up and networks are already there.

Obstacles

Not giving landowners a choice, could kill the plan

Make sure that collaboration occurs not once but over time.

If through this process people get interested, it might bring in other groups not thought of before to collaborate with. Also, bring in other rural fire protection districts that are not very involved – interior valley RFPDs are quite involved and have training, while exterior valley

RFPDs are less involved and don't have staffed fire stations and very little training...basically just have a fire truck and volunteers (there is an existing Lane County Fire Prevention Co-op).

Opportunities with the noxious weed program.
Also, opportunity with RFPDs defensible space programs.
Awareness and education in interface areas of WUI issues.
Building codes have helped with flammable materials.

ODF sees a places a great importance of creating partnerships with traditional and nontraditional partners. This could include bringing in organizations like water shed councils and homeowners associations.

Having these partnerships in place will helps ODF fight fires, because they will then already have connections to people and resources: the connections will already have been made.

Different agencies have different rules and regulations, different priorities, which could cause obstacles. For example, ODF can do projects pretty quickly on private lands because their system allows for it, but federal agencies don't have such an easy process, and can't act as quickly as ODF. Working around everyone's bureaucracy could be an obstacle.

Whatever they can do to collaborate with law enforcement, BLM, and landowners with reducing the occurrence of roadside fires is important to Weyerhaeuser. Vigorously prosecuting the people who do seal from them and set fires puts the word out that people shouldn't mess with Weyerhaeuser because they will follow through and prosecute trespassers and violators.

Weyerhaeuser has a pretty good relationship with the BLM in reducing public access to Weyerhaeuser lands during high fire season. Weyerhaeuser doesn't have as much contact with the USFS.

Weyerhaeuser is more interested in collaborating with their neighbors, and doesn't see obstacles to collaboration. Potential obstacles could come from trying to collaborate with other agencies/stakeholders where goals aren't aligned.

Other obstacles come from people who are well meaning but uneducated on wildfire prevention issues: they can throw up road blocks because they don't understand the real goals to reducing wildfire.

Funding source as opportunity and obstacle

County wide plan will encourage involvement
Coordinator is key, need leader to keep it up. Some folks are not willing to participate for whatever reason

Obstacles:

- Compressed timelines
- How to keep process sustainable and manageable
- How to maintain funding stream for efforts
- How to keep issue on radar if no challenge, how to keep up interest

Providing better wildland fire training for rural fire departments
Rural homeowner education
Providing people with more education
Governmental regulations control the ability to reduce fuels: prescribed burning is getting harder to do, stricter governmental regulations—so looking at ways to make the regulations not as tight.

Opportunity-> who will take ownership at the County is unclear, needs upper echelon (County Commissioners) commitment to last.

Obstacle-> \$\$\$\$

10. Do you know of effective efforts, programs, or public/private partnerships in other communities related to wildfire mitigation that could be applied in Lane County?

no

no

no

Look at Josephine County plan and the Deschutes County plan.

Deschutes County education programs – seem to be successful and have gotten several grants funded.

Does not know specifics
Referred us to New Mexico, Communities in Colorado, and Bonanza County, CA (Lake Tahoe area)

Heard of some, but no details

SB 360, Firewise, Fire First. There are codes and regulations already in place.

ODF has the defensible space program. Also, Lane County code - if build next to F1 and F2 lands, then you acknowledge your building next to lands where forest management/industry. This is good, because landowner can't later object to commercial forest activities. There is an opportunity here the defensible space issues when new homes are built. People could install sprinkler systems, but I don't support telling people they have to install a sprinkler system or anything like that.

Josephine County's CWPP

Bend is starting a CWPP and so is Klamath Falls. All four counties in Northeastern Oregon will be starting soon too.

Washington – a college mentioned a program near King County run by the Washington Department of Natural Resources. She didn't mention specifics (had none to tell me), but said that what we're doing sounds like something that the DNR was doing.

ODF has something funded by the forest service to do public outreach
Tim Mehan as an ODF contact.

No, refer to fire folks.

San Diego CA County community wide plans

Kathy Lynn

HFRA- provides clear direction

Her outreach grant in the works

Collaborative examples

Josephine County

NFPA 299 codes and regs

No, he couldn't think of any.

Not really, Deschutes County cooperation

11. Would your organization be willing to collaborate on more site-specific local community fire plans that follow the countywide plan?

Referred me to Kent Howe

Yes. We work best at very local level; our scope is mostly very local. We are involved at single home and individual level.

Yes, don't know how much time could be given. He said that the office was strapped. Maybe the Fire Department and other fire districts could help in this area.

Hazel Dell Rural Fire District would be a place to start.

Yes – already work closely with ODF and would follow their lead on private projects.

Yes – and have already agreed to help on the Oakridge/Lowell/Dexter community fire plan.

Kent Howe question (see contact information above)

Yes

EWEB will work with ODF in communities on the McKenzie that will follow the CWPP

Sure

We'll definitely be up for listening and being part of the process.

Absolutely, as long as funding can be found to implement local plans.

If this plan is aligned with their business plan then they would be willing to collaborate.

It's more likely that Weyerhaeuser would work any collaboration efforts through the Easter Lane Forest Protection Association. The association meets briefly to get consensus about what partnerships they want to make and what positions the group as a whole is taking on collaborative efforts.

Yes if applicable to area of response, which is public lands and unincorporated areas of Lane County, areas outside municipal areas.

Definitely, key to working project

Would encourage FDB chief to provide technical oversight and encourage participation

Yes, often times local community groups can get together to work on these issues, and he sees that ability here.

Sure.

11.1 Who else might be interested in working on more local plans?

Sheriff's Department

See above

Incorporated governments, Rural and City fire departments, watershed councils, soil and water conservation districts

Depends on the area – maybe private timber companies, EWEB, RFPDs, independent communities, watershed councils.

Howard Schussler
Assistant Public Works Director
Will be taking Dale's place after May

Rural fire districts- all that EWEB is involved with are part of this project.

Rural Fire Districts, Homeowners Associations

Rural fire departments are always interested, especially when it comes to mapping and identifying their local high-risk areas and available access routes and obstacles to access routes.

Federal agencies are always interested in local plans because working with local governments helps them cooperate with projects on federal lands adjacent to local government lands.

Watershed councils
Tribal Governments
Fish and Wildlife

The Eastern Lane Forest Protection Association will be discussing the CWPP because of the Association's connection with ODF.
Steve Cafferata, a retired forester, is, in his opinion, the most knowledgeable person in Oregon about funding and collaboration for wildfire prevention. Might be a good resource, he's very active in the Eastern Lane Association and is currently working on a funding project for Weyerhaeuser.

USFS, BLM, ODF, LC Fire Defense Board
Umpqua, Siuslaw, Willamette, ODNRA, all BLM lands in County

Homeowner Assoc
Co Commerce McKenzie Valley
Local newspaper
ODF
Large Timber companies

EManagers Citizen Groups Media Outlets
Homeowners Assoc Kathy Lynn PWCH ODF Ann Walker
LCF Co-op (big Player) wide range of organizations

Certainly rural fire departments
Watershed councils

ODF #1 partner
LC Public Works – hauling debris, turned over roads to local access status
Couple homeowners assoc, desire is there action so far is not.

12. Introduction to Firewise Community Workshop in early April. Invite stakeholder to attend and bring local stakeholders that would be interested in creating site-specific community wildfire protection plans.

He wants to come and he said that he would bring people

Yes, I'll attend or one of our builders will.

He is interested in attending and wanted to make sure that we are inviting the RFPDs.

Send information to Brian Maldenich, GIS Coordinator 682.6950

Yes.

Is looking forward to bringing together non-traditional players (such as planners, developers, insurance company agents) with traditional players. Planners, developers, insurance companies, who don't necessarily look at the fire safety aspect of homes when building homes, are targeted through the Firewise Workshops. Hopefully we can increase education and awareness and look at the whole aspect of wildfire risk reduction.

Is on the Board of Directors for the Eastern Lane Forest Protective Association and thought he and the Association's president would want to come.

Interested, How to apply to rural communities?

Oregon Small Woodlands Associations are collections of small woodland owners, and Lane County has a chapter. The Lane County Chapter may be interested in coming to the workshop.

Yes, keep posted, busy schedule

13. Is there anything else that I haven't asked you about that you think I should note?

Long term and big- OR legislative develop an overall agency or committee to work with FD, counties and others to discuss hazard plans.

No

No

No, covered everything.

No

Other organizations to consider

LCOG- Talk to Linda to get a contact name

They want to be part of the process and informed of treatments that will occur on the McKenzie River.

No

No

No

Can't think of anything.

This is programs third year, funding source is BLM O+C timber rev, LCSO is only O+C county fully funded by title 3 and have the largest crew, other counties cost share the position in their existing department.

Forest Work Camp

Fire crews in summer, do fuels reduction projects for USFS and BLM as well. Contact Clint Riley David Thomas

Glad doing it, community and county-wide plans carry legitimacy.

Interested in tracking CWPP efforts, and communicate to larger whole
Ann Walker ODF NFP Coordinator

Bonnie Wood USFS NF Plan Coordinator

PNW Wildfire Coordination Group=> Prevention team (she is member)
focus on Communication between teams, coordination across teams,
maximize assets ID and solve gaps.

Challenge is pooling data at the state level

Fire Defense Boards per county to take to local level

RFD's generally focused on suppression, key is to bring in, listen to
demands they have

Funding source for local RA

Inventory in community
ready for dispatch

Sending unprotected areas perspectives and SB 2154 to respond before
resource depletion.

Construct mutual aid programs to include un-included areas, ISO orgs

Point of County CWPP to eliminate comp in county

ID strong grant writers in County
portion out work and apply skills

ID overlap of interests

Mutual mentor of mitigation (statewide levels)

Gated Y newsletter issue 1/05 and 12/04 CWPP

Often times we see these fire hazards that accumulate on private property where the landowners should have an obligation to deal with it, but isn't. Those types of situations should be a concern to the county. Issues that can arise through no one's fault or that are no one's responsibility, fuel build-ups that no one is taking care of. The county should look for ways to identify those areas and deal with them, maybe use contingency funding.

Graphic example of disaster potential is missing in the county, all from elsewhere.

Long term solution is needed to perception problem, which will result in commitment or lack there of.

FD as centers in rural areas, County wide yearly celebrations, debris pick up points, info centers, celebrate who they are and not using them
☺

Demo fire proof homes.

Debris removal partners, standalone fire sheds?

Central v Decentralized mulch conversion cost-benefit analysis.